

NO INTERVENTION
COMPROMISE governments thrown up to stop revolution rarely last long. When the De Céspedes regime followed the Machado dictatorship in Cuba less than a month ago, we pointed out that the new provisional president was a conservative land owner and former Machado cabinet member, closely identified with the old ruling class, against which the revolt was directed.

He was more acceptable to the American building interests dominating the island than to the Cuban people. Now he has fallen.

That Senor De Céspedes gave his conservative best is not questioned. But that best was not good enough. He did not proceed quickly enough against his old Machado associates. He did not hasten a constituent assembly. He did not move toward a solution of the land problems.

His sympathies were not with labor, though left wing influences in his cabinet prevented positive action against the workers. His regime planned for property interests, instead of hearing the cries of the people in their misery.

The revolutionary leader De La Torre put the case against the De Céspedes government in a sentence: "It does not represent the workers, the women or other national elements."

And in any revolution that is the determining issue. The government may make mistakes, it may fall for a time to improve the lot of the people, but it must represent the revolutionary masses and hold their confidence.

President De Céspedes never had that popular confidence. Therefore, he was overthrown for failure to achieve in three weeks that which might require several years for a revolutionary government to accomplish.

Considering the long reign of terror to which the Cuban people have been subjected, it is noteworthy that the overthrow of Machado was accompanied by a minimum of violence and that the revolt against De Céspedes has been bloodless—at least according to early reports.

With this record of restraint, in the face of provocation which easily might have led to widespread violence, the Cuban people in their revolution deserve the sympathetic respect of the United States. Both the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations wisely refrained from military intervention under the Platt amendment against the Machado dictatorship, even though American property and lives were endangered.

Therefore, it is all the more necessary that the United States now refrain from military intervention against a revolutionary government—except under the most extreme provocation.

Because it would cause more unrest than it would quiet, because it would interfere with the inalienable right of the Cuban people to work out their own problems in their own way, because it would create an enemy at our door and make Latin-America hate us, United States military intervention now would be a tragedy for all concerned.

There are too many war clouds in Europe and the Pacific for us to fool with the friendship of our American neighbors.

THE HOOVERCRATS EMERGE

IT isn't often that the Hoovercrats emerge from their enforced seclusion to take pot shots at the new deal.

For one thing, they have learned that it's unpopular to attack a system which is getting results, where their own failed so miserably. For another, few people will listen to their wails about the passing of their cherished "rugged individualism."

So, for the most part, these political torials have remained on the sidelines, saving their verbal ammunition for special occasions and sympathetic audiences.

The recent convention of the American Bar Association was such an occasion. From start to finish, it was a field day for those who dislike what is going on today in Washington. And they made the most of their opportunity.

Clarence A. Martin, president of the association, bitterly denounced the child labor amendment to the federal Constitution. It was, he said, "a Communist attempt to nationalize America's children."

Democratic Senator Patrick A. McCarran of Nevada, accused President Roosevelt of violating the principles of the Democratic party by the NRA and other emergency legislation.

He, figuratively, raised his hands in horror at the revolutionary character of the new deal, declaring that it "sweeps away the structures fought for and reared by the great Jefferson."

Other speakers bemoaned the passing of state rights in favor of a centralized government. That, too, they said, was deserting the principles laid down by the fathers of the nation.

And as a final touch, the association was called upon to approve the NRA only as a "temporary expedient"—this approval to be withdrawn as soon as the necessity is removed.

There is nothing to get alarmed about in the utterances of these exponents of the old order of things. Fortunately, they speak only for a discredited minority—and as the representatives of a system that has its chance and failed.

Yet, it is strange that the events of the last five months have not softened their opposition to the new deal. It is strange that these political torials are blind to what the rest of the country sees so clearly—the de-

nite results the Rooseveltian program is beginning to achieve.

Five months ago, this band of irreconcilables could and did attack the new deal on the grounds that it wouldn't work. But today that argument has been scotched.

The new deal is working. It already has put 2,000,000 men back to work. It has meant wage increases for hundreds of thousands of employees. It has meant shorter hours for millions.

In the face of all this, the silly talk about "Communism," "revolutionary changes," "centralized government," etc., is hard to understand.

Even though these Hoovercrats are skeptical about the new deal, they at least might give it a chance to work. Fairness alone calls for that.

Yet, they persist in making foolish prophecies, in pointing out handwriting on the wall that is visible to no one else.

Fortunately for the country's economic salvation, the great majority of America's 120,000,000 people will pay little attention to such croaking soothsayers.

WAY OPENED FOR PROGRESS

BACK of all the concrete developments of the new program at Washington there exists a profound change in the outlook of the American people—a change which, in the long run, will prove the most important single development of the whole "new deal."

This changed outlook finds its reflection in the various legislative and administrative acts by which the administration is seeking to implement recovery.

But it is a deeper thing than any mere change in the machinery of government or political theory; it is not born of any party and it does not owe its existence to the presence or absence of any particular group on Capitol Hill.

Briefly, this change can be described by saying that we at last have got entirely away from the psychology and the odd kind of idealism that characterized us during nearly all the '20s.

We have outgrown, that is to say, a stage in our history during which we were perhaps the most purely materialistic people on earth. In that stage we worshiped material success in a way that was almost devout.

With very few exceptions, our heroes were the men who knew how to make money fast—and we weren't very particular about how they made it. The go-getter and the high-pressure lad were in the limelight, and most of us envied them and tried to copy them.

That this was an extremely unhealthy period is, by this time, pretty clear. The machine age was beginning to dump its greatest problems in our laps, and we blithely ignored them, because the machine age was making some people very rich.

The seeds of all our present misfortunes took root in those days, and we were too self-satisfied to try to dig them out.

We are wiser now, and in our attainment of wisdom we have had something very like a spiritual rebirth.

For in giving up our slavish admiration of money and the money-makers, we have made possible a return to the traditional American idealism.

We have stopped defining progress as a steady increase in the number of millionaires, and because of that fact we have opened the way for progress of the only kind that is worth making—the progress that represents a fuller and wider life for the ordinary man.

DRY ROT, RED TAPE, SOLID IVORY

THERE is a slashing indictment of the policies, methods, and finances of our war department in the North American Review. It is contained in an article entitled "Our \$300,000,000 Skeleton," by Robert Wohlforth, a West Point graduate, a former army officer, and an expert on questions of national defense. Therefore, it is no bilious squawk by a professional pacifist.

In the first place, our military policy today is based almost wholly on the assumption that we are going to fight the World war over again in our next hostilities. The plan is to maintain a vast skeleton army which is practically useless as a coherent and integrated defense unit. It could serve only as the basis for mobilizing a "nation in arms," to be shipped overseas by the millions.

As a matter of sober fact, however, the one type of war we are not likely to fight again is one like unto the World war. It is not probable that this generation will be played for suckers to pull chestnuts out of the fire for some European coalition.

If we are engaged in another war, it is likely to be a war of defense, so far as land warfare is concerned. What we need is ample ability to man our coast and harbor defenses and military airplanes and a small and well-trained army that can be moved rapidly to any pivotal area.

We are overstaffed tremendously with officers. "Only 7 per cent of the colonels and lieutenant-colonels of infantry on active duty and less than 3 per cent of the majors ever can hope to command a number of men commensurate with their rank."

The war department is an expensive branch of the government—costing about a million dollars a day to operate. It successfully opposes all efforts at economy and curtailment of its budget. In spite of grotesque overstocking with officers, the cost of producing an army officer is staggering.

It costs \$27,000 to get one via the C. M. T. C.; \$14,000 by the way of West Point; and \$3,000 through the R. O. T. C. Believe it or not, it costs us about \$5,500 a year for each effective soldier. It costs us the amazing sum of \$100,000 a year for each fighting plane we maintain in operation.

Then there are any number of absurdly wasteful expenditures, such as \$25,000 for lady hostesses for the army; \$20,000 for horses and mules and \$120,000 for "encouragement of horse breeding" at a time when all up-to-date armies are using motors almost exclusively; \$10,000,000 a year for the R. O. T. C., which even high army officers admit to be about worthless as a military venture; \$2,500,000 for citizens' military training camps, conceded by a former chief-of-staff to be completely worthless from a military point of view; and \$1,069,000 for promoting civilian practice with weapons of a type unlikely to be used extensively in another war.

To keep the public congenial to its archaic and dangerous policies, the war department keeps about 700,000 citizens, with their friends and relatives, on its rolls. Here is a large and

well-integrated group "eager to oppose any reduction in war department expenditures and avid for more free two-week vacations in summer military camps, more free rifle ammunition, snapper and costlier uniforms, bigger and better bands, more travel allowances and free handouts all around.

"It means, also, a powerful and well-financed military lobby in Washington and every state capital, a definite and subsidized class beholden to our war department." Such are the extravagant and ramified activities of the war department for political and propaganda purposes.

Worst of all is the inefficiency and inadequacy of our army and our military program. We have only 54,000 men in our regular army, though we spend more on our land forces than some countries with an army ten times this size. Of these 54,000, not more than 20,000 could be put into the field at once to defend us from invasion in an emergency.

We do not have more than 10 per cent of the men who would be required to man our coast and harbor defenses. We have fewer than 300 fighting airplanes—a mere handful compared to those of France and Italy. Yet we pay enough for military aviation to have one of the largest and best air forces in the world.

In short, in spite of the fact that we lead the world in expenditures for armaments, we do not have even a respectable defense force. We have a plan for organizing a fictitious army for a war which never will take place and none for defending us in a probable conflict.

It is time we had a new deal in military as well as economic affairs. We need a small well-trained army, promoted according to merit rather than longevity, and organized to defend us if the invader ever does come to our shores.

Today we veritably have nothing more than a "300,000,000 skeleton," which is a snare and a delusion and keeps 125,000,000 citizens in a fools' paradise.

REPEAL'S BIG MONTH

THIS is the big month in the drive for repeal of the eighteenth amendment. Between now and Sept. 19, six states vote on prohibition. Maine ballots Sept. 11; Colorado, Minnesota, and Maryland on Sept. 12; and New Mexico and Idaho on Sept. 19.

The chances are bright that Sept. 20 will find all these states in the repeal column, along with their twenty-five sister states that have voted to date. That will bring the total up to thirty-one—with five to go.

That is a happy prospect to contemplate. Six months ago even the most ardent repealists were skeptical of the chances for abolishing prohibition by Christmas.

They felt that, regardless of how strong national sentiment was against the eighteenth amendment, it was impossible to speed up the cumbersome machinery of state ratification to achieve the goal in such a short time.

Today that skepticism has passed. It seems almost certain that repeal will be an actual fact no later than Dec. 7. Two states vote in October and five on Nov. 7. That makes thirty-eight in all—two more than the necessary thirty-six.

This does not mean, of course, that the repealists can afford to let down. Some of the drys' resistance has vanished, due perhaps to the realization that they face a hopeless task in trying to block repeal.

But enough remains to insure real trouble in the event the anti-prohibition forces become over-confident.

Therefore, the fight should be carried on with undiminished vigor. With the long-awaited goal finally in sight, this is no time to start counting chickens before they're hatched.

If legislatures keep thinking up new things to tax, it won't be long before they will tax our patience.

Any girl can get the man she wants. The really smart girl is the one who gets the man some other girl wants.

M. E. Tracy Says:

LIKE most other people, I believe that there is a definite alliance between crime and politics, not only in some of our large cities, but in many small ones. How else explain the brazen frontiers with which racketeers operate, the chronic failure to catch and punish them, the nonchalant dismissal of indictments, the frequency of suspended sentences, and all the other shadow-boxing which leaves them immune?

Backstage lurks the skulking figure of rotten politics, the ward boss and district captain man, handling the police force, the prosecutor, and even the court.

In the name of direct government, with the people electing all important officials and passing on all important questions, we have built up a mechanism which responds to nothing so quickly as the wire-pulling of crooked politicians.

Through party organization, these politicians have been able to develop an invisible power, which stifles the legitimate functions of government.

The organization is held together largely by favors, by a job for the faithful worker, or a helping hand to the voter in trouble. The voter can be a thug as well as an honest citizen.

Gangdom lends itself to politics. It can herd voters in the same way that it can browbeat little tradesmen, can march frightened people to the polls in the same way that it collects tribute from them.

Gangdom is of value to the party leader who sees nothing in government or politics except victory at the polls and who cares little about justice, decency, or the price he must pay.

To an obvious extent the idea of politics as a medium of good government has given place to the idea of politics as a medium of power. What leaders can get out of the public treasury or the public service for themselves and their friends has developed into the chief source of interest, and is responsible for the alliance which exists between machine politics and crime.

In all communities over which machine politics has gained control, elective officials are exposed definitely to the power of political bosses.

IT is no more than human for men to fear those who can hire or fire them. That is exactly the position occupied by police chiefs, district attorneys, judges, and other elective officials in a machine-ruled town, city, or state.

Theoretically, they are chosen by free citizens, but actually they are named by a comparatively small group of politicians, who have developed an effective organization through use of public funds and prostitution of the public service.

It is high time that we broke up this element of demoralization. Our officials must be liberated from political interference. In no other way can they perform with that honesty of purpose which is essential to good government.

In no other way can the public obtain from them the efficient, conscientious service which it has a right to expect and which most of them would be glad to give under normal conditions.

An Epoch Passes



:: The Message Center ::

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

(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.)

By Tom Berlin.
In the issue of Aug. 25, under the heading of "Attacks Unions," a gentleman, evidently a scholar and a good taxpayer, threw a few well-timed verbal brickbats at myself and some other fellows.

I always am interested in your Message Center, which does not mean that I take everything I read there seriously. As none of my fellow craftsmen have answered this communication, and as I feel that it would be very unkind to ignore it, may I take the liberty to answer the same in a personal way?

The question is, why should any man get \$1.12 an hour when men will work for 40 cents?

Answer: The average earnings of carpenters belonging to the union in the last two years will not exceed \$300 per annum. We assumed obligations in the past that requires a minimum wage of \$35 a week to meet. We can not pay taxes, mortgages, doctor bills and send our children to school on less. We have lost our shirts and unless we get a break soon will have to seek employment in a nudist colony.

We do not ask this wage for our union. We fight for our families that they may enjoy some of the comforts of life. And we are not interested in a so-called living wage. That means bread and water three times a day.

We demand a wage that will enable us to enjoy life as well as exist. We are loyal to the bosses for whom we work and like to see them prosper. Very few contractors retire rich. Now you yourself never heard of a carpenter retiring of his own free will.

In this the contractors and men have something in common. Why should our families sacrifice and skimp along so some other individual or corporation can have a lot of money for his next generation to spend foolishly or wisely and look down on the class that provided the coin of the realm that they are so free with for their own selfish luxuries?

So you see, my friend, you have missed the psychological angle of the union man. It is not a matter of cards, or dues, or business agents, but of flesh and blood, of happiness, of miserable poverty that spurs us on.

And we never stay whipped. Separated at times, but in the crisis we must stay together. The man or group who will take time from legitimate business to make a serious or prolonged fight against labor will lose sleep, appetite, and money. We use the Cope method. By united thought, plus a guilty conscience at the receiving end, we get our message across. How the ears must burn at times.

After a long and strenuous vacation, I recently was promised a job.

Archaic Idea

By C. S. G.

INDIANAPOLIS Merchants' Association stores, I note, are going back to the 5:30 closing hours, minus the Saturday half holiday. The notion that stores must remain open until 5:30 is as archaic as an ox cart. It is a relic brought along from the ancient days when stores kept open every night until 9 o'clock and midnight on Saturday.

In these days of perfected refrigeration, perfection in can and package goods, good roads and fast transportation, etc., 5:30 closing is as obsolete as 9 o'clock closing used to be.

Take a look at downtown traffic, any day, around 5 o'clock, and you see thousands of women shoppers homeward bound to prepare or supervise the evening meal. Most shoppers are actually worth your while to kick us in the pants. Not that we care, only it should be a criminal offense under the status quo to hit anything you can't eat.

And, by the way, how do you like the new beer?

By Fair Play.

With much being said about the NRA as to its success or failure, I can't understand why its leaders and those who are leading the great drive for its success have nothing to say about the employment of this great army of married women who are keeping thousands of men and single women out of employment.

The NRA being an emergency act to create jobs for the unemployed, why should thousands upon thousands of married women with husbands with good positions be allowed to continue, while business houses are called upon to add to their pay rolls new employees to cut down the number now out of work?

It looks to me as if no one has the nerve to start a move in this direction, while this is the opportunity time for such move, if they are really sincere in their efforts to relieve the unemployment situation. Two jobs in one family at a time like this is not in accord with the spirit of the NRA.

It looks to me as if no one has the nerve to start a move in this direction, while this is the opportunity time for such move, if they are really sincere in their efforts to relieve the unemployment situation. Two jobs in one family at a time like this is not in accord with the spirit of the NRA.

It looks to me as if no one has the nerve to start a move in this direction, while this is the opportunity time for such move, if they are really sincere in their efforts to relieve the unemployment situation. Two jobs in one family at a time like this is not in accord with the spirit of the NRA.

Tuberculosis Control Starts With Child

By Dr. MORRIS FISHBEIN

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

IN a survey of the present status of our control of tuberculosis, Dr. Donald B. Armstrong emphasizes the fact that the biggest problem today, as it was twenty years ago, is to find the cases early in the course of the disease.

However, one change has occurred in the medical point of view that is of great significance. Twenty years ago medical attention was concentrated primarily on the adult in an attempt to get him early into the hands of a doctor and under proper treatment.

Today the chief interest in the prevention of tuberculosis concentrates on the child.

In the child appear the early signs of invasion by the germ of this disease. Apparently the course on the condition now is: 1-Infection; 2-Mild forms of the disease in childhood; 3-Complete or partial healing of this condition; 4-Possible reinfection; 5-The disease actively as it affects the adult.

In studies made recently in Pennsylvania, 90 per cent of school children were found to have positive tuberculosis tests, which meant either they were infected or had been infected and recovered.

In Massachusetts, including both rural and city communities, examinations made among children between 5 and 15 years of age indicated 28 per cent with positive tuberculosis tests.

When these cases were checked over by X-ray examination, it was found that 5 per cent showed some damage to the lungs and in 1 per cent the damage was sufficiently serious to require medical attention.

The figures vary in different parts of the country as, for example, one out of 160 in Minnesota and 4 per cent in North Carolina were positive.

It Seems to Me

BY HEYWOOD BROWN

NEW YORK, Sept. 6.—The blue eagle and the lone wolf ought to put up quite a pretty scrap.

When somebody comes to write "Fifteen Decisive Battles of the Industrial World," the clash between NRA and Henry Ford probably will be among them.

On the surface the points at issue are trivial. The automobile code is among the poorest which have been accepted as working agreements. It contains a few vague sentences which certainly are intended by the owners to constitute a defense of the open shop. To the best of my knowledge, no other code, save that of the revised agreement with the Newspaper Publishers Association, includes any such joker.

The minimum set for unskilled labor in the Detroit sector is 43 cents an hour, while Ford pays 40. And, of course, it has been rumored very generally that Henry Ford intends to establish new wage scales and working hours somewhat more generous than these in the code which he so far has refused to sign.

There Is a Reason

ACCORDINGLY, some may ask what all the shooting is about. General Johnson has made a number of serious mistakes, but it seems to me that he has been spiritedly right in insisting on the code, the whole code, and nothing but the code in the case of Henry Ford.

The general has tackled no setup. From one point of view Mr. Ford is an industrial giant. From another he is an archaic feudal baron. Although he is one of the rulers of America, he doesn't even fit very neatly into the modes and manners of big business.

But when you begin to talk of "rugged individualism" Henry Ford certainly is that rugged individual. I suppose more than any other person in America he speaks with the deepest intensity when he says in effect, "Nobody is going to tell me how to run my business!"

For a time this attitude brought Mr. Ford a good deal of national popularity. In the public mind he was pictured as one fighting "the interests" and "the rulers." He was not even wholly under the control of the law of supply and demand. At least, so he thought and so it seemed.

He was willing to pay a little more for labor than the harshest market scale afforded. To be sure, it may be said that this was a little less than pure benevolence or reckless extravagance. It gave him the privilege of poking around into the personal affairs of his employees, and it was a safeguard against the growth of unionism.

Moreover, Mr. Ford and his lieutenants were adepts in the development of the art of speeding up the workers.

The Legends Tarnish

TODAY some of the myths have been swept away. When a good full-sized depression came, it hit Ford plants just as it did all the others. It was discovered that the patriarchal little white father who was intent on keeping his children from liquor and cigarettes was somewhat less concerned with the problem of whether they starved or went homeless.

It may be that labor has by now come and learned the proverb "Put not your trust in benevolent princes of industry." Under the economic system which produced this man, there is no God, and Henry Ford is his prophet.

It would be stressing the situation far too much to contend that if Henry Ford can be made to knuckle down to the demands of Washington a new day of complete industrial equality has dawned. And yet any such happening would be a distinctly revolutionary thing. The costs which the code would impose upon Mr. Ford are not very great. The strain upon his soul and temper would be far more weighty.

Handful of Pennies

BUT if even 3 cents an hour can be added to a wage scale by legislative and executive action on the part of the government something very new in our economic setup already has happened. It will be a precedent for far more drastic action later on.

I say it will be, for I certainly feel inclined to bet on the blue eagle against the lone wolf. A victory for Ford in the encounter will be material of the finest sort for all who contend that political action never can bring about significant change in economic relationships.

If 40 cents can not be changed into 43 cents by public pressure operating through the duly elected representatives, it will be extremely difficult for anybody to debate against those who say that necessary change can come only through bloody and violent revolution.

This present fight isn't Armageddon. But it looks to me something like one of its suburbs. Armageddon Manor or East Armageddon-on-Hudson, let us say. Henry will have his supporters. The big boys and the barricade boys will both be cheering back of his corner.

I'm going to be on the other side shouting: "Hit him in the breadbasket, eagle! He can't take it down there!"

(Copyright, 1933, by The Times)

Forget Greed

By CHRISTIE RUDOLPH

Along these idle roads and pleasure spent, Among this carefree lot both far and wide,

The worthless chatter, thy true self hide.

Amid the eyes of others keen present.

In frivolous mood, your broodings chide,

All godly thoughts are thus denied,

But this, tortured one, does not prevent

Your love for beauty. Ah, this you need.

Poor delirious one, forget that lustful greed.

Daily Thought

Repent therefore of thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.—The Acts, 8:22.

TRUE repentance also involves reform.—Hosea Ballou.