

## Comment

Americans who experienced an appreciable period of mature life before the age of the automobile, the movie and the airplane are fast growing old. Among men and women who reached maturity in the eighties or nineties and who have never become fully accustomed to the things of the new era, there is a feeling that there has been a good deal of loss. Admittedly, it is better to live in a day of individual communion sets, sanitary drinking fountains, comfortable clothing, outdoor activities, electric washers, and cleaning and pressing establishments. No one wants to drink from the common cup at the town pump again, or wear a frock coat at his daily work, or return to the wash-board and soft soap, or buy crackers out of the barrel where the cat sleeps—all agree that it is well that those days are gone forever. It is however, only natural that reflective individuals whose days of manhood or womanhood have been about equally divided between the older and newer regime should often feel sorry for a generation of men and women, now rapidly coming into control, who were born into a world of speeding cars and movie performances that succeed each other in a never-ending series, to which has been added the radio to furnish distraction for all leisure time not taken up in whizzing over pavements or looking at the screen in the theater.

---

In the year, 1932, we have seen the Congress of the United States, at the behest of the President, increase taxes and cut wages for government employees in order "to balance the budget". We have also seen the Indiana Legislature, and those of many other states, decreasing taxes and cutting down the pay of all employees of the state and local governments in order to relieve men of property of their public burdens. In both nation and states, the process has been carried on without understanding or intelligent discrimination. The general demand for economy in the conduct of public affairs has been met almost entirely through forcing sacrifices upon employees of the national, state and local governments. The process has not increased prosperity—rather the reverse is true, because the demand for goods has been lessened. It is to be hoped that more

fundamental and just methods of bringing about governmental economies will be discovered in future sessions of Congress and state Legislatures.

---

The people of the United States will soon be confronted with the problems connected with caring for the destitute during the fourth winter of the great depression. It has been proposed to employers that such work as they have to offer shall be "spread" among as many workers as possible. The proposal seems to many worthy citizens, especially to those who are weary of repeated calls to contribute to community chests, to be a wise one. In the case of work created to relieve unemployment, there can be no valid objection to the idea of "spreading work". In all industries and institutions where varying degrees of activity have been kept up during the depression, where employees may be said to have jobs of their own, there is a fundamental question at issue. To take away a part of a man's job, usually his only source of income, and give it to another, is to say the least a new and startling departure. Such a policy may be justifiable in the present emergency, but if so, why is it not equally defensible to take a part of a man's business and give it to another. If jobs, acquired through time and patience and industry, can be divided and "spread around," why can not factories, stores, banks, mines, and farms be dealt with in like manner, in order to avoid increasing taxes or donations to community chests?

---

Republicans won national victories in 1920, 1924, and 1928. Can this statement be challenged? If the choice of the President by popular and electoral votes be considered, the statement is sound. It is true, nevertheless, that neither of the three Presidents, Harding, Coolidge, or Hoover, has at any time been supported by a working majority in both House and Senate at the same time. No party is ever really in control of the General Government in the United States, save when the President is able to carry out policies in harmony with majorities in both House and Senate. The greatest defect connected with party government in the United States lies just here. Parties and party leaders are only occasionally given the opportunity to carry through constructive programs. Responsibility is hard to locate whether the President is a Republican or a

Democrat, if either the House or the Senate is controlled by an opposite party.

Presidents, congressional leaders and people would function better, receive credit for constructive policies and accept responsibility for mistakes much more certainly if a system were adopted making harmony between the President and Congress a necessary basis for the existence of an Administration. Under the Constitution as it stands, the only chance for an efficient and responsible Administration is for the same party to elect the President and a majority in each branch of Congress. A simple remedy for a really serious defect would seem to be: to elect Senators and Representatives all at the same time and for terms of the same length; to have the President chosen by Senate and House, acting jointly for that purpose as a *national assembly*; and to have any deadlock between House and Senate settled likewise by joint action in said *national assembly*. As it is, it is seldom true that a political party has a fair chance to govern even when supposedly in power. For this reason all parties should combine to work out some such fundamental change as that mentioned above, which has the merit of being an adaptation of the established American system rather than a system borrowed from another country.

---

Under the presidency of Andrew Wylie, who was styled "Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy and *Belles Lettres*", something in the nature of history was attached to the curriculum of Indiana University as a side issue. Following a diagram showing the subjects to be taken by freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors, the following note appears in the *Annual Circular and Catalogue* of Indiana University for the year 1851: "Two lectures on History are delivered every week to the Freshman and Sophomore classes, which are also open to such other students as desire to attend them." Nothing in reference to history appears in earlier catalogues of the University. Whether the lectures were intended as a dessert or a medicine, it is hard to say. Possibly both purposes were in the minds of those who were bold enough to experiment with "Lectures on History" before the students of a struggling college on the frontier.

---

The annual Indiana History Conference will be held on

Friday and Saturday, December 9-10, at the Claypool Hotel in Indianapolis. Readers of the *Indiana Magazine of History*, if there be any who have not attended such meetings in previous years, will find it interesting and profitable to be present this year. Programs will be mailed to members of the Indiana Historical Society. Others may obtain copies by writing to the Secretary of the Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis.

---

A New memorial to Abraham Lincoln was dedicated at Fort Wayne, Indiana, on September 16, 1932. This heroic bronze statue of "Lincoln, The Hoosier Youth", created by Paul Manship under the sponsorship of the Lincoln Life Foundation, stands on the Plaza in front of the Lincoln Life Insurance Company building. The work rises twenty-four feet above the sidewalk and it was the aim of the sculptor to present Lincoln as he appeared at the age of twenty-one, when his Indiana career just was coming to a close. Twenty thousand people attended the dedicatory exercises. The principal address was delivered by the Hon. Arthur M. Hyde, Secretary of Agriculture. Other speakers were Ida M. Tarbell, Senator James E. Watson, Reverend Joseph R. Sizoo, pastor of the church in Washington which Lincoln attended when President, Arthur F. Hall, president of the Lincoln Life Insurance Company, Governor Harry G. Leslie, and the sculptor, Paul Manship.

It was the aim of Manship to represent Lincoln, the young man, "as a dreamer and a poet rather than as a railsplitter". These qualities were regarded as of more importance on account of Lincoln's great accomplishments in later life. Had he not been a dreamer in his youth and young manhood, he could not have performed in his mature years with such "idealism and clarity". While these views dominated the thought of the artist, he did not neglect other characteristics possessed by Lincoln at the end of his Hoosier period. Interpreting the completed statue, Manship says: "Everyone has heard or read the stories of Lincoln's youthful physical prowess, and so we have depicted Lincoln as the brawny youth that he was. The ax tells the story of the railsplitting days. The book symbolizes his intellectual qualities; and the dog reminds us of his exceptional love for animals as well as the greater feeling of human sympathy and protectiveness. His clothes, I decided to

make to represent Linsey-Woolsey homemade shirt, buckskin trousers, and boots."

---

Contributors to this issue: Dr. Christopher B. Coleman, Secretary of the Indiana Historical Society and Director of the Indiana Historical Bureau; Dr. Victor L. Albjerg, Associate Professor of History, Purdue University; Mrs. Flora McDonald Ketcham, daughter of Judge David McDonald and a resident of Indianapolis; Mrs. Nelle Decker Hubbard, a resident of Brazil, Indiana, and historian of the Hendrix family; Arthur Homer Hays, Instructor in American History in the High School of Boise, Idaho, native of Indiana, and author of a novel of early Indiana, *Notawkah, Friend of the Miamis*, which is just from the press.