

The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)

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

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1934.

THUNDER ON THE RIGHT

NAZI orators are invoking all their best rhetoric in what they term "the battle of the spirit," to sell Hitlerism to the German people. The oratorical onslaught is significant, for it reveals what dispatches have been hinting for some days, that Herr Hitler's regime at last is on the defensive.

Thunder against Hitlerism is rumbling not from the left, but from the right.

The immediate challenge to the chancellor's power appears to be about to issue from the conservatives, led by Vice-Chancellor Franz Von Papen. His speech of June 17, boldly criticizing the Nazi policies, was suppressed in Germany, but now is being bootlegged about along with other "verboten" opinion. And what he said may awaken hope among the suppressed minorities and the masses of Germany even though he himself speaks for the privileged old regime. He demanded that the government permit free criticism and quit treating the people like morons. It is a mistake, he said, to think that military discipline can be imposed "upon the entire life of the nation."

Whether Von Papen succeeds Hitler to power or whether a royalist-military dictatorship supplants the Nazi dictatorship is really of less moment than the fact that, at last, the voice of criticism is being heard in Germany.

Steel helmets may overcome brown shirts. Little systems may come and go. But the important thing is that the voices of free men will not remain stilled for long. The "Battle of the Spirit" that the Hitler stump speakers are fighting is only a phase of a long war of the spirit that stretched far beyond Socrates and will reach far beyond Hitler or Von Papen. And always sooner or later the spirit of freedom wins.

THE POCKET VETO

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S refusal to use the pocket veto illustrates again the new spirit of candor in the White House.

A pocket bill after adjournment is proper under the Constitution that says: "If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law."

Presidents from Jackson down have used the pocketing device, often because they had no time to study the proposed legislation. President Roosevelt says he'll take the time, and either will approve or disapprove each measure before him. Already he has vetoed more bills than any President in the same time in sixteen years.

Congress and the people have a right to know why their measures are vetoed by the executive. Pocketing deprives them of that right. They will rejoice that this practice has gone the way of the White House spokesman.

HOW MANY UNEMPLOYED?

THE American Federation of Labor reports that in May 10,267,000 workers were unemployed.

The National Industrial Conference Board, which certainly is no Pollyanna organization, estimates the May unemployed at 7,899,000.

Both organizations agree that at the bottom of the depression, in March, 1933, the number of unemployed was in excess of 13,000,000. But they disagree as to the number that have been put back to work.

On the subject of unemployment these two organizations furnish the best statistics available. The fact that their estimates differ so radically seems to us to be conclusive proof that the Republicans in the last congress erred in blocking enactment of the unemployment census bill. Because they feared too many Democrats would be given jobs as census takers around election time, the Republicans defeated the measure which would have enabled the government to gather authoritative data needed for an intelligent attack upon unemployment.

NO BEATING THE BUSH

JACKIEL JOSEPH, president of the park board, is guilty either of misinterpreting or misunderstanding The Times' urgings for a playground for the north side.

The Times has pointed out that in that section of the city which boasts more home owners who live in their own homes and pay taxes than any other section of Indianapolis, not one public playground exists. That comprises the territory from Thirty-eighth street to the canal.

A playground is needed badly in that section and The Times asks merely that the park department lay plans to provide a playground for north side children by NEXT year—1935. There has been no agitation for immediate setting up of a north side playground, merely a plea that city officials make plans to have a playground in that section of the city by NEXT year.

The park department has no money for new playgrounds this year. Mr. Joseph is right in that assertion. But Mr. Joseph has misunderstood the urgings of north side citizens.

No effort is being made to embarrass the park board officials and no one is hurling charges of mismanagement. To the contrary, Indianapolis has a most efficient park board and recreation department. Few boards in the nation operate more efficiently and more conscientiously.

But the park board has an erroneous impression of the north side. The board says that it must provide playgrounds in the poorer

sections of the city. Correct. But thousands on thousands of those who live on the north side are not wealthy. Their children do not all have front and back yards in which to play.

That impression must be corrected. And here must be no beating around the bush about pleas for a playground on the north side. The least that can be done is a definite plan being laid for a site upon which a playground can be built by next year.

TRIPLE A'S FIRST YEAR

ONE year's operation is not enough for judging with any finality Triple A's services to recovery and reform. This particularly, is true since the worst drought in forty years has upset rural economy over a vast area of America.

Its benefits so far are substantial from the farmers' viewpoint. If these benefits can not argue for the broad policies behind the act they certainly can answer the partisan and sectional critics now attacking it.

According to Administrator Chester C. Davis, 3,000,000 farmers have in one year organized themselves into county production control associations, signing crop control contracts covering wheat, cotton, corn, hogs and tobacco. This in itself is an achievement in cooperation.

In the year ending in April the farmers' cash income, exclusive of benefit payments from processing taxes, rentals and options, had increased 20 per cent over the year previous. Including rentals and benefit payments of some \$216,000,000, the income from farm commodities was up 39 per cent. Last month's payments were up 60 per cent over those of March, 1933. Rising costs of things the farmers buy offset the income to some extent. Congress has added sugar, beef cattle and drought relief to AAA's scope of operations. Many smaller marketing agreements also have been entered into.

One of AAA's objects is to get some 50,000,000 acres of overplanted lands back into forage crops. Pledges in the adjustment contracts now give promise of reducing the surplus acreage by some 35,000,000 to 40,000,000. Critics are raising the point that the processing taxes are unjust, since they help rural states, but harm industrial states. Representative Taber of New York quotes internal revenue figures to show that his state paid out in processing taxes \$31,847,000, while New York farmers received only \$55,800 in benefits. On the other hand, Texas and Louisiana farmers got back five times more than the total tax collections in their states.

If it were true that consumers in the industrial states were paying all the processing taxes collected in those states—and they are not—there still would be no substantial injustice done. For years cities have drawn population and wealth from the farm regions, impoverishing the rural states and setting up a double standard of American living.

The industrial states have not scrupled to force protective tariffs which the farmers paid in higher living costs. If under Triple A farmers can get back a fraction of this wealth they will help the entire nation through the redistribution. Here is the tariff in reverse, and working for the farmer at last.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Triple A's real significance lies, however, in the magnificent audacity of its purpose. Here, for the first time in a democratic capitalist country, is an attempt at rural planning on a nation-wide scale. It may work, it may not. If it does America will be enriched by a prosperous farming class. If it does not, some other way to stop the descent toward peasantry or peonage will have to be found.

Liberal Viewpoint

BY DR. HARRY ELMER BARNES

At one time it was not surprising that Dr. Livingston Farrand of Cornell university would express a congenial reaction to the New Deal.

In his commencement address, he said: "I welcome the New Deal, so far as it is an effort to establish a workable new social and economic order that will preserve the best of the old and a recognition that group and individual prejudice have no place in the system."

He went on, however, to express some solicitude lest the New Deal might go to extremes. The danger, however, lies in the human habit and instinct to go too far, to lose sight of the original aims and to create new difficulties and new wrongs. It is there that clear thinking and fearless action are needed."

One need not quarrel with this qualification of Dr. Farrand's as a general or abstract statement, but there seems little reason to fear any such development in the case of the New Deal.

On the contrary, the real danger is that the New Deal will stop short of those policies and methods which are indispensable if prosperity is to be recovered under capitalism and the democratic control of society.

Probably the most unfair charge which has been leveled against Mr. Roosevelt is that he has been heedless or reckless and has lunged ahead too rapidly or too far in his zeal to reconstruct American economic society. While it is desirable to give him the benefit of the doubt until his experiment has been thoroughly worked out, it would seem that to date he can be criticized chiefly for having exhibited far too much caution and restraint. The record itself will clear him pretty effectively of any charge of precipitate excess.

THE major challenge which Mr. Roosevelt had to face upon his assumption of the presidential office was embodied in the ravages of finance capitalism—the subordination of sound business enterprise to the anti-social practices and ideals of financial gambling and predatory raids.

Many well informed observers, including perhaps the ablest of the President's advisers, believed in March, 1933, that he should nationalize the parks and credit functions of the nation, thus wiping out in one stroke the major obstacle to the continuance of American prosperity under the capitalist system.

He resolutely refused to take any such bold step and contented himself with a number of minor reforms, all good in themselves but still leaving the moguls of high finance in control of the economy of the nation.

Next to the menace of speculative finance, the major problem with which Mr. Roosevelt had to wrestle was that of inadequate purchasing power on the part of the American masses.

Some of his closest advisers in the administration and in congress believed that a minimum of \$10,000,000,000 should be appropriated for public works and spent rapidly in order to give us one effective boost out of the ditch of depression.

Instead, a sum of \$3,300,000,000 was asked for, and was received, allocated and spent with almost unprecedented care and deliberation. Most liberals also believe that this emergency expenditure was inadequate.

THE agricultural adjustment act, designed to increase the purchasing power of the farm population, made no daring espousal of "the economy of abundance," but was a very restrained and tentative experiment thoroughly subscribing to the old economy of scarcity.

Now was the President's attitude with respect to the NRA at all that of a swashbuckler, so far as increased purchasing power is concerned.

The minimum wage provisions of the act are modest in the extreme. The President has shown himself very reluctant to assert forceful policy with respect to the collective bargaining clause of the NRA designed to aid labor in its struggle for higher wages.

In spite of numerous charges of over-regulating industry, the NRA did not go any further in this respect than had been urged by the eminent American business men when they were dominated by temporary humility and wisdom in the midst of the depression.

Moreover, the President has surrendered the licensing power, which was the chief whip that he had used to hold over business in connection with the NRA, and he has modified, if not relinquished, the price-fixing powers under the act.

In his policies with respect to taxation, the policies of the NRA have certainly not been any more daring or original than those of Mr. Hoover.

It may be too early definitely to accuse the President of overtimidity or lack of vision, but he has certainly demonstrated that any charge of recklessness or excess in well doing is manifestly unfair and unjustified.

Capital Capers

BY GEORGE ABELL

SENATOR DAVE WALSH, prominent member of the naval affairs committee of the senate from Massachusetts, went up to Boston to pay a visit to the German cruiser and training ship Karlsruhe, now at anchor there.

David was escorted about the decks by the German commander. He saw the middies stand at attention, noted the various features of the ship, seemed much interested.

Finally, he turned to his escort and inquired blandly: