

SCRIPPS-HOWARD NEWSPAPER
Owned and published daily (except Sunday) by Indianapolis Times Publishing Co., 214 W. Maryland st., Postal Zone 9.
Member of United Press, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, NEA Service, and Audit Bureau of Circulations.
Price in Marion County, 5 cents a copy; delivered by carrier, 20 cents a week.
Mail rates in Indiana, \$5 a year; all other states, U. S. possessions, Canada and Mexico, \$7 cents a month.
RI-5551.
Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way

TAKE POLITICS OUT

CLEAN-UP of Marion county and co-operation with other law enforcement agencies are pledged by Lewis Johnson, Democratic candidate for sheriff.

The Times has endorsed Mr. Johnson, on the basis of his record during 29 years as a police officer, over his Republican opponent, Albert C. Magenheimer. Mr. Magenheimer was named sheriff by the board of county commissioners following the death of Sheriff Otto L. Petit, whose administration we opposed and whose force of deputies Mr. Magenheimer retained.

Mr. Johnson charges that gambling and lawlessness are thriving in Marion county through a system of "collectors and front men" and promises this will be stopped if he is elected. He asserts that this system exists under the political "permission" of Henry E. Ostrom, G. O. P. county chairman. Mr. Ostrom has not commented on this charge.

"There will be no 'boss' with his thumb on me," Mr. Johnson said in one of his speeches.

We believe him.

ANOTHER criticism which he makes—and a well-founded one in our opinion—is of the lack of co-operation among law enforcement agencies. Mr. Johnson says on that point:

"Good law enforcement is contingent upon fullest co-operation of the sheriff, prosecuting attorney, criminal court judge, chief of police and judge of juvenile court."

That co-operation does not now exist.

We have recommended election of Judge Judson L. Stark, Republican candidate for prosecuting attorney, on the basis of his record of performance. And we have recommended defeat of the Republican candidates for sheriff, criminal court judge and judge of juvenile court on the same basis.

With Judge Stark and Mr. Johnson in office, along with Jacob L. Steinmetz as criminal court judge and Joseph O. Hoffmann as juvenile court judge, we believe the law enforcement picture in this county would be considerably brighter.

The reasons we endorse Mr. Johnson are to be easily found in his record. He has walked a beat as a patrolman, been a sergeant, lieutenant, captain, major, deputy inspector and assistant chief of police. When on the police emergency squad, he handled a large number of murder cases, and never lost a one which he investigated.

While he was captain of traffic, Indianapolis won the national contest for greatest reduction in traffic fatalities in the five-year period 1935-39. During the latter year, the lowest city fatality record since records first were kept was established, and it has not been beaten or equalled since.

While "Cap" Johnson was major of police, he personally raised the money from local businessmen to install the police radio, which he operated for its first 18 months.

In other words, Mr. Johnson knows law enforcement from all its angles, and knows how politics can reduce its efficiency.

THERE is no chance of his election unless hundreds of Republican voters cross party lines and independent voters in large numbers come to his support.

We believe a vote for Stark and Johnson, Steinmetz and Hoffmann, is a vote for non-political law enforcement in Marion county.

THE NOBEL PRIZE

INDIANA UNIVERSITY is awaiting the return of Prof. Herman J. Muller, distinguished member of its faculty, to honor him for winning the Nobel prize.

Dr. Muller was named Thursday as recipient of the award for his discovery of the production of mutations by X-rays.

Working on the faculties of universities and colleges in the state are a number of "starred" scientists of eminence. However, Prof. Muller is Hoosierdom's first winner of a Nobel award.

Prof. Muller joined the Indiana faculty a year ago as a member of what has become known as the outstanding group of geneticists in the United States.

HAPPY HOOLIGAN HENRY

BECAUSE he ran a tremendous international issue into domestic politics, Woodrow Wilson shattered the ideal of the United States' participation in the League of Nations he himself had conceived.

President Truman wisely has benefited from Wilson's mistake. To his everlasting credit he has held the bipartisan line, the Byrnes-Connally-Vandenberg line.

But Henry Wallace, in a speech at Minneapolis, tried to toss the international issue into the present political campaign. He accused Senator Vandenberg of "needing" Secretary Byrnes into risking war with Russia. He presents no proof. But being a well-known crystal-gazer he thinks he doesn't require proof.

His objective obviously is to start a political fight among our international triumvirate. Should he succeed fully he would bring about a repetition of what happened in Wilson's time. But he will not, for neither Byrnes nor Vandenberg will fall for the trick, and Connally, though not mentioned by Wallace, is very dry behind the ears.

U. S. WON'T BANK UN

LET'S give a hand to Senator Vandenberg for standing up in the financial committee of the United Nations assembly and declining the flattering proposal that this country pay half the total cost of operating the UN.

As the senator says, if it be true that the 5 per cent of the world's population residing in this country possess 50 per cent of the world's earning capacity, then other nations should adopt our economic system.

It's strange how little other countries think of our free-enterprise capitalist society until they get around to the question of who shall pick up the check. Another tenet of the American way, as the senator made clear, is that a man's heart is where his purse is. And so with nations. The United States is ready to match or surpass any other nation in meeting the UN budget. But we want the other 50 nations also to make substantial investments in the world's peace machinery.

John L. Negotiates With the Government



Hoosier Forum

"Revert to Law of Supply and Demand; Abolish Subsidy, Ceiling"

By Norman Glenn, Gen City

America, the land of abundance in natural wealth, with great industrial enterprises, unequaled farm lands, productive genius, and abundant manpower, and with transportation supreme, this great America now finds the shelves and cupboards bare. And why should this be so?

Quite a puzzling paradox. Government statistics showed great industrial production—but no goods on the market. Farms showed bumper crops of most things, but foods were scarce. A great amount of work available, but many not working, on strike or otherwise.

So the workers wouldn't work, the manufacturers wouldn't put out, and the farmers wouldn't sell—unless there was that dollar "incentive." It was the great American squeeze play—but after all truly American, for in this land, born and raised on laissez faire, who was to tell anyone anywhere they could not do anything?

This was the basic cause of the failure of OPA, a fact now taken advantage of by political party opportunists. In this triple squeeze play by manufacturers, farmers and union labor, John Q. Public has had to come through and pay the bill.

Let us survey food prices. Why should butter sell at 51 per pound, lard at 65c, oleo at 45c and meat at fantastic prices? Was there a shortage? Yes, but it was artificial.

Not many years ago this farmer was pleading for farm subsidies against low prices and John Q. was taxed to pay that bill. Now in unprecedented farm prosperity and high prices this same farmer demands that government remove controls so that prices may go the limit. And so John Q. again pays the bill.

Now, let's be fair. If in a few years when prices take that inevitable tumble, will this same farmer be yelling for John Q. to pay him a farm subsidy? If we do go to the law of supply and demand as he insists, why not go all the way and abolish both price ceilings and price subsidies. If our government must not act to keep prices down for benefit of consumer, why should government tax consumer to hold up prices?

"PUT MR. TAFT IN GERMAN DP CAMP"
By Edgar E. Hamer, Indianapolis
One hour and 16 minutes. That's all it took to wipe out of existence the 10 disciples of Hitler. One hour and 16 minutes of time to justify the eternal suffering wrought by those whose ultimate aim was to enslave the world. How ironic it is to execute 10 human beings and then claim that justice has been done. Yet, roaming the streets of a desolate Germany today are many of the fanatics who actually did the plundering, raping, burning and murdering—Hitler's famed elite.

"NUT IN INSANE ASYLUM COULD DO BETTER"
By Reader, Crawfordsville
Just read your article about private enterprise being on trial and will say a nut in an insane asylum could do better. It sounded like old hen Roosevelt saying our way of life is on trial, which is a damn big lie as big as yours. Of course, you have jumped around so much you are dizzy and don't know the score anyway. You never did and never will, for it's not in you. The only thing you ever had in The Times that amounted to anything was Fegler and since he had brains enough to know what he was talking about about you ditched him. Your policy seems to be as little brains as possible. My Day and Stokes, etc., show what you want, and then your editorial are rotten as your murdering—Hitler's famed elite.

"SOMEONE MIGHT WANT TO PULL MY WHISKERS"
By Grandpa, Indianapolis
No one hollers so loud when his toes are cramped on as the fellow who has corners. No one likes to retaliate so quickly as the fellow who is wrong. I'd rather read the writings of a "Voice in the Crowd" or "A Citizen" who say something, than to read the babblings of "Will U. Rattel-Brains." When someone starts talking like the so-called greatest President did awhile back—"I'll show you who is your master"—it is just a matter of self-protection to hide behind something. It's a shame that it is not as safe as present to speak the truth as to speak falsely.

Union labor is wielding a sharp instrument these days, and since they don't seem to care who they hurt, it's just the part of wisdom to keep out of the way if possible. They seem to be anxious to bring forth a condition in this country, something similar to what our boys had to go over to Germany to stop; but who will be kind enough to shed their blood to finish our Hitler, if we produce one. Unions are always right. Anyone opposing them is bound to be wrong. I ought to know for I married a union father-in-law, and had to support his family while he danced to union fiddling. This has happened before. Everything happened before. Everything is happening in the battle of wits in the Hoosier Forum, they start calling for names. When the editor refuses to comply, then they threaten to stop taking the paper. Kiddish, but they can't help it. Sugar is no less sweet to the fellow who happens to not know its name. Just to show that I am old enough to know how to spout off, I'll sign my name. Thanks, Mr. Editor, for allowing me to clothe in anonymity; someone might want to pull my whiskers.

"DAILY THOUGHT"
Six days shall work be done; but the seventh day is the sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein; it is the sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings.—Leviticus 23:3.

"TAKE REE; A FIELD THAT HAS RESTED GIVES A BOUNTIFUL CROP.—Ovid.

"Sure, you're entitled to your own opinion, but don't let it show on your face!"

"I do not agree with a word that you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."—Voltaire.

"EXPELLING UNION MEMBER IS WRONG"
By John Alvah Bilewicz, 516 1/2 Broadway
After reading the con and pro arguments about the C. I. O. in The Times I believe that expelling members from a union or jailing members or union leaders for contempt cannot be guaranteed to bring peace within a union or bring about real public service. It is more likely to convince them that they are the victims of arbitrary action, court and union made laws.

The servicemen, newspapers and citizens who uphold the full thirty-three freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights and Constitution—not select those which they will uphold and throw the rest out of the window—are tough. It is not ignorance that makes the latter mentioned misquote and misconstrue the Bible, Bill of Rights, Constitution, Shakespeare, etc. They think their way of doing or saying it is better. Mein Kempf.

Voltaire said: "I do not agree with a word that you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Thomas Jefferson, the man with many talents and the first President to be inaugurated in the city of Washington, said: "When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe." When there is no freedom of expression there is no certainty of any other freedom.

Christ, our Redeemer, who drove the money changers out of the temple with a whip, was tough. Was he not tough because he was right? If people are right in their policy of defending the freedom of thought, whether by tongue or in the newspapers, speech and free press—voice of freedom, guardian of liberty—the question of expelling a union member for so doing is wrong.

"CARNIVAL—By Dick Turner"



"Sure, you're entitled to your own opinion, but don't let it show on your face!"

IT'S OUR BUSINESS . . . By Donald D. Hoover

How a Newspaper Selects Candidates

IT IS INTERESTING . . . and significant . . . to watch the inner workings of an independent newspaper as it prepares to make recommendations to its readers on candidates in an election.

As a case in point, I believe Times readers would like to look behind the scenes and learn how this newspaper arrived at the indorsements which will be published on the editorial page Monday, the day before the general election.

People Will Find Way

HAVING NO OBLIGATIONS to either the Republican or Democratic party, nor to any factions or individual candidates . . . and no ambition to "run" any part of the community . . . The Times places emphasis on the candidate himself and his qualifications. That is consideration Number One.

No consideration is given to political affiliation in the discussions, on the theory that party responsibility really is rarely involved, except in the U. S. senate race. In that instance, the newspaper's opposition to basic Democratic national policies was the primary consideration. It may be argued that the same position should be taken on the congressional candidates, but those involved in the decision to support the incumbent were unanimous in believing that even this factor was outweighed by the weakness of his opponent.

When indorsements are made in this manner, it is obvious that The Times is indorsing some losers. However, the philosophy behind indorsements may be found in the Scripps-Howard motto: "Give Light and the People Will Find Their Own Way." At times, it seems that the word "eventually" should be added when it comes to politics. However, this newspaper would rather indorse a competent loser than an incompetent winner.

Eventually, enough voters may cast their ballots as independents to improve the caliber of men in

public office . . . and The Times will keep plugging away, fighting for losers many times, in its attempt to hasten that Utopian day.

Enough of this philosophizing. What are the mechanics? Well, here's the way it works.

The editor sets a time for a meeting to discuss qualifications of candidate . . . informs the various department editors.

The reporters are in the office early in the morning.

"Hey," calls the city editor, "meeting on candidates in the boss's office at three this afternoon. Politics, city hall, statehouse, courthouse men be there."

And at 3 p. m. the long meeting begins. Each candidate is discussed in detail . . . his record, in and out of office, his independence of political domination or lack of that independence, his personal habits . . . all those things a reporter learns in his day-by-day contact with these men. When discussion is complete, the editor asks each man:

"Well, what do you say?"

Final Decision

WHEN EACH HAS EXPRESSED his opinion . . . and argued about it if there is a difference in the group . . . The Times indorsement for that office is made.

There are relatively few visitors to the office to try to "pressure" indorsement of candidates . . . because politicians know The Times doesn't react to that approach. Indorsements are made in the editor's office, after full discussion and on merit alone . . . The Times accepts no one's slate blindly. And it has no candidates of its own . . . feeling public office is the gift of the people, not the press.

Perhaps, eventually, the people will awaken to the responsibility of the ballot . . . give careful scrutiny to qualifications before they give their indorsements at the polls. Perhaps.

IN WASHINGTON . . . By Daniel M. Kidney

Hoosier Got Wallace Peace Formula

DEAR BOSS:

DID YOU KNOW that Henry A. Wallace went on record for the Molotov disarmament program more than a week before the Russian foreign minister made his UN speech?

Well, he did so and in writing to a humble Hoosier pacifist who paid his own way to attend UN and come here and talk to Wallace. Here is the story that never before has been told.

Views Similar to Molotov's

CHARLES C. ROHRER, North Manchester, Ind., one of the leaders of the Church of the Brethren there, went to New York to try and interest the Russian UN delegation in disarmament. He was well received at the palatial former J. P. Morgan estate where the U. S. S. R. top brass is ensconced, but he didn't get to see Molotov.

So he left a copy of the Brethren service committee's plea for world disarmament and perpetual peace, attended one session of UN and came here to talk to Wallace.

It was just before the ousted secretary of commerce took off for the West Coast in his whirlwind campaign tour which winds up in New York. He got to see Wallace in the family apartment at the Wardman-Park hotel. They talked peace and all at once Wallace reached for a paper. It was the kind of blue-ruled paper on which school children write exams. On it the one-time vice president wrote the following:

"The time has come to work definitely and especially on carrying out article eight of the Atlantic charter providing for disarmament of all the nations and the abandonment of force in the making of international policy."

SAGA OF INDIANA . . . By William A. Marlow

State Grew With the National Road

THE "NATIONAL ROAD" came into being as America was poised to shift, in a big way, across the Appalachian mountains from a narrow seacoast on the rim of the nation to the wide-sweeping plain in the heart of one of the world's five great continents. Just now and then in the history of mankind has there come a moment like that.

So this road, America's first great national road, became a rolling melting pot of the nation.

Westward Parade

ON IT MINGLED the rich, the well-to-do, and the poor. They were rolling west to roam, to squat, or to stick. Some of them were educated, wise and ambitious. Some, too, if chance favored, would steal, rob, or murder, as some did.

They moved over this highway in equipment as varied as tools and ambitions. Families came in big wagons piled high with household goods, cattle and hogs. Men and women, boys and girls, rich and poor—they all, by turns, grabbed the opportunity to help the procession move along on its way.

With a knowing eye, you could spot the sources of the variegated stream of humanity as it rolled by on this road. There were the Pennsylvania wagons, for example, with paneled beds, high front and rear.

drawn oftentimes by four or even six horses, matched in size and color.

But from the south, especially from the Carolinas, the horses were small and bony. The wagons, too, were small, many of them only carts. They were made entirely of wood—no nails, no tires, not a touch of metal of any kind. Some families, grim and poor, moved along with this thing, carrying everything in the world they owned on their backs, or in a small haunch-wagon which they were pushing from a humble southern home.

For the folks who lived along this road, this daily moving through that throbbing by on this highway was a never-ending sight and thrill. To them it was the moving picture of their day. As you could look behind the curtain, it had all the tragedy and comedy; all the hope and heartbreak; all the vile and low that only a Shakespeare could well portray.

State on Receiving End

INDIANA was at the receiving end of this long procession. Much of it disbanded in Indiana. As it fanned out over the state, it gave color and punch to the Indiana scene. It undoubtedly added much to the biting flavor and tangy touch of Hoosier folks. However much or little the National road helped to make Indiana what it is today, it brought a lot of good Hoosiers and some of the great ones to the state.

POLITICAL REPORT . . . By Thomas L. Stokes

Dewey Majority 500,000 to Million?

NEW YORK, Nov. 1.—Thomas E. Dewey is running for re-election as governor of this state.

But his race against Democratic Senator James Mead has gathered far more significance as the campaign nears its end.

To many people outside this state, including high-placed party leaders, as well as many in this state, next Tuesday election will be interpreted in terms of the contest for the 1948 Republican presidential nomination.

Outcome Affects President Race
HIS RE-ELECTION is accepted as a foregone conclusion. Democrats concede it privately. That of itself, by only a comfortable majority, would put him in the forefront of contenders for the 1948 nomination. But much more than that seems in the making. They are talking of a triumph that may roll into a majority of 500,000 to a million—which would be quite a feat for a Republican here.

Any such victory in this key state, with its big convention and electoral vote will speak loudly on behalf of the still young governor at the 1948 convention despite precedent that the party never has renominated a candidate defeated for the presidency.

He will be in the best possible position to try to break tradition, given a landslide. He broke a long-standing tradition by winning renomination as gubernatorial candidate after being once defeated, and went right on to victory in his second attempt.

He seems to have a lucky star. After defeat by President Roosevelt in 1944, he generally was counted out for 1948. But seemingly undismayed, he went back quietly to his governor's job. A year or more ago his chances for re-election as governor were considered none too bright. The Democrats still seemed to be riding high.

But here he is again. He got a fortunate break. That was the reaction that began to set in against the Truman administration, and now is at high tide, here as everywhere else.

At the same time, he was ready for the break.

He has behind him his excellent record as governor. He is an able administrator, shrewd politically. He kept at his job. His foresight suddenly was revealed to the country when national control went out to a time with temporary suspension of control law state was prepared with its own rent control law which he had put through the legislature months before, the only state statute in the nation when the emergency came.

While Republicans and Democrats fiddled around in Washington over a federal fair employment practices act, without action, Governor Dewey put one on the books here. This law, co-sponsored in the legislature by Irving M. Ives, Republican candidate for the senate against Herbert Lehman, is important in this state and city with its large racial and religious minorities whom it is designed to protect against discrimination in jobs.

It was natural, when Governor Dewey came into this city this week-end to wind up his campaign, that he should emphasize this anti-discrimination measure and the state rent control law. If you wanted to read significance as to his national aspirations into his speeches here, you could find them in his repeated comparison of his administration with "the confusion and incompetence of the present administration in Washington."

He has been running largely against President Truman in his campaign. But his comparison of his administration with that of President Truman has more bearing on national politics.

In Strategic Position

WHAT POSITION GOVERNOR DEWEY takes between now and 1948 among the conflicting elements within his own party will be closely watched. He might well become, along with Harold Stassen and Governor Earl Warren, a potent force for progressiveness on behalf of the younger and more progressive element of the party against the Taft-Bricker old guard group.

He should be in a fine strategic position to exert much influence on his party's course.