

## The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)

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

Phone—Riley 5551



TUESDAY, JAN. 2, 1934

## WE OWE IT TO THEM

THE Philippine issue is up again. This month the ill-advised Hawes-Cutting independence law will lapse. And there is danger that a bad mistake will be made worse. The President is busy with domestic affairs. The American public is intent on troubles closer home. Congress is impatient. It may be in a mood—since the islands have not accepted independence on the Hawes-Cutting terms—to cut the Philippines adrift at once without any protective period of preparation for political and economic freedom.

This would be disastrous for the islands. And it would be a very cruel act on the part of the United States. Moreover, it would inject a new uncertainty and unrest in the Pacific at a time when the far east already is threatened by war.

In this emergency a distinguished committee sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association and the World Peace Foundation has appealed to the President to take the initiative with Filpino leaders in working out a mutually satisfactory solution for presentation to congress.

The committee's suggestion is so reasonable it doubtless will command itself both to Mr. Roosevelt and to Mr. Quezon, who recently arrived in Washington as head of a Philippine mission.

The six-point program recommended to the President by the committee as a basis for a Philippine settlement is much more than a just academic solution. It is a practicable plan which reconciles many conflicting interests. In general it represents the approach of the American friends of justice to the Philippines, who objected with the Filipinos to the selfish commercial considerations which were injected into the Hawes-Cutting bill. Committee program follows:

1. The Philippines at once should be given a system of responsible government, subject to certain restricted rights of intervention by an American governor-general.

2. While enjoying this status, the islands should have a right to conclude certain treaties and to be represented at international conferences.

3. This period of responsible government should terminate at the end of ten years, subject to the conclusion of an international neutrality agreement.

4. The United States should surrender all naval bases in the Philippines to take effect upon neutralization and independence. A Philippine neutralization agreement should be negotiated as part of a settlement of larger Pacific issues at the naval conference to be held in 1935 or later.

5. The United States and the Philippines should conclude a fifteen-year reciprocity agreement providing for moderate duties and for quotas on imports from each country into the other.

6. Filipino immigration into the United States after independence should be placed under the quota, or regulated by a reciprocal immigration agreement.

Thanks to American beet sugar interests and others, the Hawes-Cutting law would have given the Philippines, independence tied to beggary and international jeopardy. Properly, the islands declined to accept doubtful freedom on such terms. But this has left the situation so confused unscrupulous propagandists may be able to persuade congress to kick the islands out from under the American flag without any protective provisions either for the islands or the United States.

The President can prevent this. The honor of the United States, the welfare of the Philippines and the safety of the Pacific may be at stake.

The Scripps-Howard newspapers join with the committee sponsored by the Foreign Policy Association and the World Peace Foundation in appealing to the President to take the initiative for a statesmanlike solution of this vital problem.

## THESE DIVORCES

PATHS always cross somewhere sometime. A man and a woman who have seen each other in cold cream and shaving lather, only to have their nuptial contract canceled at some future date, are quite likely to meet at somebody's tea party or the night boat train to Cherbourg. They even may be friends and arrange to see each other. After all, we do live in a civilized society.

But they never, never decide that they will live under the same roof when one or the other annexes a new matrimonial partner. He doesn't say: "Now darling, the blue room will always be yours!" In fact, the new heart interest in a man's life would not have a guest room if she thought her predecessor was going to sleep under the scented sheets.

Christa Winslow, famous author from whose book the play, "Maedchen in Uniform" was made, recently has advanced the theory that a progression of women who liked one another, all of whom have been married to the same man at one time or another, would not object to having a common roof shelter them. The flattered gentleman would be acting as husband to his current heart interest only. The others would be an auxiliary society, wives emeritus one might call them.

But after all, what sense would there be in a lot of women sticking around after they had lost interest in the man? Certainly they wouldn't be there if they still loved him.

They either would be trying to recover him or forget him. Not loving him, they would be bored to have him singing in the bath tub, sending back his eggs because they were a minute overdone, running his hand over the thinning place on the top of his head.

They would much prefer to go out and make newer, gayer conquests. After all, they had him once! Of course the early entries might glean a small amount of self satisfaction

when the latest annexation had to hunt for stray collar buttons or a lost umbrella.

When two people have loved each other they can't do a brother and sister act. When a husband and wife stage such a play it is because they never loved in a high, romantic fashion. They never upset each other very much. They never had sheer moments of ecstasy. Of course they thought that they had. They would swear it on the Bible, Webster's dictionary and the classified telephone directory. But always there was that brother-and-sister groping toward each other.

If a woman is disturbed emotionally over a man she can't stand to have another woman play the lead in his play while she takes a seat in the wings. She will get out. She'll go start a play of her own or make a scrapbook of scenes from the one she knew in case there aren't any more curtain calls.

After all, there may be a few people—a few men and women with an ultra-sophistication—who can live happily together with a man who has been their husband in turn. But most of us still are on speaking acquaintance with a strange little imp with green eyes who passes as jealousy. We would like to be modern. We all try hard. But we just couldn't do it, that's all.

## F FARMS AND THE FUTURE

THREE-FOURTHS of our farmers produce all that we can consume domestically. One-half of the farmers now tilling the land could, if the known technique of agriculture were employed fully, raise all the farm products we need.

This means that we have too many commercial farmers. But even the government can't go around padlocking farms like it once did speakseasies.

There is another way to meet this problem: Through a national program of land planning.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Tugwell has announced that such a program is being formulated not for the benefit of the present generation alone, but also for those to come.

This announcement is one of the most promising long-time proposals to come from the administration.

As purchasing power rises, and the unemployed no longer have to subsist on inadequate diets, as they are able to buy more clothing, the need for increased production arises. Here enters the Roosevelt land plan of retiring eroded, denuded acres; and of plotting the production from fertile lands.

This whole problem of land planning has another fundamental aspect: Shall we attempt to live alone or seek foreign markets? If the former, then we must retire even more acreage from production.

"For the first time," said Dr. Tugwell, "the government is thinking of land as a whole. For the first time we are preparing to build a land program which will control the use of that greatest of all natural resources. . . ."

The assistant secretary seems to realize the immense implications of such a program. He does not overstate when he says that it eventually must be provided "if our civilization is to continue on a broad and wholesome base."

## A ACHIEVEMENT

IT is a little more profitable right now to look back at 1933 than to look ahead to 1934. What the coming year may hold for us, the good Lord only knows; what 1933 brought us is a matter of record, the significance of which begins to be fully apparent as the year ends.

A lot of things happened, a lot of changes were made, and a lot of experiments were begun in the last year; but in some ways the biggest development of all was the change that came over our unemployment relief policy.

Starting with the forestry corps, continuing through the NRA codes, and winding up with the \$400,000,000 public works administration, we set out for the first time in our history to make jobs for our citizens.

We shifted, that is to say, to an entirely new attitude. We accepted as part of our social philosophy the proposition that society owes each individual—not merely a living, but the chance to earn a living.

Here is a change of the most profound significance. The Declaration of Independence itself is packed more with consequences. For this change implies an entirely new concept of the function and the duty of government itself.

Traditionally, our government was supposed to do little in time of depression except to keep the tracks clear for such revival as private industry might be able to bring about. Now its responsibility is almost infinitely greater.

Great numbers of Americans who are able and anxious to work can't find jobs, it is up to the government to provide jobs for them—no matter what the obstacles or what the cost.

You don't have to think about this very long to discover that it could contain the seeds of changes as sweeping as any the country ever has seen.

Yet there is no reason for us to be afraid of what this new attitude may bring us. It is drastic and unprecedented, to be sure; but it also is a very great step forward along the difficult road which democracy must travel in this industrialized era, and as such it is worth all the risks.

For democracy is a mockery unless the right of self-government is accompanied by the guarantees the one must guarantee the other.

To this guarantee 1933 brought us; and the date will loom large in the history books.

## KEEP AN EYE ON THEM

CONGRESS meets tomorrow. Everything seems to be quiet, and harmony is reigning along the Potomac as the new year gets underway.

But it will be a unique session of congress if there are no rebels, none who dares spring up with obstructionist stunts, and tricks to pull out of sleeves for greedy, vicious special interests, by no means dead.

It will be well worth while for us in Indiana to keep a weather eye on our senators and congressmen. We are going through a wonderful period, a period of transition from the rule of tyrannical capitalism to apparently liberal democracy.

Our Indianapolis senators and congressmen have been known in the past to veer from the "straight and narrow." Perhaps our votes count. Let's watch the gentlemen and then act accordingly.

## WHEN A LIFE IS AT STAKE

STRANGE, how all the attention of a busy nation can be focused on the plight of one tiny baby!

When 5-months-old Sue Trammell of Texas fell ill of a malady that required the most delicate of operations, the whole country held its breath until she had been got to a hospital where that operation could be performed properly. A visiting nobleman gave up the use of his airplane; one of the land's best aviators dropped everything to pilot the child on a long and perilous flight; officials of distant cities did all they could to expedite matters.

And the story of this spectacular flight, meanwhile, occupied newspaper front pages from coast to coast, and millions of people waited anxiously to learn how it came out.

Strange, and revealing, the way in which the sympathy of a nation can be focused on one small baby!

## HERE'S A RESOLUTION

WE'RE in 1934. It's a new year and we all tell ourselves we're starting with a clean slate. There is nothing finer than a good resolution carried out.

Here's one resolution: This year I shall drive my car with caution and with sanity. I shall think of others as I sit at the wheel of my automobile. I shall not become an accident-driver.

That's a good resolution. There were too many, far too many lives lost in Indianapolis and in Marion county during 1933 as the result of careless driving.

Think just a moment. How would you like to pick up this newspaper some day and read on Page 1 that you were being held as the driver of a car which killed a child? It's dreadful and shameful. But we can avoid just that.

Don't go so fast! Don't be so careless!

After all, what's the hurry? Wherever you're going, what's all the speed for? Will two minutes make that much difference? Suppose you lose five minutes?

Wouldn't you rather lose five minutes than have your car, with you at the wheel, kill some child.

Let's be sensible. Let's drive carefully, safely and slowly. It pays.

## PAN-AMERICAN PROGRESS

LOOKING back at the just-finished Pan-American conference at Montevideo, one is compelled to admit that State Secretary Cordell Hull deserves to have a few choice bouquets tossed his way.

It isn't often that the United States can look back on any international conference with the feeling that anything especially worth while actually has been accomplished. This conference, however, was different.

A better understanding between this nation and its southern neighbors really seems to have been achieved. The groundwork has been laid for genuine co-operation in the future; for a continuance of peaceful relations; for a betterment of understanding, and for a revival of that trade which all the countries.

In no small measure this is due to the tact and vision of Mr. Hull. He had a rather ticklish job to perform, and he performed it well.

A Negro in Colombia was lynched for wounding a politician. Colombia being in South America, politicians there are held more sacred than here.

A psychiatrist warns us to destroy the idots born among us before they overpower us. Why destroy them, when all we need do is not elect them?

Surely President Roosevelt didn't have to restore citizenship to 1,500 wartime dissenters just to get their votes!

Greta Garbo is said to be planning a new film company in Sweden. By doing so she'll prove no producer's feet are too big for her.

## M.E. Tracy Says:

SUMMONED as a witness by Commissioner Levine, who now is investigating New York news stands, Herman Klein admitted that he had obtained a news stand license on the ground of being a disabled veteran. He further admitted that, until last July, he had drawn an allowance of \$18 a month on the same ground, though his salary was \$3,000 a year.

When asked if the injury for which he claimed to be suffering had been received while in service he said that it had not.

When asked why he didn't limp, he said that was a fair weather injury and did not bother him at this time of year.

When asked if he thought it was right for a salaried man to receive compensation under such circumstances, he justified himself with the explanation that "everybody was doing it."

That probably is the most common excuse for people to do something which they know is wrong. It lends a plausible color to all sorts of acts and practices. It is a most convenient method of stifling conscience and twisting law.

Everybody knows why the government allows compensation to disabled veterans. Everybody admits that such compensation is due where actual injuries were suffered or where real need exists.

Beyond that, everybody knows the government's financial condition and how tax payers are being pressed to get the necessary funds not only for its maintenance, but for the aid which it is compelled to render millions of unemployed people.

Everybody knows that \$18 a month would go far toward helping some poor family, and that a man getting \$3,000 a year can do very well without it.

THERE is nothing mysterious about Mr. Klein's case. He did not need the money, but he took it for the simple reason that he could get it, and he took it with the full knowledge that it was subtracting that amount from the common good. But he said to himself, "Everybody's doing it," and he argued that if he didn't get it some one else would.

Everybody knows why the government allows compensation to disabled veterans. Everybody admits that such compensation is due where actual injuries were suffered or where real need exists.

Beyond that, everybody knows the government's financial condition and how tax payers are being pressed to get the necessary funds not only for its maintenance, but for the aid which it is compelled to render millions of unemployed people.

Everybody knows that \$18 a month would go far toward helping some poor family, and that a man getting \$3,000 a year can do very well without it.

NOT only law books but other books are cluttered with the sophistries and plausibilities of expert debate, which serve no purpose more distinctly than to undermine conscience and common sense. To a measurable extent we have reasoned ourselves into a state of mind where fundamental dishonesty can be white-washed with a smart epigram.

## THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES

## More or Less of a Solo!



## :: The Message Center ::

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

In Protest

By Arthur Cremin.

I hear considerable talk among the rank and file of voters in Indianapolis of the candidacy of Mark Gray editor and publisher of the Indianapolis Commercial for mayor, to succeed Reginald Sullivan. The Democratic party could go a long way and do a lot worse than nominating and electing Mark Gray as mayor. He is a trade unionist (member of the Mailers' Union), besides being an editor and publisher, and a former member of the Indiana legislature.

He is a solid, substantial citizen and always has been a Democrat. One thing is certain, if the Democratic party nominates some chronic comical, long on promises and short on fulfillment, it's going to be just too bad, for the workers of Indianapolis are going to have plenty to say in the next municipal campaign. And if you don't believe this, go out in the byways and talk with them. Mark Gray would make a first-class mayoralty candidate, and if elected, a high grade official.

I hope that in the future statements published by your paper are the result of careful and intelligent investigation, and not the result of superficial antagonisms; which when utilized as such keep your readers in moods of intense restlessness.

Some newspapers already have published full retractions or apologies though the article in question is a syndicated one.

visions of the motor vehicle operators law absolutely is erroneous, both in fact as well as substance.

This law does not apply in any way to the issuance of automobile plates and no one is required to take out this insurance unless he is participant in an accident in which property damage is shown or serious injury to person is inflicted.

Even in this case