

The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIBNER-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)

BOY W. HOWARD President
TALCOTT POWELL Editor
EARL D. BAKER Business Manager

Phone—Riley 5561

Member of United Press,
Scribner-Howard Newspaper
Management Association, Enter-
prise Association, Newspaper
Information Service and Auto-
dit Bureau of Circulations.Owned and published daily
(except Sunday) by The In-
dianapolis Times Publishing
Co., 414-29 West Maryland
Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Price in Marion county, 2
cents; elsewhere, 1 cent;
cents—delivered by carrier 12
cents a week. Mail subscription
rates in Indiana, \$5 a
year; outside of Indiana, \$5
cents a month.

MONDAY, AUG. 28, 1933

MOLEY RESIGNS

NEWS of the withdrawal of Dr. Raymond Moley from the administration will be received with regret by those who know of his valuable services as an adviser to Mr. Roosevelt.

His best friends have realized since, if not before, the London economic conference that his position at the state department was untenable. The secretary of state is the chief of cabinet. In the case of Mr. Hull, the secretary of state also happens to be a powerful party leader.

By the very nature of the case, it was impossible for one of the President's closest advisers to serve as assistant secretary of state in such manner that the authority and responsibility of the secretary could be questioned. Also, there was the added consideration that Professor Moley was not an expert in foreign affairs.

It was unfair to put him in that position at the state department in the first place, and his own indiscretions did not improve the original mistake.

But in recent weeks there has been hope that some special position might be created for him in which he would continue in his capacity of adviser to the President in domestic affairs, or that he might be given a key position in the weak department of justice as an expert.

Unfortunately, his recent temporary assignment to that department's racketeering investigation seems to have been more in the nature of a face-saving than anything else.

If Mr. Moley now feels, as he says, that he can function better in connection with a new liberal weekly magazine than in an official capacity, it is easy to believe that his close personal association with the President will continue.

This newspaper wishes him the best of luck in the new venture.

WITHOUT A BREAK

THE state of Washington Tuesday is expected to become the twenty-fourth state to ratify repeal of national prohibition. Saturday, Texas voted for the repeal amendment. So, with monotonous regularity, the once arid regions of the south and west join the wet parade. Not one state so far has voted in favor of prohibition in this referendum.

No wonder that Bishop Cannon, the oratorical bug gun of the drys, just has sailed for Europe. He has seen the handwriting on the ballot boxes.

As Postmaster-General James A. Farley in his campaign in Vermont is telling the voters, the question is not "shall" the eighteenth amendment be repealed, but "when."

The time element is important not only to wipe out the travesty of enforcement, but also for financial reasons. Tax relief is needed. Liquor taxes automatically will be repealed if prohibition repeal becomes effective before the first of the year. But if repeal is delayed until January or later, those special taxes automatically will carry through the entire year.

Apparently there is now little danger that ratification by the thirty-sixth state will be delayed beyond December. But it would be very foolish for the repeal forces to accept as certainty that which can be assured only by pressing the fight until the last necessary state is in.

IF THIS BE DICTATORSHIP

PROFESSOR WILLIAM F. OGBURN, University of Chicago sociologist who quite properly resigned last week from the NRA Consumers Board in protest against its do-nothing policy, is in the headlines again. This time it is with a speech predicting the decline of democracy and the spread of dictatorship.

Handicapped by inability to foretell the future, we can not compete with the professor as a soothsayer. He may be right or he may be wrong about the future.

But we disagree with him as to the present. To imply, as he is reported to have, that dictatorships are more efficient than democracies because they are quicker in meeting issues is muddy thinking, in our judgment.

The world's most severe dictatorship just has fallen in Cuba, while the Russian dictatorship survives and grows stronger. The German democracy has collapsed, while the American democracy is showing greater powers of recuperation than many dictatorships.

These examples are typical. They prove that it is impossible to generalize with accuracy. The fact is that there are efficient and inefficient, strong and weak, dictatorships, just as there are efficient and inefficient, strong and weak, democracies.

The mechanical form of a government, when tested by experience, seems to be much less important than other factors. Among the determining factors certainly the ability of the men in power and the spirit of the people are important.

The relative success of the Russian dictatorship and of the American democracy today is due largely in both cases to the willingness of the people to follow the government, even at great sacrifice. And the failure of the German democracy and of the Cuban dictatorship was due largely to the people's loss of faith in the governmental leaders, rather than in the governmental forms.

When quick government action is necessary to save a situation, a dictatorship has more power to compel such speed than has a democracy—in theory, but not always in fact. The Russian dictatorship was unable to carry out its farm planning program quickly, while the American democracy cut its cotton production almost overnight.

Speed in meeting emergencies, which Professor Ogburn finds so important in a government's survival, obviously depends far more on the spirit and temper of the people

in relation to government leadership than on whether the form of government is a democracy or a dictatorship.

A dictatorship, no less than a democracy, depends for its life on consent of the governed—as many failed dictators have discovered to their sorrow.

It is true that in national emergencies the chief executive must have extraordinary powers, similar to those of a captain of a ship in a storm, if he is to pull the nation through. But, as has been proved repeatedly in the history of the United States, a democracy is capable of delegating those extraordinary powers to its executive.

And when those unusual powers are delegated freely by the people, the democratic executive is apt to be more powerful than any other kind of dictator.

America is operating under a dictatorship today, probably the most powerful in the world. But the dictator was chosen by the votes of the people in a free election, and his temporary extraordinary powers were granted by the elected representatives of the people constitutionally.

GET IT CIRCULATING

THE vast American caravan of recovery moves forward. But its wheels would turn faster if greased by the vast spending power of \$2,026,000,000 tied up in the 2,858 national and state banks that still are closed.

Recovery Chief Hugh S. Johnson is urging the treasury department to speed up the opening of these banks. He is asking this in a general demand upon banks that they loosen up in response to the appeals of reviving business and industry for loans which many banks are reluctant to make.

The business men say they must have money to move the goods which are coming in growing volume from the factories.

The treasury department, we are glad to note, promises that the next sixty days will see the reopening of the 897 closed national and ninety-five closed state banks affiliated with the Federal Reserve system.

These contain \$167,000,000 and \$204,000,000, respectively. Some 1,866 closed state banks which do not belong to the Federal Reserve system contain \$1,005,000,000 in deposits.

If measuring sticks are needed to help visualize the volume of spending power represented by the \$2,026,000,000 we offer below several such comparative measurements. The \$2,026,000,000 of deposits frozen up in closed banks represent:

Two-thirds of the federal government's \$3,300,000,000 public works appropriation.

One-half of the total budgeted cost of the federal government for this year.

One-sixteenth of the deposits in the nation's banks now open.

One-fifth of all the savings bank deposits in the country.

One-twentieth of the total cost of the World war to the United States.

One-eleventh of the war debt owed this country by foreign powers.

One-third of all the money in circulation in the country at the end of June, 1933.

These comparisons indicate how extremely important it is that the pledge of the treasury department officials be kept regarding the opening of the 992 Federal Reserve affiliates yet closed.

And the federal government ought, we believe, to exert more far-reaching effort in stimulating the state to open up the 1,866 closed state banks and to get the \$1,005,000,000 deposited in them circulating again in the country's reviving commerce.

Half enough money is tied up in all the closed banks to run the federal government for a year. Get it into the hands of the spenders!

LABOR COMES INTO ITS OWN

AMERICAN labor can take a hitch in its pants and cock its hat over one ear when it celebrates Labor day this year.

On every Labor day, that any one can remember, the nation has handed the working man a lot of flowery tributes about the nobility of his toil, and has complimented him with sugary phrases for being the backbone of the republic.

This year, for the first time, the nation is beginning to act as if it meant all those things.

In that fact there is signalized the opening of a great new vista for labor. It has its charter of freedom, at last; it has its most valiant friends in high places at Washington; it has a pretty definite assurance that it is not going to get marked cards from the bottom of the deck any longer.

And on the coming Labor day, so significant with its promise of a new deal for the man who works for wages, it might be an extremely good thing if the men who own and direct the physical properties of the United States would sit down for a moment and meditate on the debt that they owe to labor.

Labor has played ball during the trying years of the depression.

It has paid for those years in acute hardship—in hunger, in want, in loss of hope, in disappointment, in unwanted idleness. It has been tried as never before. It has seen the games of former Labor days turned into mockeries by the economic collapse.

But it has kept the faith. It has not turned radical, it has not opened its brawny hands to destroy the system which let it down. It simply tightened its belt and waited for a break in the luck.

Now the break has come. Labor can celebrate this holiday as never before. Its rights are written into federal law—its rights to a job, its rights to a living wage and a decently short working day, its rights to organize in its own way to protect its status.

The federal government is pledged to see that those rights are respected.

With all of this, of course, goes a new responsibility. Labor has been given a new charter of rights; it is up to labor, now, to demonstrate that this charter will not be abused. To prove that capital and consumer alike can get from labor the kind of co-operation that will be necessary if the last pull will be prosperity is to be completed.

That such co-operation will be given is easy to believe.

A new day has dawned for the American working man. His past record makes one confident that he neither will abuse the privileges it brings him nor neglect the duties it entails.

THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

THAT SPARE TIME

WHAT are the American millions now becoming turned loose anywhere from eight to forty hours weekly in that devil's workshop, idleness, going to do about it?

Nothing to do at all Monday or all Tuesday or all Wednesday. Holiday and no picnic to go to. With characteristic vision Grover Whalen, head of the New York recovery administration, leaps to the front with the appointment of a committee to help solve this great problem. He says:

A large percentage of garment workers, who have been toiling in sweatshops as high as seventy hours a week, are about to return to work for a maximum of thirty-five hours weekly. What are they to do with these thirty-five hours saved?

What are the clerks in the countless stores and shops of the nation going to do with the twenty hours and more a week that will be left hanging heavy on their hands?

Mr. Whalen expects that his committee will make New York City a great laboratory for the solution of the problem for the whole country.

The committee will find a reservoir of experience in the million Gotham victims of unemployment who can testify well to the effects of a life of no work and also no play. The problem of these in solving itself through new jobs will make a problem of leisure for the now employed.

The former has been bearing the whole brunt of the inevitable consequence of the technological age—a surplus of leisure. Now leisure is to be distributed.

Obviously the general solution will cost money and greater effort. It will, doubtless, in great part take the form of community activities, such as cultural, musical, choral and sporting activities.

Education will have to be provided along new lines for people all the way from the cradle to the grave.

Mr. Whalen and his committee will be pioneers in what is to become the foremost problem of the American people. In the answer to that problem will come a vast new growth of enlightenment and new sinews for true democracy.

NO MORE TOOTHACHES

DR. FRANK M. CASTRO, president-elect of the American Dental Association, predicts that the toothache will be practically unknown in another hundred years.

The science of preventive dentistry is advancing so fast, and people are getting so well educated to its advantages, that few teeth ever will reach the stage in which they give pain.

All this is a very glittering and attractive sort of picture, surely, and it leads one to speculate idly on the attitude our grandchildren will have when they look back at the conditions under which we are living today.

We ourselves look back at Elizabethan times and wonder how on earth people ever endured the manifold discomforts and physical inconveniences of that era; and, by the same token, we thank our stars that we live in a more enlightened age.

May not our grandchildren, reading of the torments we suffered from aching teeth, wonder how we ever put up with such things?

We haven't read that new laundry code yet, but we trust there's something in it that will provide divorce litigants from washing their dirty linen in public.

That world's fair midget who fired a pistol to attract the attention of a dancer with whom he was in love probably was just trying to make her think that he was a Big Shot.

The loan shark is a very diligent man—he takes so much interest in his work.

M.E. Tracy Says:

THERE are two basic theories of medicine. One is that promising remedies are justifiable for the sake of knowledge. The other is that doubtful remedies should be avoided for the sake of the patient.

No one has been able to draw a satisfactory line between them, and the chances are that no one ever will. There are too many doubtful cases and too many promising remedies.

Dr. Evan says that "many doctors still have to learn that when the operation is more dangerous than the condition to be remedied, the surgeon should not operate."

Dr. Harold B. Disbrow says, "before you perform an operation, involving any risk for the patient, don't consult your professional views, but ask yourself would I perform this operation, under these conditions, on my mother?"

Such sentiments are not only beyond question, but beyond practice.

In theory, no remedy should be applied if it is worse than the disease, but if a disease is sure to be fatal and to involve excruciating pain, how can any remedy be worse?

IT goes without saying that medicine was made for men, but largely through such blunders and experiments as one does not like to think about.

If doctors had hesitated to apply remedies or perform operations where grave risk was involved, they would not know as much as they do today. On the other hand, some of them have been altogether too free with the knife and drugs, not only for the sake of science, but the sake of fame and revenue.

It is easy enough for a doctor or even a layman to sit back while in good health and prescribe rules under which an operation should be performed, but just let a case of cancer pop up or a fractured skull and see how quickly those rules break down.

All patients want to live or to be relieved of severe pain. Their relatives and friends feel the same way about it. In critical cases, there always is doubt, and the doubt is such as to make emotionalism, rather than intelligence, the deciding factor. The doctor can guarantee nothing, and neither can any one else.

IT relatives and friends refuse to permit an operation under such circumstances and the patient dies, they always regret it. If an operation is performed and the patient dies, they are inclined to say that the doctor took unnecessary chances.

It sort of puts the doctor on the spot. He should, of course, place human values above scientific values, but not to a point that would prevent science from being of greater benefit to humanity.

Though we would like to believe otherwise, medical progress calls for more or less gambling with life, more or less experimenting, guessing, and empiricism.

Many operations that once were considered dangerous now are regarded as comparatively safe. That is because some doctors "dare" to take the risk.

In the beginning, every new idea which deals with vital forces involves more or less hazard, but unless our notion of progress and civilization is all wrong, refusal to try it involves even greater hazard.

Speed in meeting emergencies, which Professor Ogburn finds so important in a government's survival, obviously depends far more on the spirit and temper of the people

A Tough Subject to Work On!



It Seems to Me

BY HEYWOOD BROUN

NEW YORK, Aug. 28—As age creeps on, I have begun to worry about the fact that columnists are very seldom loved. I mean in our public capacity. I understand that in private some of the boys are doing very well indeed. That may burn me up, but it does not concern me. At least, not in open discussion.

I am thinking wholly of our position in the great world at large, and I doubt that any code can save us.

There is something of endearment in such phrases as "veteran actor," "venerable clergyman," "aged bard." But "old world man" suggests somebody with five weeks growth of white beard who wants to bore row \$6.

Booth Got a Break

NOBOOTH ever held it against N. Booth, as far as I can ascertain, that he played Hamlet very many times. And when a preacher picks a sermon out from the barrel nobody gets mad. Perhaps a few stay away. But, after all, they do that to columnists all the time.

Only yesterday I was talking of the five-day week. There is no effective movement at the moment to make it apply to those who do a daily column stint. There should be such a demand. It ought to come from the consumers.

Obviously the run-of-the-mill columnist is not overworked. He merely becomes more mill-like with the years. I have a notion that I would be quite a little better if I could only skip Friday. This isn't a superstition. I am just making the point where the sag is likely to set in.

Most Mondays are brilliant. I mean comparatively speaking. Here is the beginning of a new week and the wage slave says, "Now I am going to turn over a leaf, and actually settle down to serious contemplation."