

The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)
 ROY W. HOWARD, President
 TALCOTT POWELL, Editor
 EARL D. BAKER, Business Manager
 Phone: Riley 5531



SCRIPPS-HOWARD
 Give Light and the
 People Will Find
 Their Own Way

Member of United Press, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Newspaper Enterprise Association, Newspaper Information Service and Audit Bureau of Circulations.
 Owned and published daily (except Sunday) by The Indianapolis Times Publishing Co., 214-220 West Maryland street, Indianapolis, Ind. Price in Marion county, 2 cents a copy; elsewhere, 2 cents—delivered by carrier, 12 cents a week. Mail subscription rates in Indiana, \$3 a year; outside of Indiana, \$5 a year; outside of Indiana, \$5 a year.

FRIDAY, OCT. 13, 1933.

THE EXTRA HYDRANTS

THE best laugh of the week is on the local real estate men. They have been waging a noisy battle for reduction of the city budget without, however, making any specific suggestions. They have preferred to cry for the enforcement of the \$1.50 tax law. The city administration and the county adjustment board repudiated with more oratory. The budget was not cut.

Now an interesting fact has appeared from this cave of the winds. It was dragged into the light by Howard S. Morse, water company manager. He pointed out that one reason the city's public utility bills are so high is because in recent years real estate interests have forced the laying of unnecessary water mains and the installation of useless hydrants.

The purpose, of course, was to make it possible for realtors to sell lots in speculative "improvements." One of these "improvements" is laced with water mains and studded with hydrants for the servicing of two houses! No doubt it has plenty of street lights, too.

Mr. Morse says the water company protested against all this useless piping and the facts bear him out. The real estate interests were strong enough to over-ride him. There is no evidence that Mayor Reginald Sullivan's predecessors did anything to protect the taxpayers. They apparently approved the scheme and left the bill to the Sullivan administration.

This is merely a miniature of the tax situation in the country at large. Selfish business interests have succeeded in getting enormous subsidies from local, state and national governments. These same interests are now roaring for tax reduction. Each one wants the other fellow's subsidy reduced, but squeals like a pig under a gate when his own ox is gored.

Did we say the laugh was on the real estate men? Perhaps it is at the moment, but it is really on the taxpayer. In fact, it is perpetually on that harassed individual.

Unless the state tax board reduces the city budget Mr. Taxpayer may have the last laugh because he already has demonstrated his inability to pay his taxes. And you can't run a city, a political machine or have expensive real estate improvements without taxes.

PLAIN FACTS

A GOOD many people have toyed lately with the idea that the news-hungry citizen ought to be able to sit at home in his arm chair and have the news of the day wafted to his receptive ears from the loud speaker of his radio.

In theory, it's not a bad idea. In practice, it seems to be a completely nonexplosive dud. Not long ago a gang of convicts escaped from the Indiana state prison.

An Indiana radio station immediately set to work to broadcast the story of the man hunt.

The man hunt wasn't having a great deal of luck right at the moment, and some radio official decided that the listeners-in deserved more excitement than the plain facts were likely to provide. So that part of the public which tried to get its news out of the loud speaker began to hear a wild and woolly tale of a running gun battle, with a juicy slice of trumped-up melodrama substituted for facts.

As a result, the listeners-in were hoaxed and the enforcement officers who were trying to catch the convicts found the work seriously hampered.

In a protest to the federal radio commission, Captain Matt Leach of the Indiana state police asserted:

"This broadcast seriously interfered with the work of the sixty-five state police under my command and a considerable number of other enforcement officers. . . . We wasted several hours of precious time. . . . Telephone wires of the state police at their barracks in Chesterton, Ind., were tied up for several hours by persons who apparently had heard the broadcast and were calling for information."

So the net result of all this was that the attempt to catch the convicts was hampered, some scores of citizens were frightened badly—and nobody knew just what was happening until the daily papers came around with the real facts in the case.

This is just the sort of thing that has happened over and over again in radio news broadcasts. The Los Angeles earthquake some time ago took on the proportions of one of the great disasters of all time—until the newspapers came out with the truth.

Wild-eyed announcers have told us of frenzied and sensational prize fights—which next day turned out to be affairs so spiritless and slow that the participants were almost tossed out of the ring for failing to try. The Indiana man hunt was a desperate gun battle—until the newspaper reporters turned in their reports.

So it goes. The loud speaker may be a fine medium for hearing feminine-voiced tenors and third-rate vaudeville. For accounts of the day's news, it seems to be a good deal less than reliable.

ALUMINUM TRUST VS. NRA

THE NRA aluminum code has a tendency to slip into the background because the group opposing it is exceedingly small. It should not be allowed to do so. It presents an issue which is vital to the recovery program and the country's economic life.

The Aluminum Company of America is the world's outstanding example of a monopoly. It is the sole producer of virgin aluminum in the western hemisphere, and it owns such a large interest in European producing companies that it is able to control prices on that continent as well as on this. In addition to

producing aluminum, it fabricates aluminum products. In this field independent companies are trying to compete, though badly handicapped by having to buy their materials from the producing monopoly and having to pay more for them than the production units of the monopoly.

The Aluminum Company of America is trying to perpetuate this condition through the code it has offered the NRA. The independents are protesting and asking either a separate code for fabrication, apart from production of aluminum, or else a safeguard in the form of requirement that the Aluminum Company, in estimating its cost of manufacture, include as an item whatever price it charges for the same materials.

No code should be approved for aluminum without this provision. For years the Aluminum Company has been able to evade the consent decree entered to restrain it, by various bookkeeping devices. A requirement as plain and unequivocal as this is necessary unless every purchaser of aluminum household utensils and important industrial materials is to pay a monopoly price dictated by Andrew W. Mellon's business leviathan.

The recovery act contains a plain injunction against monopoly or monopolistic practice. If the NRA can not recognize monopoly when it comes face to face with the biggest, most obvious combination of all, whose existence is no longer disputed even by its owners; if NRA shows itself impotent in conflict with this antagonist, then we shall have reason to fear growing monopolistic power in other industries.

Wages as well as prices are an issue, and recent aluminum code hearings offered a shocking example of the overbearing tyranny of a powerful monopoly on this question. The Aluminum Company demanded the right to pay wages far below even the minimum set in the blue eagle agreement. It did this in the face of declaration by the independents that they can afford to pay just twice the monopoly's proposed wage rate if they can get aluminum at an equal cost.

If the Aluminum Company should grant every concession asked by the independents it still could consider itself unusually and unduly lucky that it has not been dissolved as a monopoly.

IS NEW DEAL SOCIALISM?

ONE hears many positive declarations nowadays that the new deal is easing the United States into a socialistic regime. Such claims come from two widely opposed camps of commentators. On the one hand, we have the sour apostles of "rugged individualism" who have learned nothing from either history or the experience of the last four years. Their charge in surly tones that the NRA is nothing short of "rank socialism." In this fashion they hope to discredit and wreck the Roosevelt program.

On the other side, we find radicals, especially foreign socialists, who claim to see in the new deal the most extensive adoption of socialism in human history outside of Russia. With the growth of Fascism abroad, socialism has had rather slim pickings during the last few years. Hence, there is an eagerness to seize upon any seeming proof of its renaissance in our day.

Few sensible persons would be distressed greatly if the new deal were actually socialistic in character, provided it works well and delivers us from the Hooverian brand of "permanent prosperity." Since, however, the socialistic bogey is raised chiefly by those eager to sabotage the new deal, it is worth while to examine the validity of such charges and epithets.

Without in any way holding to any orthodox or Marxian definition of socialism, we may note with reason and moderation the traits of any truly socialistic regime and see how far the new deal corresponds to such characteristics.

A socialistic regime would be one controlled by the masses of mankind—laborers, the white collar proletariat and the farmers. It would aim very decisively at the end of the capitalist system of profits, private property and price values. Goods would be produced for human service rather than private profits. The state would own all the major public utilities, manufacturing establishments, oil wells, mines and the like.

The banks would be nationalized. There would be no more private banking and credit of any considerable proportions. There would be a capital levy taking away all or most of the holdings of the former capitalist classes. There would be a classless society even though there might be grades of personal reward based on merit.

Such would be the outstanding traits of even a moderate socialistic commonwealth—one which might fall far short of the rigorous communism aimed at in Russia. How does the new deal measure up to such requirements?

In the first place, the new deal does not represent popular initiative or control in economic matters. It recognizes and permits the domination of the capitalist groups as certainly as did the Hooverian "rugged individualism." It does not challenge capitalist authority. It merely challenges the old capitalist piracy which was wrecking capitalism. Prices and profits are not ruled out. The price system remains untouched and the only demand is that profits be reasonable so that workers and farmers can get enough of the social income to be able to buy goods.

There is little or no state ownership envisaged. The state may promote conservation and enter slightly into the public production of power. But there is no hint that the government will take over basic industries and operate them or that it will own the utilities and transportation system of the country. Far from nationalizing the banks, the administration banking bills have not even drastically eliminated the obvious abuses of private banking. We have gone little further than to scowl at finance capitalism.

No capital levy is yet in sight. The taxation program has not even gone so far as to adopt the policy of taxing in proportion to ability to pay.

Nor is there any apparent intent to abolish the economic classes. They remain as before. The difference is that Mr. Roosevelt has decided that the government should have some interest in the 99 per cent who are neither great bankers, industrialists nor merchants. It is no longer a government of, by and for the capitalist class alone.

In short, the new deal has little or nothing in common with even moderate socialism. It is a plan which does no more than insist that capitalism give some evidence of ordinary sense and decency, so that it can have some chance of survival.

Let those who are raising the hue and cry

of "socialism" realize, however, that if they wreck Mr. Roosevelt's effort to save capitalism we shall before too long have socialism good and plenty. Let them save their shouts of "wolf, wolf," until that day.

THE STEEL-COAL AGREEMENT

STEEL companies operating so-called captive mines have notified the President that they will recognize the union check-off system of dues payment as requested by him. The companies have been criticized sharply—and properly, we think—for their delay which held up the recovery program. But now that they have accepted, they should be given full credit for putting the new deal and the national welfare above their personal opinions in this dispute.

The only qualification in their letter of acceptance is that "all of our employees shall be free to join or not to join any union as they please." In reply, the President notes that it is not his understanding that this or any other company qualification is intended to modify the law or statutory administrative discretion.

The qualification appears, on the contrary, to be both within the letter and the spirit of the law and within the rights of the companies.

Of course the test will be whether, on this basis, the company and union representatives now trying to negotiate a contract, are able to reach a just agreement.

A FORWARD STEP

THE American Federation of Labor's action in taking into its fold the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' union signifies more than a patching of a twenty-year-old dispute between two union groups. It means a strengthening of the American labor movement in numbers, in power and in vitality.

Amalgamated's membership totals about 125,000. Its achievements have been larger. It had, until the depression, practically wiped out sweatshops in one of the country's most competitive industries. It owns and runs two banks, model apartment houses for 1,200 workers' families, co-operatives for insurance against sickness and unemployment.

Under its president, Sidney Hillman, the Amalgamated has pioneered in a new labor statesmanship that is the central idea of the National Recovery Administration.

THE PRESIDENTIAL VOTE

THE famous lame duck amendment to the Constitution takes effect this fall—and a very good amendment it is, too. Now it is reported that certain statesmen, including Senator Norris, who sponsored this amendment, are preparing to submit another one which would abolish the electoral college and substitute a fairer method of counting electoral votes in a presidential election.

At present, if a candidate gets a majority of the popular vote in any state, he gets all that state's electoral votes. Under the proposed amendment, he would get a percentage of them equal to his percentage of the popular vote. As a sample: In 1928 Mr. Hoover carried New York by a narrow margin over Mr. Smith and got all New York's 45 electoral votes; under the new system, he would have got 23 and Mr. Smith 22.

That this would make the electoral vote a much closer reflection of the popular will is indisputable. There is only one question that occurs to us: Why not, while we're about it, abolish the electoral-vote business entirely and make the presidential election a straight-out matter of popular votes?

Man in Bloomsburg, Pa., had a piece of his shin bone grafted on his spine, and now will be able to tell us whether barking our shins is worse than being kicked in the back.

We wouldn't mind it at all, if the politicians only would live within our income.

M. E. Tracy Says:

JOSEPH V. MCKEE's eleven-hour plunge into the New York mayoralty race has upset most everybody's calculations, chiefly because of his supposed backing by the Roosevelt administration.

While President Roosevelt has said nothing to indicate that he wants Mr. McKee elected, Postmaster-General Farley has done more than enough to make many people think so.

Hearst's New York American expresses the view of pro-Roosevelt leaders when it thanks Mr. Farley "for having saved the situation in New York city for the Democratic party and for the citizenship."

The citizenship was getting along quite well before Mr. Farley intervened, but the Democratic party was not. The Democratic party stood to lose not only the forthcoming election, but a perfectly good machine.

Without casting any reflection on the postmaster-general's interest in good government for New York city, it is justifiable to assume that his chief concern was for the Democratic machine.

THIS assumption is borne out by the fact that about all the leaders, captains and even office holders who can break away, are deserting Tammany and climbing aboard the McKee bandwagon.

To a humble observer, it looks as though Mr. Farley were slipping into Boss Curry's place, with virtually the same old crew to run things, but with a greatly enlarged pie-counter in prospect.

If the postmaster-generalship of the United States and the Democratic boss-ship of New York city could be combined in one person, that person could come pretty near Tammanyizing the country.

Wouldn't it be a good idea to get this job of planned economy in better shape before going too far with planned politics, or is one inseparable from the other?

Still speaking from the standpoint of a humble observer, it strikes me that the national administration were going out of its way, or permitting Postmaster-General Farley to go out of his way, in search of unnecessary trouble, and that, excellent as the scheme may appear from a political angle, it represents a mighty poor way of promoting that co-operation which is essential to the success of NRA.

I DO not believe that this or any other administration can entrench a political party and promote national recovery at the same time. Mussolini has done it in Italy and Hitler is apparently doing it in Germany, but the United States is not exactly like either, nor yet at least. President Roosevelt calls on capital and labor to forego special privileges at this time. Well, why not include politicians? Why not let people alone, especially in their constitutional right to manage local affairs? Or are we about to set up a political code, with Postmaster-General Farley as administrator and ex-Tammany henchmen as his lieutenants?

Whether they realize it, the people of New York face the issue of home rule in this election, which is something that should interest the entire country.

'Let Not Thy Right Hand—'



: : The Message Center : :

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

Those Water Mains

(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 J. J. S.
 I am a reader of The Times, if I am a hill billy. Now that Mr. William Andrews has mentioned the scarecrow and one from the sticks, if it were not for such men as he who come to the country and watch for the first ears of corn that are big enough to eat, and the tomatoes, pumpkins, walnuts, hickory nuts, etc., the country people would have plenty to sell and they wouldn't have to come to town and hunt work. You come to the country and strip it of everything you can get your hands on, so they have to do something for a living.

Very few townspeople ever pay any attention to a "stay out" sign on farmers' private ground, but let me come in town and step a foot on their ground and you have me arrested. And as soon as hunting season is opened up the farmers are busy and haven't had a chance to go hunting. By the time they have their work all done, there isn't a rabbit or bird or anything else.

The townspeople don't think about asking. They think they have full right. They don't think when they climb over a fence that by the time hunting season is over, the farmer has to have a new fence. Well, so much for that, but if a few of our city folks will just give the farmer a thought, you won't say so much about him as a scarecrow or a hill billy. If you will do good by him, he will do the same by you. If it weren't for the farmer, most townspeople would starve.

By Times Reader.
 Have read The Times since it was the Sun. Will you please return the favor by printing this? Are all concerns in Indianapolis working under the NRA code the same as the taxicab companies? If they are, then the employees never have received any increase in pay or reduction of hours. Why was there such a rumormongering about the taxi code? Why did it all quiet down so suddenly? Was it because

the cabs all displayed the pretty blue eagles on their windshields?

Do you suppose the people in this town all believe that when they enter a cab they are riding behind a \$14.50 a week man or even a \$10 a week man? I bet that they do not know they are riding behind a \$7 a week man.

A driver's commission is 30 per cent on the dollar. He takes in an average of \$3 a day, which nets him 90 cents. He may get one or two dime tips all day. He puts in an average of eleven hours a day, seven days a week, seventy-seven hours a week at about 9 cents an hour. He has the responsibility of his passengers' lives, listens to especially prepared howlers out from the traffic cops and catches holy fire from ill-tempered passengers who think he is taking them for a ride if he makes a mistake on an address.

I'm not singing the blues for sympathy. I'm merely making public what is in the heart and mind of every cab driver. The majority of us have wives and children and feel that we are human and that we have been given a nice raw deal, as far as the new deal is concerned.

Editor's Note—Taxi drivers have been classified as outside salesmen and do not come under minimum wage scales.

All sort of soothing syrups have been promoted for relief of coughs. These soothing syrups, including those formed in the mouth by sucking on cough drops, have the advantage of soothing. You must understand, however, that none of them really will cure your cough.

The only thing that will cure a cough is reaction by your body to the germs, lessening the inflammation and stopping the pouring out of irritating substances. Sometimes the irritation of the germs, particularly in the back of the nose or in the throat, brings about a sudden

swelling and inflammation of the adenoids and the tonsils.

The enlarged and inflamed adenoids cause the throat to become dry and cause the dropping of secretion from the back of the nose into the throat. This results, in most instances, in an almost constant cough, which can be controlled only by removal of the infected and swollen tissues.

The operation for the removal of adenoids is very simple, requiring but brief time, and it is practically without danger when done by a competent doctor.

Another way you can control a cough temporarily is to take sedatives of various types which lessen the threshold of irritability of the nervous system, so that coughing is not so frequent. Under these circumstances, however, you should remember again that the real cause of the cough is not being reached.

Sedatives should not be used permanently, but only long enough to permit sufficient rest for the swelling to subside and for proper attention to the causative condition.

Cough Is Warning of Inflammation

BY DR. MORRIS FISHBURN

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

"It isn't the cough that carries you off. It's the coffin they carry you off in."

The cough serves the double purpose of removing the secretion and of removing some of the germs at the same time. It is for this reason that the public health rhyme was promoted—

"Cover up each cough and sneeze—If you don't, you'll spread disease."

All sort of soothing syrups have been promoted for relief of coughs. These soothing syrups, including those formed in the mouth by sucking on cough drops, have the advantage of soothing. You must understand, however, that none of them really will cure your cough.

The only thing that will cure a cough is reaction by your body to the germs, lessening the inflammation and stopping the pouring out of irritating substances. Sometimes the irritation of the germs, particularly in the back of the nose or in the throat, brings about a sudden

swelling and inflammation of the adenoids and the tonsils.

The enlarged and inflamed adenoids cause the throat to become dry and cause the dropping of secretion from the back of the nose into the throat. This results, in most instances, in an almost constant cough, which can be controlled only by removal of the infected and swollen tissues.

The operation for the removal of adenoids is very simple, requiring but brief time, and it is practically without danger when done by a competent doctor.

Another way you can control a cough temporarily is to take sedatives of various types which lessen the threshold of irritability of the nervous system, so that coughing is not so frequent. Under these circumstances, however, you should remember again that the real cause of the cough is not being reached.

Sedatives should not be used permanently, but only long enough to permit sufficient rest for the swelling to subside and for proper attention to the causative condition.

swelling and inflammation of the adenoids and the tonsils.

The enlarged and inflamed adenoids cause the throat to become dry and cause the dropping of secretion from the back of the nose into the throat. This results, in most instances, in an almost constant cough, which can be controlled only by removal of the infected and swollen tissues.

The operation for the removal of adenoids is very simple, requiring but brief time, and it is practically without danger when done by a competent doctor.

Another way you can control a cough temporarily is to take sedatives of various types which lessen the threshold of irritability of the nervous system, so that coughing is not so frequent. Under these circumstances, however, you should remember again that the real cause of the cough is not being reached.

Sedatives should not be used permanently, but only long enough to permit sufficient rest for the swelling to subside and for proper attention to the causative condition.

It Seems to Me

—BY HEYWOOD BROWN—

NEW YORK, Oct. 13.—According to all reports available, it seems as if Florida has joined the wet parade. And that will leave the cause of repeal standing at dormie three.

On Nov. 7 a whole cluster of commonwealths are to have their say and it is a hundred to one that this date will mark the end of prohibition.

By now it is too late for any of us to do much about it. If there were the slightest chance of success for a forlorn hope I would gladly immolate myself upon the barricade. Like other blessings, I never realized precisely how much prohibition meant to me until the sound of its departing wings began to agitate the air. All that is left for us is to stifle our sobs and exclaim brokenly: "Goodbye, enforcement; take care of yourself."

Never Can Happen Again

NOT in our lifetime will the fine, brave, predatory days of prohibition come again. I can assure either Bishop Cannon or Mrs. Ella Boole that the new dispensation hurts me more than it does them. They have nothing to contend with but a moral defeat. I assume that neither the bishop nor Mrs. Boole seriously will change his or her habits simply because the fundamental law of the land has been altered. I take it that both these gallant fighters are realistically minded, caring very little one way or the other about the sentimental implications of the new dispensation.

I'm an old sofite and not a statistician. If it is of any comfort to Jim or Ella I can assure them that even though more alcohol may be consumed under the new deal it will be received with far less zest. Twenty years from now the young folk will talk of the golden age in New York City—the era of prohibition. And they will be quite right. Even if exaggeration creeps in they can not picture this glorious age in colors much too bright.

I have lived through the days of a wide-open town, a compromise city and the decade of complete negation. After sampling them all I must report that there will never be anything comparable to down-right licentiousness.

But now I see all things more plainly. Heroes and martyrs and saints we may have been, but look at the fun we had. It was not solely principle which animated us as we formed hollow squares in order to defend the brass rail against the depredations of the federals. The fuzzy wuzzles of law and order never broke our square because it never did remain hollow save in brief transitional periods.

Passing of a Great Law

ON the morning of Nov. 8 I suppose I shall read that prohibition is no more save for a few necessary formalities. And on the eve of this doleful dawn I propose to hold at some convenient citadel a party to mark the passing of an old friend. When day is done we must embark like Columbus and his crew in the "Santa Maria," snug harbors will be gone and every anchorage of habit and custom cut by the mine sweepers of federal action.

As the clock strikes midnight I intend to shatter my goblet on the floor and go home early, never again to drink the juice of vernalis or of grape. This government or any other has a nerve to nudge me on the elbow and remind me that what I am doing is perfectly legal. Robin Hood, the outlaw, and all his men would have been chagrined and very much annoyed, I hope, if by royal edict the outlaw of them had been created an eagle scout and with a stroke of the pen respectable.

I am not empowered to predict what Mr. Hood would have done under similar circumstances, but speaking for myself alone, I want to say to Washington that I won't stand for it. At 11:59 I'll stand with my contemporaries as one of a brave band of scowls laughing at congressional enactments, the better element of the board of public morals and the board of temperance. Bang, bang, bang! and one more bang! sounds the big clock upon the wall just back of Charlie and of Jack. Our pumpkin of pleasure has suddenly been transformed into a coach-and-four. The rats about the place are now white horses or at least they have started in that direction.

An Outrage to Outlaws

WE who lived under the greenwood tree have come within the borders of organized society. The one of protest has suddenly become an authorized part of the recovery program. We are caught up into the wheel of service. Wild blades are beaten into ploughshares. "Here's to crime!" cries out one of the bonnie boys addicted to rum and rebellion. The chimes in the belfry sound. The words die upon his lips. His face grows pale. The gh curdles like a thief in the night. Robin Hood realizes that he drinks for no better purpose than to balance the budget.

(Copyright, 1933, by The Times)

Size

BY HARRIET SCOTT OLINICK

All men may be important to a few. But mostly to themselves are kings; Wishing always their own thoughts to sing,

And prating of every noble act they do;

They the mighty in their own narrow view,

And claiming more happiness and the greatest of sorrow's sting. But always to themselves ennobling,

Mocking with their enlarged ego even the sky's ironic blue.

Man is so infinitesimal in the great march of years. His tiny reign so puny, himself so small;

With his round of youth and laughter, age and tears.

Upon this terrestrial ball. The mountains know the meaning of eternity.

And yet they hold their heads in all simplicity.