

The State's Voice

A PAPER FOR THINKING PEOPLE

VOL. I.

DUNN, N. C., SEPT. 15, 1933

NUMBER 17

A Maximum Limit of Income Necessary

A Square Deal Requires A Limited Maximum Wage Or Income As Well As A Minimum Wage

The NRA has thus far got hold of only one end of the stick with which a square deal is to be lifted in this country. The minimum wage has been accepted. A limited maximum wage is its corollary. So long as there is a limit to the total production of wealth there can be no satisfactory minimum wage fixed which is not accompanied with a limited maximum wage, or income from any and every source.

There is no sense in saying that each of eight people, for instance, are to have no less than a half-peck of apples out of the bushel that is available, for distribution, so long as any one of the dozen is permitted to snatch up a half-bushel and make off with them, or after the division is made to so maneuver as to get possession of half of the others' shares. And that kind of process is the more indefensible when it comes to the division of wealth with 120,000,000 of people, when a few manage to get not only what impoverishes millions but means accumulations by the few which are far beyond their needs for ten life-times.

Robbers On A Smaller Scale

But it is not only the Great Danes in the mangers that are to be deprived of their prerogative, to starve the oxen but the very fice. A thousand million-dollar incomes depletes the general stock no more than do ten million incomes of \$100, each, in excess of a fair quota. Both robberies, alike, amount to a billion dollars. Yet there is a difference in the final effect. The fellow getting the \$100 which is not equitably his may use it in the purchase of things of fleeting value, while the possessor of the million-dollar income necessarily invests much of it in the permanent values of the country, and thereby not only deprives the oxen of their immediate supply of hay but levies for decades a tribute upon the very hayfields, and thus skimps the supply of oxen not yet born.

The Disastrous Effects of Excessive Incomes...

For years I have pointed out the disastrous effects of excessive incomes. The man who uses up practically all his income in living expenses is not so great a menace, even though his income be a million a year, as is the man who has a few or many thousands of dollars of excess income to invest in permanent values. The former may, and does, cut down the rightful share of the average man, but what he buys or the labor that he monopolizes in operating his menage, yachts, etc., is reproducible. His excessive income does not levy tribute for decades or centuries upon the unborn. On the other hand, the excessive incomes of the last century have enabled a small percentage of the people of the country to grasp and hold nine-tenths of the values in the country and to extend their monopoly to the wealth of other countries.

Where Lies the Cause of the Depression

In that fatal monopoly lies the cause of the troublous period through which we have gone, and will continue to go so long as the dogs are allowed to remain in the mangers. While abundance prevails for all in the country, the few roll in wealth, and though their holdings may have lost nominal value, these monopolists still possess the sources of wealth and the money that would make a fairer distribution of the reproducible wealth possible. The only way in years that this money has been, to any appreciable extent, returned to circulation is through government loans, which are making their hold upon the sources of wealth all the firmer, while the collapse of prices and the resulting inability of debtors and producers to continue to hold their possessions, are of necessity causing a great proportion of the wealth sources not formerly in their grasp to fall into the keeping of the same group of manger dogs.

More Than Limitation of Incomes Needed

The consequence of long unlimited incomes is such that the future limitation of incomes to a more equitable basis is not sufficient to restore the equilibrium that must exist before a fair minimum income can be enforced. So long as, so great a percentage of the sources of wealth is held by a small percentage of the people of the country, it is inevitable that

no adequate share of the newly produced wealth can be assigned to the average citizen. Moreover, it is hardly sufficient, or effective, to limit effectually the income from these holdings, as any excessive income tax or rather agency for decimating such incomes may result in the idleness of the sources of wealth — factories, fields, transportation facilities, mines, etc.

The Hayfields Must Be Freed

Not only must the dogs in the mangers be driven out, but the monopolists must be deprived of their power to lay tribute upon the bulk of the sources of wealth of the whole country. If the New Deal is a correction of an existing inequitable and unbearable condition, it is not enough to correct the immediate effects of the old regime, but to destroy the grasp upon wealth sources secured by ten-percent of the people through the operation of the inequitable, and now condemned, processes of the old regime. It is not enough to prevent the further extension of the process of mass impoverishment but it becomes necessary to break the bonds of mass poverty already welded and clinched. For either the old stranglehold upon the sources of the wealth of the country has been wrongfully, unjustly, inequitably, attained, or there is no justice, no equity, in proclaiming a "new deal". The thieves should not only be forbidden to steal more but should be made to surrender their former stealings.

An Unbearable Condition

As indicated above, the few will not only hold the formerly held accumulations of wealth sources and actual wealth when the depression is over, but will be found to have laid violent hands upon much of what had not formerly been seized by them. It stands to reason that millions cannot lose home, farms, and businesses without their acquisition by others. Consequently, we shall awake, despite all the hoped-for benefits of the "new deal", so long as it confines itself to a just division of wages and incomes, in a most lamentable plight. A few families will possess the great sources of wealth, and thereby retain the power to force the same unjust practices of accumulation they have all the while possessed. What matter big wages if those wages can be recaptured through rentals and a hundred other processes?

Consider the high wages of the Ford Company. The factories were located on an area that had only nominal value before the erection of the plants. Yet four-room houses on minimum plats have rented for more than the rental value of a thousand-acre farm, residence, and farm houses in thousands of cases, the past few years. Thus has a large percentage of the high wages paid by the Fords been seized with

one fell swoop of the capitalist. Thus has a value created by the contributions of almost the whole riding world been monopolized by those who seized the opportunity, whether the Ford Company or land speculators, to lay hands upon the barren areas of what is now Dearborn.

Unearned Increment Must Be Saved For The Pro-

From time immemorial, men have made fortunes through monopolizing the values created by society as a whole. Not only should this means of levying upon the wages or incomes of the masses of people be discontinued, but the stranglehold thus acquired in years ago should be broken. But that kind of power over permanent values scarcely needs special treatment. The power of excessive wealth or holdings of permanent values unjustly acquired in any or every manner, should be broken, and will be broken. It is only a question of when and how. In Russia and France, the how was terrible. It should not thus be in the United States. Peaceable or mild means of redeeming for the people all the sources of wealth acquired without an adequate or equitable quid pro quo should be discovered, for in equity no title otherwise acquired can be justified.

Let No Great Groups Profit At The Disadvantage Of Others

Yet the tyranny and robbery of great groups can be as effective in keeping other groups submerged in poverty as that of the smaller group of great monopolists. Organized labor has no right to claim for itself a greater per capita share of real benefits than can be allotted, under the limitations of wealth production, to other groups who work as efficiently and in as essential employments as the individuals of organized groups. Reverting to my original illustration of the bushel of apples, if the number and the equitable division limited the distribution to two each, some could be left without any apple at all, or only one each, by a considerable number of the whole group of sharers seizing three each as well as if one hog took a peck.

Far To Travel!

The "new deal" has far to travel and new roads to cut before it can really be an equitable deal. But the start has been made. The recognition of the rights of the masses to share adequately in the common wealth of the country has been recognized. But such recognition is largely futile so long as the corollary is not accepted, that an adequate minimum wage or income is possible only when there is established a limitation of maximum income upon the righteous basis of an adequate and equitable quid pro quo.

Down in the Tip-End of Sampson

Sometime ago I had the opportunity to cross that upper tip of Sampson which juts up into a swallow-fork in Johnston some distance further north than Dunn. Till ten days ago I had never been to the southern tip at Beatty's Bridge, nearly sixty miles from Dunn as the crow flies, and actually just about sixty from the line at the Mingo crossing out here two miles by the most direct roads. No other such direct journey can be taken through any other county. Robeson is as large as Sampson but more blocky. Two miles above the tip-end at Beatty's Bridge, at Ivanhoe, our little Black River out here toward Erwin, lower the South, joins the main Black. And just below the junction is Corbett's Bridge, famous as the crossing place of both the Highlanders and the army of Cornwallis.

The Corbetts were there then and they are there now. The first three men I put on the Voice list at Ivanhoe were Corbetts, and three as fine citizens as Sampson affords, Haywood, Charlie, and Sprunt Corbett. At Beatty's Bridge I get Mr. W. M., who was raised right near the Corbett bridge.

I was surprised to find quite a lumber plant at Ivanhoe. More than 25 years ago it was established by a Mr. Brown from the western part of the state.

Ten years ago, came Mr. E. H. Brown, nephew of the founder, who has managed the mill since the death of his uncle. The river furnished convenient transportation for logs from above. But the timber is now rather scarce, though the stock on hand indicates a good deal of recent cutting or mighty little selling in quite a while. At the depot I found as agent one of the Parkersburg Reeves. He ought to be a youngster, but he talked of his daughter off at college. His brother is agent at Atkinson. The Ivanhoe brother is also postmaster. And I am reminded that I forgot to ask him, as directed by Sprunt Corbett, to show me that whale of a rattlesnake Sprunt had killed—a six-footer with body like a young telegraph pole.

When Franklin Was Wealthy.

Time was when Franklin township had some of the wealthiest citizens in New Hanover county, for it was in New Hanover till 1774 or 5 when Pender county was formed and the township came to Sampson. The swamp lands afforded finest of farm lands and the hill lands the finest of turpentine forests. In that township you will find more big old antebellum residences than in half of the rest of the county. Another long-straw pine crop is getting well

(Continued On Page Six)