

The Indianapolis Times

(A SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER)

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

Phone RIley 5531

Member of United Press,
Scripps-Howard Newspaper
Association, Associated
Press, Associated Newspaper
Information Service and An-
drews Bureau of Circulations.
Published and published daily
at Indianapolis by The
Indianapolis Times Publishing
Company, 214-220 West Mar-
land Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Price: 10¢ a copy; elsewhere, 2
cents; copy elsewhere, 3
cents; delivered by carrier, 12
cents a week. Mail subscription
rates in Indiana, \$3 a
year; outside of Indiana, 65
cents a month.

Give Light and the
People Will Find
Their Own Way

MONDAY, JULY 16, 1934.

GENERAL STRIKES

THE general strike is the way of suicide for organized labor.

The history of every attempted general strike proves this: In Sweden, in England where attempts were on a national scale; in Winnipeg and in Seattle, where attempts were limited to local communities. Few other attempts are of record, an argument in itself of the unwise of the general strike.

In every case organized labor suffered a setback lasting many years.

This is true, in part, because the basis of organized labor is the union contract and any union which engages in sympathetic strike, can do so only by breaking its own contract with its employers. It destroys thereby what it has obtained, in most instances, by long and painful processes.

As an institution which for more than fifty years has supported the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, the Scripps-Howard newspapers feel free to remind organized workers of this fact in any general strike and to spell out the reason why such strikes can not succeed.

An example of labor relationship with which we are particularly familiar is that between newspapers and the typographical union. With the union the newspapers have contracts. These contracts specify certain things. They specify wages, hours, working conditions and payment for overtime. They specify that the union shall supply competent men and define such competence.

The list of specifications is long and it is designed to be to the mutual advantage of employers and employees. It is arrived at by collective bargaining. Relations are not always harmonious, differences occur, sometimes strikes and sometimes lockouts, but, yet, the typographical union wouldn't think of operating in any other manner and a vast majority of American publishers never would propose that this regular, well-ordered system be abolished.

Another way is a frank meeting by the government of the problem of regulating the railroads' competitors, the truck, bus, barge, air and pipe lines. These industries should be made to pay their share of taxes and maintain the same sort of labor standards the railroads maintain under government regulation. Next congress should see that they do.

Finally, there are savings to be made by the elimination of competitive waste.

What the railroads need is new business. They are geared to carry 1,250,000 cars a week. They're carrying only 650,000, although their business is increasing, except for the seasonal slump. In the first five months of 1934 the rail carriers' income doubled over that of the same time last year.

Several million organized working men in this country are parties to such contracts.

A sympathetic or a general strike runs counter to this whole system. It destroys this relationship between employee and employer and the destruction can not be repaired quickly.

At the same time something else is destroyed. In the case of a strike in a single industry, part of the public is likely to be sympathetic with the strikers, part indifferent, part hostile. This depends largely on the merits of the dispute or on the public's understanding. In the case of a general strike, however, the public is certain to be wholly hostile. The public, indeed, is made a direct party to the conflict. It obeys the first law of nature. It fights to save itself.

Which is why modern history has yet to record a successful general strike.

FARM LABOR

ANNOUNCEMENT by Secretary Frances Perkins that the labor and agriculture departments soon will undertake a joint study of farm labor conditions is the first serious note the government has taken of one of its most distressing economic puzzles.

Farm hands are the forgotten men, even under the New Deal. They come neither under the NRA codes nor, except for a vague clause in the sugar contracts, under the AAA agreements. Working in an industry that has been struggling to maintain itself from disaster for years, they have been forced to work for a bare subsistence. Often a whole family works in the fields during harvest time and then lives on public charity in the winter.

The distress of this group is beginning to break through to public notice in labor disturbances of a peculiarly bitter nature—in the Ohio onion fields, in California's fruit and vegetable valleys, in New Jersey. The greatest hardships appear to be found among the casual workers on the large industrialized farms, where harvesting is purely seasonal and often must be pushed with high speed.

There is no easy answer. A long range program looking to better conditions should include some means of tying these families to home life through land-ownership. The President's subsistence homestead plan should include farm hands' families as well as city unemployed. Those working on the soil are more likely to succeed as part-time farmers than city families, and unless this type of labor is de-casualized its lot can not be improved.

STOP POLLUTION!

THE thought of children swimming in a stream which is loaded with sulphuric acid is repulsive. The thought that this situation has been permitted to start and continue not only is repulsive but points directly to the fact that many persons in Indiana have been negligent as far as public health is concerned.

The series of stories on water source pollution now appearing in The Times brings to light many facts which show the irresponsibility and inability of Indiana to handle its public problems.

Unless something is done, on a state wide basis, the pollution situation may spread to proportions which will not be capable of combat.

It is time for every government unit and every citizen of the state to organize to battle this evil. To permit it to continue will place every child and adult in jeopardy of serious illness or death. It must be stopped.

THE OLD DAYS

ACTS of a woman in hurling steaming mash upon federal agents who sought to raid her home for alleged illicit manufacture of liquor Saturday, was an echo of the old days.

Every one in the city can recall when these altercations between the alleged distiller or bootlegger and federal agents were common occurrences. In fact, in that era of prohibition shooting was not unheard of.

But today the picture has changed. The federal agents who attempted to raid this woman's home are supported by an overwhelming vote by the people who wanted the unfair liquor law repealed.

Years ago the acts of that woman would have brought a wave of sympathy. Today her acts are passed by. The public has changed its sentiment. The public has liquor and knows that liquor can be bought in compliance with the law.

Any one who tries to handle the situation in any other manner will find but little support from the man who, not long ago, pleaded for a revision of his rights—and got that revision.

FREIGHT RATES

IT would be unfortunate for the country, and, we believe, for the railroads themselves, if they were granted the 10 per cent freight rate increase they are preparing to ask of the I. C. C.

It is true that the new pension act will add to the carriers' pay rolls and that the pay cut restorations will do the same. The railroads estimate the pension act will cost them \$66,000,000 annually, pay cut restorations \$156,000,000, increased prices of materials \$37,000,000—a total addition in operating costs of \$359,000,000. But there are better ways to meet these than by the familiar formula of soaking the public.

One way is to scale down debt charges, as President Roosevelt has urged. The RFC, which has loaned the carriers more than \$400,000,000 at around 4 per cent, has just sold this idea to New York bankers, who have agreed to float a \$50,000,000 loan to the B. & O. at a rate eight-tenths of one per cent below their original offer. Of course, a wholesale scaling down of the interest rates on the carriers' \$13,000,000,000 of bonded debt would require either general recourse to the bankruptcy courts or a taking over of this huge burden by the government. But certain financing economies can be effected.

Another way is a frank meeting by the government of the problem of regulating the railroads' competitors, the truck, bus, barge, air and pipe lines. These industries should be made to pay their share of taxes and maintain the same sort of labor standards the railroads maintain under government regulation. Next congress should see that they do.

Finally, there are savings to be made by the elimination of competitive waste.

What the railroads need is new business. They are geared to carry 1,250,000 cars a week. They're carrying only 650,000, although their business is increasing, except for the seasonal slump. In the first five months of 1934 the rail carriers' income doubled over that of the same time last year.

Several million organized working men in this country are parties to such contracts.

A sympathetic or a general strike runs counter to this whole system. It destroys this relationship between employee and employer and the destruction can not be repaired quickly.

At the same time something else is destroyed. In the case of a strike in a single industry, part of the public is likely to be sympathetic with the strikers, part indifferent, part hostile. This depends largely on the merits of the dispute or on the public's understanding. In the case of a general strike, however, the public is certain to be wholly hostile. The public, indeed, is made a direct party to the conflict. It obeys the first law of nature. It fights to save itself.

Which is why modern history has yet to record a successful general strike.

AID TO MEMORY

SENATOR BORAH may be a very annoying man, especially to politicians, but now and then he is a very useful one.

Conducting a single-handed campaign in opposition to both Democratic and Republican policies is an idea that would occur to few people but the senator from Idaho. Even fewer people, having conceived the idea, could do anything with it. But Senator Borah is in a class by himself.

No one can foretell the effect of his campaign. The country may yawn and look the other way, or it may greet him with loud cheers; but, whatever happens, the senator will be useful, just as a bit of string tied about one's finger is useful.

The controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics. The present controversy between Republicans and Democrats may be compared aptly to two men standing on a railroad track in the path of the new streamline train arguing over the relative merits of a stagecoach and an ox cart.

Capital Capers

Liberal Viewpoint

BY DR. HARRY ELMER BARNES

WE do not know whether Nero actually fiddled while Rome was burning, but, like the ostrich with his head in the sand, it is a striking and useful phrase.

Nothing in recent years more perfectly exemplifies its point than the trivial and vulgar squabble between the Republicans and Democrats which lies in prospect now and November.

If we wish to retain the American system of government, it may be necessary to stick to representative institutions, and representative government means party government. But it is time to secure some party alignment, which bears at least a slight relationship to the economic, social and political realities today.

The real issue before the American people this fall in a congressional election is support or disapproval of the New Deal. All else is irrelevant and incidental. Under the present setup Mr. Roosevelt inevitably must appeal to Democrats to support him and the New Deal. He will have to imply that a Democratic victory means a vindication of the New Deal, thus seemingly identifying the Democratic party with the New Deal.

The absurdity and illogicality of any such identification is obvious to anybody but the most simple-minded partisan. The American party today does not permit the President to make a clear issue out of the New Deal.

Certainly the Democratic party, as such, is not responsible for it. If its leaders could have foreseen the character of the New Deal in 1932 they certainly would have rejected Mr. Roosevelt at Chicago or defeated him in the ensuing campaign.

It is obvious that plutocratic and reactionary Democrats have no stomach whatever for the New Deal. It is far more repulsive and alarming to them than the Bourbonistic somnolence of the Hoover administration. Carter Glass has been as much an obstacle to emancipation from the money-changers' dominion as a Republican war horse. Senators Byrd and Smith led the foolish attack upon Doctor Tugwell.

Once the emergency has passed its more intense period there would have been an open revolt on the part of the reactionary Democrats had it not been for their yearning for the rich patronage at the disposal of the President.

Similarly with the Republicans, there is no clean-cut alignment on the issues of the day.

Norris, La Follette, La Guardia, Cutting and others were more helpful to Mr. Roosevelt in promoting the New Deal than most of the rank and file of the senators and congressmen. On the other hand, the regular Republicans in congress have far less in common with La Follette, Norris, Nye, et al., than they have with Carter Glass or even with Jon Robinson.

CERTAINLY, the Republicans as a party have nothing constructive to offer the country in case they slaughter the New Deal. The party has not had a new idea since the days of General Grant. In wounded rage it occasionally has been compelled to take some note of civilized suggestions made by Theodore Roosevelt and other progressives when on a rampage. But it never gave any hospitable reception to their views.

The whole Democratic-Republican lineup is a product of war times and has about as much relevance to present day realities as a Civil war stagecoach has to modern transportation systems.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency, never have been clean cut issues between the parties.

There have been plenty of high tariff and hard money free-traders, as well as numerous Republican free-traders, greenbackers and silverites.

If the controversy over the New Deal could help to break up this absurd heritage from an ancient past and give some logic to the American party system, it would render an incomparable service to American politics.

The differences between the two parties have been relatively slight since reconstruction days. Even the two topics on which they have seemed to be most divided, the tariff and the currency