

WEAR AND TEAR OF LIFE MUST BE CONTINUALLY FOUGHT TO PRESERVE ONE'S GOOD LOOKS, DECLARES BILLIE BURKE

"It's All Right to Talk of Mental and Spiritual Beauty, but It Needs a Healthful and Wholesome Medium Through Which to Express Itself," Is What Wife of Flo Ziegfeld Has to Say.



BY ANTOINETTE DONNELLY. This is the fifth of a series of articles by Miss Donnelly on the 12 most beautiful women in America.

NEW YORK—"It is so uninteresting for a woman not to take care of her looks," says Miss Billie Burke, in private life Mrs. Flo Ziegfeld Jr., "I simply cannot imagine anyone not doing it. It isn't just your face to fight—but the wear and tear of life, and we all have that to combat if we live at all. I think a woman very shortsighted to make no effort to preserve her beauty and to add to it, if possible. You owe that to your husband, your family and your friends, and if you are in public life your public demands it."

Getting on to the subject nearest my note book at the moment, I asked Miss Burke for some of her beauty secrets which others of us might profit by.

"You shampoo it yourself? And what nature of shampoo preserves its lovely color?"

"My maid usually shampoos it for me, and brushes it every day for more than the proverbial hundred strokes. I have a shampoo that I have been using for years, put up specially by the same man. His secret is locked therein."

"I don't think for instance, after a certain age, or long before it, for that matter, you can have a good complexion unless you take care of it. It needs plenty of creaming and the massage that goes with it."

"Yes, I brush my eyebrows and lashes daily, too. My lashes are fair, of course, but I love lashes that curl up, and I know some of the women with this heavenly asset make it daily practice of brushing them up, and it certainly pays. They are so much more effective that way."

"I am a cold shower fan. Every morning of my life I take an icy bath, and then rub until I feel every atom of me glow. I feel every atom glow without breakfast than without that shower."

"I'll pursue you. This one is the first of several bending ones, I do. I find these bending exercises are the best for waist and stomach."

"I'm a cold shower fan. Every morning of my life I take an icy bath, and then rub until I feel every atom of me glow. I feel every atom glow without breakfast than without that shower."

"I'll pursue you. This one is the first of several bending ones, I do. I find these bending exercises are the best for waist and stomach."

"I'll pursue you. This one is the first of several bending ones, I do. I find these bending exercises are the best for waist and stomach."

"I'll pursue you. This one is the first of several bending ones, I do. I find these bending exercises are the best for waist and stomach."

"I'll pursue you. This one is the first of several bending ones, I do. I find these bending exercises are the best for waist and stomach."

"I'll pursue you. This one is the first of several bending ones, I do. I find these bending exercises are the best for waist and stomach."

"I'll pursue you. This one is the first of several bending ones, I do. I find these bending exercises are the best for waist and stomach."

"I'll pursue you. This one is the first of several bending ones, I do. I find these bending exercises are the best for waist and stomach."

Auction Bridge

BY ANNIE BLANCHE SHELBY.

As there are many players, I find, who are of the opinion that dummy, the declarer's partner, has absolutely no rights or privileges, that he must be literally what the term "dummy" would seem to imply; that, having eyes, he must see not, and, having organs of speech, he must nevertheless be dumb, I would herewith state that this is entirely erroneous.

As is seen, a fine distinction exists between what constitutes a violation of his rights, and what would be a transgression of his rights. It is the latter which he has no right to attempt, it constitutes a flagrant violation and generally works to the detriment of the side. Surely, the dummy has many obligations resting upon him, and in many cases responsible in no small degree for the proper development of the game. If, therefore, he has not in his proper position as the table in order to fulfill his obligations, or being present, he is ignorant regarding them, much concern can often be laid directly to his door.

Let no one, therefore, run away with the belief that dummy's position is that of a sinecure, and that he is entitled to all the rewards and emoluments which may fall to the side, but is divested entirely of any responsibilities in connection with the position.

As is seen, a fine distinction exists between what constitutes a violation of his rights, and what would be a transgression of his rights. It is the latter which he has no right to attempt, it constitutes a flagrant violation and generally works to the detriment of the side. Surely, the dummy has many obligations resting upon him, and in many cases responsible in no small degree for the proper development of the game. If, therefore, he has not in his proper position as the table in order to fulfill his obligations, or being present, he is ignorant regarding them, much concern can often be laid directly to his door.

Let no one, therefore, run away with the belief that dummy's position is that of a sinecure, and that he is entitled to all the rewards and emoluments which may fall to the side, but is divested entirely of any responsibilities in connection with the position.

One of the most important of dummy's duties (as also of the adversaries) is to ask his partner whether he has been dealt a card, if he is without a card of the suit. This precaution often saves a revoke as well as a player, and perhaps stands him in good stead at some future time. Another reason why dummy should stick closely to his job.

If such play be made by one of the adversaries, the card played in error becomes an exposed card, subject to the call of the declarer. This responsibility is placed upon the table face upward, and led or played as the declarer may dictate (provided that in so playing the card he, the holder, does not make a revoke). Should he, however, get the opportunity to play the card before the declarer calls it, he should undoubtedly do so.

No penalty attaches to the declarer because of an exposed card for the reason that he has no partner who may benefit thereby, but two adversaries to whom the knowledge that he holds a particular card may prove of benefit.

There are some players who assert that if the declarer makes a revoke the dummy is quite as responsible for the error as the declarer, as if the dummy had called his attention to the fact that he had renounced a trick the revoke could have been saved. This is a somewhat strong assertion, yet it is not without foundation. It should certainly tend to emphasize the watchfulness and care which the dummy player should never fail to observe.

Revoke is made at times by the best and most conservative of players. The declarer, trusting upon the play of the two hands, can easily make a revoke by reason of his own carelessness. On the other hand, the dummy, whose mind is free so far as the play of the hands is concerned, should easily be able to detect a revoke, and, by the irregularity of the sort which the declarer may be on the point of committing. While, as stated, much of the responsibility for a revoke is justly to be laid to the carelessness of the dummy in failing to call attention to the fact that the declarer has renounced a trick, the adversary who makes a revoke cannot be held quite so accountable, as in himself he is absorbed in the play and development of the hand. In other words, his mind is not as free to observe errors as is that of the dummy. The dummy, therefore, as well as the declarer, should form the habit of asking their partner when first he renounces to a trick if he is without a card of the suit. The exercise of a little care and watchfulness on the part of all players will often enable to avoid penalties which would score heavily against them.

While on the subject of irregularities, I cannot refrain from touching upon what I consider not only a breach of etiquette, but a most flagrant violation of what is right and proper. This is the habit, possessed by many players, of themselves playing cards from the dummy hand. The act is a most reprehensible one, and, in my opinion, it is supposed, that only a certain card can be played to the current trick, but this in no wise excuses the player who so acts. The wise declarer is he who will not permit any such irregularity, who will at once assert, courteously but firmly, that he alone has the right to play the dummy hand, and that he neither desires nor will tolerate any infringement of his prerogative. If it is not right for the dummy to play a card from his hand unless authorized to do so by the declarer, it is certainly a flagrant breach for the adversary to make any attempt to do so.

The following came within my observation a short time ago. It is the first revoke the declarer of some players and the tendency whenever possible to shift the blame of some irregularity on their own shoulders. In this case the game was well along, when the declarer led an unopened suit, and the dummy player renounced. The declarer again led the suit and the player again renounced. Upon the third round of the suit the declarer led a card of the suit to which he had renounced, and insisted upon substituting them for the cards he had renounced. It was too late, however. The tricks had been turned and the declarer had become established.

There is no doubt that the declarer had the option of taking two tricks from the adversary and adding to his honor score. On adding to his honor score the penalty for the second revoke was 50 points in his honor score.

As is seen, a fine distinction exists between what constitutes a violation of his rights, and what would be a transgression of his rights. It is the latter which he has no right to attempt, it constitutes a flagrant violation and generally works to the detriment of the side. Surely, the dummy has many obligations resting upon him, and in many cases responsible in no small degree for the proper development of the game. If, therefore, he has not in his proper position as the table in order to fulfill his obligations, or being present, he is ignorant regarding them, much concern can often be laid directly to his door.

PHYSICIAN DENIES TRUTH OF THEORY THAT COSMETICS INJURE COMPLEXIONS

Skin Specialist Announces That Effect Is Rather Beneficial Than Otherwise, Since Milady's Feeling That She Looks Well Stimulates Health by Auto-Suggestion.



A Beauty Parlor In Orient Where Cosmetics Are Used To Greater Extent Than Here



The American Girl And Her Powder Puff

Dr. Charles E. Pabst Who Declares That Cosmetics Do Not Harm The Skin

"The doctors are putting their grousches in camp and are suddenly good to suffering humanity. An epidemic of kindness has hit them. Maybe it's only a dream."

Only a week ago a Philadelphia doctor made himself eligible for the presidency of the Hoboes' League, which has just ousted its present millionaire leader, by declaring that their constitutional law, that is, one bath a year, is all that is necessary, is the right and proper one.

From extensive observation and experience in the treatment of skin diseases covering thousands of cases, I can say that powders and rouge are not harmful, do not cause excess irritants, and I can add after careful analyses that there are few powders and rouges which are made up with an excess of irritants. Even the cheapest varieties, another thing, curiously enough, women almost invariably discover the powder that "is theirs," or in other words, the one that seems to suit them best. It seems to be a case of material selection.

Flappers who dared to admit the whole truth and came out into the public light of day with chalky faces and undressed lips may now renew their tools of beauty and again adorn themselves like a picture not an artist can paint. For not only does the doctor declare that cosmetics are quite harmless to the skin, in fact he says they are even beneficial, as consciousness of looking well, by auto-suggestion, makes one feel well and thus rouse and powder have an important tonic effect on many women.

Unlike most cases, for instance, where stomach specialists generally happen to be chronic dyspeptics, hair restorer artists, bald-headed men, and women, unfortunately, it is the pessimists, Dr. Pabst himself has an astonishingly healthy and radiant skin. At first glance he seems to be a young man in his twenties, and it is only when he begins to speak that it is possible to realize that one is facing a man of mature years.

Already occupying a high place in his profession, being very generally recognized as one of the principal authorities in this country on diseases of the skin, Dr. Pabst won special honor during the war. He was in charge of the division of skin diseases in one of the biggest base navy hospitals in the country and his work in relieving the skin diseases of our sailors won special commendation.

Convention Is Addressed. Dr. Pabst made his stirring address at a convention just held at Atlantic City. In the course of his interview he afterward amplified his statements to assure people that he meant just what he said, for those who were so surprised to hear that a medical authority had given cosmetics a clean bill of health that they declared he must have been misquoted.

"I have often been asked," he declared, "whether the use of cosmetics is harmful to the skin. It is a question that always occurs to a woman using them when making her toilette and it has been a bugaboo that has frightened them, for those who, for so-called moral reasons, have taken a stand against the use of cosmetics have hoped to discourage her by declaring that it is detrimental to the skin."

"The majority of powders and rouge preparations will do no harm to the skin under any condition, natural selection or not, particularly if proper care and hygiene of the skin is observed. This might well be called a beauty secret, for as it happens, women almost invariably select the powder that seems to be the hardest to learn to follow."

Correct your digestion at once! The moment "Pape's Diaphepsin" reaches the stomach you never feel any more misery from indigestion, sourness, flatulence, gases, heartburn or acid stomach. Don't suffer! Correct your stomach for a few cents. All druggists recommend these pleasant, harmless stomach tablets.—Adv.

Pape's DIAPHEPSIN FOR INDIGESTION. STOMACH BAD—CHEW A FEW! Instantly! End Indigestion, Gas, Sourness, Heartburn