

# The State's Voice

State Library  
"People's Paper"  
A PAPER FOR THINKING PEOPLE

VOLUME 2

DUNN, N. C., MARCH 1, 1934

NUMBER 4

## "The Curse Causeless Shall Not Come"

(After writing the following article, I noticed John W. Davis's injunction to find the natural law and follow that and all would come well. That I had already done, and was convinced after the completion of the article that the Roosevelt New Deal is in the direction of the natural law.)

Let's make Solomon's assertion more general by changing the tense to the present, thus: "The curse causeless does not come," and apply it to the state of affairs existing in our country and in the world as a whole.

It will be readily agreed, I suppose, that the pursuit of any course contrary to natural law, whether physical, moral, or spiritual, is a sufficient cause to produce any evil condition, or "curse" if you please. And the corollary that no "curse" comes otherwise, as Solomon states, will be accepted without argument. Unfortunately, however, the effect of the violation of law, eternal law, is not limited to the violator of that law.

It may be observed in the beginning that man-made laws in opposition to the eternal scheme of things have frequently been the cause of infinite woes. Again, it should be noted that human instincts developed before the origin of society may often be, and are, utterly antagonistic to the eternal principles that apply to a sane social order. In fact, those instincts, developed, under the primeval order, are often the basis for the destructive man-made laws. In other words, we find the social world undertaking to legislate for itself upon the basis of instincts surviving the era of the utterly individualistic regime.

### Primordial Instincts Antagonize Social Law

The consequence is, the primeval practices, recognized as legitimate by a social world though for ages hurtful to the social order, have, as the social order becomes increasingly complex, become often a boomerang to the individualistic promoter of his own selfish ends. Since the organization of government—that is, any government intended to seek and to perpetuate the good of its citizens as a whole—there has been a constant warfare between the individualistic primeval law and the social law—not necessarily the law or laws inaugurated by society, but the eternal or necessary law of a social order. That war is still waging. In fact, it is at its height. Incomplete comprehension of what a social order implies has for ages disarmed society itself and given easy victory in many areas to the primeval law of the individual.

Thus, as Paul found a war waging within himself between the "old man" and the "new man", and himself doing "what he would not do", every government in the world impliedly confessing that it is erected for the benefit of all, has seen the social order overridden, time and again, by the individualistic order, and whole groups, unable or unwilling to resort to the primeval law of hoof and claw, become more the victims of individualists operating under a quasi social order than they might have become in a state of anarchy—where group could have openly fought antagonistic individuals or groups. In short, the social order arrayed, nominally at least, for the common good has been the victim of individualistic snipers not only embodied in the social army itself but often dominating that army. Whole regiments have been mowed down by "rugged individuals" who have happened to come upon convenient economic machine guns. And the body as a whole has consented, by hypnotized by the individualistic instinct surviving the day before a social order was conceived.

### The Evolution of Government.

Early governments were of three types. Two of them probably had the common interest at heart. The first was the patriarchal or tribal. The second was the government due to the rise of the strong man, the "can" man (Koenig)—the king, whose opportunity arose with the arrival of a menace to his group. In this case, it depended largely upon the character of the king himself as to what degree of consideration was given the man or citizen in general, but certainly generally more than in the third type of monarchy, where a course of self-aggrandizement gradually secured for one man the autocratic power. As autocrat he naturally continued his for-

mer course of self aggrandizement, regardless of the consequences to his people as a whole or as individuals. The shepherd became a greater menace than a hundred packs of wolves.

It was this type of government that became dominant. The only men the monarch favored were those who could compel his favor. King John, in his memorable "magna charta", conceded privileges to the barons. But it took many years of slow evolution for the common man of England to gain any recognition, from noble or king, for his economic and social rights. For centuries Europe was at the mercy of the strong—if not now. The laws made applicable to the common run of men were made not so much for the betterment of the common interest as for the protection of the masters' interests. Government, king or lord, gave not a hoot for the welfare of his peasants or feudal tenants as such, but chiefly because a certain degree of welfare was essential to their usefulness in his behalf.

The history of the struggles of the common folk to attain a degree of economic and social protection would make volumes. The establishment of the American republic was hailed throughout the world as a victory for the people. But, as in the days of King John, when the nobles assumed for themselves the rights of the "people", in the American Republic, the aristocratic idea, the peculiar conceptions of the rights of class, so dominated, that practices as contrary to the democratic idea as that of limiting the franchise to free-holders or that of the enslavement of a race prevailed. In time the class idea was eliminated from the law books. Yet it remained in the instincts of the people, both of high and low degree, preparing the former to utilize any means that might come to hand to enrich or glorify themselves at the expense of the masses, and the latter to be submissive to such exploitation.

But the tool for self-aggrandizement was often seized by one of the submerged, who used it as relentlessly as the tyrant to the manner born. And with the increasing complexity of the social and economic regimes, lethal weapons multiplied in number and deadliness as rapidly as did the modern means of production and transportation. The nobleman of old had first only his own strong arm to raise him above his peers, and then the bows of his underlings. To-day he might resort to poison gas. And in this complex economic age, the "rugged individualist" has at hand every kind of modern weapon which he unhesitatingly utilizes to augment his wealth or station. The gangster still adheres to actual physical weapons. That the government recognizes as a crime, vigorously running down and penalizing yeggs, kidnapers, and mere strong-arm men. But the wiser "rugged individualist" resorts to those intangible weapons which he finds ten-fold more deadly than the gangster does his bomb or "gat." The people are skilled economically, by secret or hidden sprayings of "poison gas." And this the government has conceived as legitimate in a land where individual initiative is glorified, or perhaps has connived at the crime, or even consorted with the criminals in concocting the deadly miasma.

Fortunately, as suggested in the beginning, the practice, in many cases, has resulted in a boomerang effect, destroying criminal and intended victims alike. Happily, the distress became so intense and so general that a benevolent administration could launch a "new deal," either with the consent of the robber barons or by brow-beating them.

### The Economic Armageddon at Hand.

Democracy has largely won its political fight—in legal forms at least. Effectual disfranchisement under the law or regardless of the law is still to be eliminated. Similarly, under the euphonious phrase of "equal opportunity," the people have assumed that they have won their economic rights. But as election frauds, some of which have been wrought under legally framed methods of procedure, have often proved greater injustices to the people than any legal restrictions upon the right of franchise have wrought, so under the specious platitude of "equal opportunity" the economic ruin of hosts has been wrought. Grant that the victim of the highwayman had the equal opportunity to turn bandit himself—it is too late when he finds himself dying at the hands of him who decided to play the trick

first. Yet the intended victim of the highwaymen does have a chance, say, in a hundred. But he has not that one chance when he finds himself suffocating in an economic atmosphere that has been deliberately poisoned by the barons of wealth.

Alone he is helpless. Yet the whole host of the oppressed can do nothing, or will do nothing, so long as they have failed to see that, under the hypnotizing phrases "equal opportunity," "initiative," "rugged individualism," etc., they have been victimized by practices that, if not criminal, at least have no rightful place under a "government of the people, by the people and for the people."

The government has been alert to punish the man who steals from your corn crib or smokehouse, but has utterly connived at the filching of millions and millions from the people as a whole by manipulations that vouchsafed no adequate quid-pro-quo to them in return.

At last, a champion of the people has entered the lists. An economic Armageddon seems at hand. Upon Champion Roosevelt's banner one may read: "Plenty for the Masses First." Yonder, on the opposing banner, you may read: "We Reap Where We Sow Not." Alas that we see yonder even the bold and formerly invincible white knight Lindbergh, accoutred with a quarter of a million dollars stock certificate from which he has contemplated extracting from the common wealth of his country from \$10,000 to \$50,000 a year in dividends without one whit of quid-pro-quo! Indeed, the opposing host is one of great individual respectability, all morally fortified with the conviction that it is their right to rob the people, provided it is done under cover of legal forms.

While the array is on the field of Armageddon, I cannot yet conceive that this struggle is more than a preliminary one. Neither the leader nor the masses he champions has conceived the full iniquities of the party championing the rights of "rugged individualism." The leader and those whom he would save from the clutches of ruthless greed are, themselves still partially hypnotized by the primordial instincts surviving the pre-social age. Not yet are the proponents of a new deal aware of all the misconceptions derived from another age, an age when they were logical and surviving into an age when they cannot direct individual action with safety to either the individual or society as a whole.

### Individualistic Instincts Contradictory To Wise Social Practices.

In a true or effective social scheme, the individual instincts and practices must be subordinated to the social. The slogan of the "Three Musketeers," "One for all and all for one," must be the prevailing slogan in a successful government having as its professed aim equal opportunities. The striking effectiveness of the social compact among the "Three Musketeers" would have vanished if there had been any qualifications as to the application of the slogan. That compact did not permit helpful co-operation on some tasks or amidst one danger to be counterbalanced or nullified by individual action at other times injurious to, or destructive of, the other members of the compact. A social compact, which every worthwhile government must be in this enlightened age, must not permit individualistic practices which nullify the terms or purposes of the compact itself.

### Primordial Instincts Must Be Suppressed Or Controlled.

Insecurity, the mother of greed, covetousness and the hoarding instinct, must be replaced by security. This cannot be done so long as those instincts are given free rein. One man in ten choosing to live by the rules of hoof and claw and unhindered in that mode of life can thwart the efforts of a nation to secure economic justice for the masses or an economic equality based upon benefits rendered the social body or ready to be rendered if opportunity be provided.

The provision of this opportunity and the assurance of benefits proportionate to the service rendered become the business of the government—paternalistic though such a government may be called and actually be. In an age when a few peculiarly

(Continued On Page 5)