

The State's Voice

A PAPER FOR THINKING PEOPLE

VOL. I.

DUNN, N. C., NOVEMBER 1, 1933

NUMBER 20

Final Observations and Ayer's Costly Protest

Stupendous policies are being wrought day by day in the National realm. Yet the people of North Carolina can be only spectators of the swirling tides of revolution upon the National arena. For months, the people have been, so far as state and Nation are concerned, mere on-lookers. But an event of far-reaching importance is at hand which is to be determined by the voters of North Carolina. The citizen's boasted share in the country's sovereignty has been at a low ebb for a season. But the time is at hand when North Carolinians are to wield their sovereign authority.

A Stamina Testing Event

The stamina of a state is the combined stamina of its citizens. A test is at hand. If the majority of the citizens of North Carolina are willing to follow the wish-washy example of those 33 other states and measure their responsibility and their independence in terms of the popular, then North Carolina, too, like a sheep, will jump the hurdle in the same fashion as that set by its predecessors. But if North Carolina is the old North Carolina, acting in its sovereign capacity utterly regardless of the action or attitude of any other of its sister states, then next Tuesday's election will be really a sovereign action.

Independent sovereignty may have been wielded in the event of either possible result of the election. But in case the state votes to ratify the repeal resolution it can be a truly sovereign act only if every voter forgets, or ignores, the unanimous action of the 33 other states, which have acted upon the repeal resolution. Any citizen whose vote is determined by the seemingly overwhelming vote of other states for repeal is not voting as a citizen of a sovereign state but as a person moved by mass psychology or the mob spirit.

Let The Voter Examine His Motives

In view of the foregoing observations, it behooves every North Carolina voter to consider whether he is planning to act upon considerations that are suggested by the state's own better interest and in accord with principles that are basic to the state's sovereignty or whether he is drifting upon what seems to be a wave of National foment created by interested parties abroad and at home and long and constantly deepened by propaganda proceeding from the same selfish sources.

An Individual Responsibility

One's vote next Tuesday will determine the measure of his own responsibility for whatever of evil may result in either state or Nation from the legalization of the sale of alcoholic beverages. Granted that the prohibition law is abused to an inordinate extent, yet any citizen who has not aided and abetted in the nullification of the law to any extent is utterly irresponsible for any ruin that may have been wrought by blockade liquor. Yet that aid may have been rendered by omission of a good citizen's duty to co-operate in the enforcement of law as well as by a positive participation in those practices that have resulted in whatever degree of nullification that exists. No man broken by drink, no family impoverished and disgraced by a drinking husband or father can attribute to him who has had no part, active or passive, in the nullification of the prohibition law one iota of responsibility for the disaster wrought by drink. The drinker has drunk despite the state's protest, despite the National government's bar of disapproval. He has wrought his own undoing though you and the government have sought to save him.

But not thus will it be if you vote to legalize liquor sales and to respectabilize it in a measure. By that act you become a partner in the ills that liquor works—and all the more heinously responsible if you base your action upon the selfish desire to relieve yourself of a bit of tax.

Hypocritical Mouthings

You should desire not only to avoid sharing the responsibility for the future ills due to liquor, but you should avoid as you would poison, if you have through overt act or sheer indifference aided in fostering the ills that now exist, the hypocritical mouthings of "cannot be enforced". If you have bought and drunk liquor, if you have indifferently allowed the violation of the laws of both state and Nation to

occur under your very nose, then you have no moral right to point the finger of scorn at the law itself. No law enforces itself. President Roosevelt's administration is right now preparing to provide blanks upon which the NRA violations may be reported. Even the NRA regulations will not enforce themselves. It requires the co-operation of all concerned. What a fool any employee would prove himself to suffer chiseling when the remedy is at hand. And what a fool or coward you have been, if you bewail the evils you attribute to failure of the prohibition law if you have cowardly or indifferently allowed it to be nullified under your nose by the hellish minions who have furnished supplies for the youth, who have nourished the thirst of the drunkard, and who have robbed the very wives and children of their patrons of food, clothing, and decent shelter. Scorn your own cowardice instead of the law which would, with your co-operation, prevent the evils which you bewail. For your very manhood's sake, don't be a hypocrite!

Have Regard to Your Own Economic Safety

If you would consider the possibility of a minimum of tax relief through the legalizing of the sale of liquor, common sense dictates that you have regard to the greater economic ills that threaten through the increased sale, at higher prices, of liquor. A fool must see that every additional dollar spent in the promotion of the manufacture and sale of liquor to that very extent lessens the amount of money that can go into the purchase of essential commodities or in providing wholesome living conditions. The merchant, for instance, must be half-witted if he fails to see that every dollar spent at grog shops deprives his guild of a dollar and perhaps many. Not only do the dollars that buy the drug that destroys fail to reach the honorable merchant's till but perhaps lose a good workman his job and a family its income went to be spent for home and personal comforts. The merchant who votes for more booze votes for the cutting of his own economic throat.

A Million-Dollar Testimonial

In the above connection, it is pertinent to cite the million-dollar loss of business by the Ayer advertising agency in support of the principle just suggested. For half a hundred years the Ayer Agency has been one of the most prominent in America. That concern is an authority on trade. Hundreds of men and women are constantly studying trade conditions and building trade arguments. The firm, through President Frye, positively refuses to renew a contract that has paid them mints of money. Every man, and merchant particularly, who has any regard for his own economic interest should read

Now You See!

By Arthur D. Gore

It comes with poor grace from the multimillionaire promoted Rockefeller Institute this new recommendation in behalf of the poor man that he may get drunk on cheap liquor and tote the burdens of costly government, and if this recommendation had come from some other source it would have had more appeal as actually a wise and beneficent move towards cheaper necessities of life for the poorer classes. Another thing in that Institute's recommendation doesn't set well and that is that while preaching repeal so as to restore States' rights, it urges exclusive supervision of certain initial tax-methods of liquor without states taking their pro rata share. It is, though, always easy to puncture anything that is as faulty as this repeal propaganda. One only needs to squint one eye and stay half awake to see their undercurrents of more to the man who has and less to the fellow who hasn't.

What prestige is ex-Governor Gardner's pronouncement having in his native heath now that he has gone to Washington and resigned from a seat among the officialdom of politics, in this repeal campaign? Especially since another former governor and ex-senator, and life-long dry has thrown his hat in the anti-repeal fight? Senator Reynolds is about to annex us to Russia now and plans a whirlwind campaign among the most rural counties of North Car-

The Ayer Statement

Follows the full and authoritative statement of that great company. That statement alone should be sufficient to carry North Carolina against repeal. Here it is:

"We have cancelled our ten-year old agreement with the Canada Dry Ginger Ale, Inc., a highly valued client, following that client's decision to engage in the manufacture and distribution of beer and whiskey after repeal. We regret, of course, the conditions which necessitated this step but on a strictly business basis we are certain we are right.

"The return of liquor will divert an important share of America's mass purchasing power from essential commodities. This diversion may run as high as twenty per cent, based on preprohibition experience and the trend of economic and sociological conditions since the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted.

"The moral question involved in repeal can be left out entirely, but from a purely business standpoint, we still cannot see a very happy result in the return of liquor.

"It is true that revenue from alcohol will contribute many millions of dollars to Federal, state and local treasuries, but this contribution, in the main, will be made by that class of the public which can least afford to make it. This was true before prohibition, and it will unquestionably be true when prohibition is repealed.

"The liquor business has not changed. When the thirty-sixth state has been lined up, it will be run by the same old crowd in the same old way.

"Many decades ago my firm adopted a policy of not advertising alcohol. The reason for this is simply that, as an advertising agency, we must identify ourselves so closely with the affairs of our clients that we are, a part of their business.

"In the case of a client who manufactures or distributes alcoholic beverages, this would create for us an impossible situation, since we would then be in the position of making alcohol attractive to the youth of this county. Furthermore, we do not wish to classify our other clients with the liquor business."

The foregoing opinion cost N. W. Ayer & Son big money. The authors of the repeal propaganda hope to make or save big money. It is not a mere difference of opinion but a difference in the motives back of the opinions. Choose whether you prefer to follow what is absolutely an honest opinion or one that comes accompanied by a big question mark?

olina in behalf of the dripping plank he walked into prominence upon. Why rural counties more than urban? Would he want a jury of city boys instead of 12 good farmers to sit in judgment on a question of right in a court? Why rural counties? Haven't country people sense enough to vote without special attention just now?

Raeford, N. C., October 20, 1933.

HOW TO TELL IT.

It is probable that no more definite and sufficient reason for not voting for repeal has been given in the state than that of Judge Pell, of the Corporation Commission. Judge Pell thus states his reason for opposing repeal. It is in answer to an inquiry on the part of the North Carolina Progress of which Mrs. Charlotte Story Perkinson is editorial writer. Judge Pell will not vote for repeal for two reasons: First, even though repeal seems sure, he fears that North Carolina's ratification of the repeal amendment would affect legislation in this state on prohibition; second, he does not "propose to line up with the liquor crowd on any proposition."

Mr. H. E. Faison of Clinton is interested in the Sneedborough article. He wishes to know if there is any connection between the Sneyd family for which that was named and Sir Robert Sneed (or Sneyd) for whom Sneed's Ferry was named. But you may depend upon that historic mind to find the answer to his own question.