

E. K. GAYLORD
PRESIDENT

EDGAR T. BELL
SECRETARY-TREASURER



BUILDING OWNED AND OCCUPIED BY
THE OKLAHOMA PUBLISHING COMPANY

THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN

(DAILY AND SUNDAY)

AVERAGE NET PAID CIRCULATION LAST MONTH { DAILY
SUNDAY

OKLAHOMA CITY TIMES

(EVENING EXCEPT SUNDAY)

AVERAGE NET PAID CIRCULATION LAST MONTH

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Oct. 4, 1926.

Mr. C. Guy Cutlip,
Mayor,
Wewoka, Oklahoma.

Dear Mr. Cutlip:

Mr. Mills of the fourth floor walked up this morning to hand me your permit, duly signed with the official seal of Wewoka and attested by the secretary, serving notice on all bass, perch, crappie or other fish of the dangers of flirting with a Harrison hook. Also advising any and all winged fowl, including teal, canvas back, green-head or other variety that they approach said water at their peril within season.

I hope I may have the privilege of flashing the permit some day. It has always been my desire to visit you in your native habitat, and I hope to see you at home before passing out.

Yours very truly,

A large, stylized handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'W. M. Harrison'. The signature is written over the typed name and title.

WALTER M. HARRISON,
Managing Editor.

WMH*G..

March 16th, 1936

Mr. Walter M. Harrison
OKLAHOMA CITY, Oklahoma

Dear Sir:

Am just in receipt of copy congressional record with Josh Lee's speech therein on "The Spirit of the Constitution." It should have been designated "ghost". It is a gem of sophistry. He speaks of the survival of the fittest as the law of the jungle- it is also the law of God toward all created beings. If you have it turned around you have a world of cripples and idiots. Those who could not in ten thousand years bring a helpful thought or a constructive idea to society. Where is civilization?

His woman who sold the mortgaged property- what about the one who advanced her the money? Another forgotten man. Are courts and juries to disregard the law provided by the people for every one's protection? That seems to be the kind Josh puts his stamp of approval upon. That is no law, whatever. Under his idea of government twelve "good men and true" may set aside the solemn will of the people proclaimed through their representatives. Why have a legislature? Why not just let twelve men be empaneled and decide each controversy that comes up unhampered by any rules or laws? Why, under Josh's idea of government and justice, shouldnt a woman shoot a man down and then when confronted with her crime, get out of it by saying: "I needed the money he had in his pocket to feed " five little hungry mouths". That would be Josh's idea of a complete defense.

He says "one man's right to make money is tempered by the other man's right to live." What does he mean by this when he has just said: "One man's right ends where another's right begins. Each individual right is limited by the rights of others." Has it come to such a pass that under our government certain of our citizens have ceased to have rights? Have the industrious and the thrifty no rights?

He says "trusts and monopolies violate the spirit of the constitution". This is true in a sense- yet he says (speaking of the constitution) "its purpose is to grant equal rights to large and small." He says the last twelve years have seen big business throttle little business. If, so, then it is the duty of government to prevent such abuses. They cannot be corrected justly by resorting to another evil to do it. Two wrongs simply constitute two wrongs they never cured an evil. He admits the constitution is to establish justice. Can justice apply to one class and not to another?

He attacks "rugged individualism" and says a great percentage of the wealth of the land is concentrated in the hands of ten per cent of the people. He must be speaking of money and liquid assets and credits. Those are not wealth. What about the homes, and the cattle, the hogs and the herds, the farms, clothing, furniture, etc., which is wealth? Are these in the hands of ten per cent of the people? Could they be? Such statement is folly.

He contends the law is to prevent the strong from exploiting the weak; is it also his contention that, by way of government, the strong shall be exploited by the weak? A strange government, so one sided. Because a few foolish big business men, greedy and unthinking, and for immediate gain have gotten without "bonis" does not make it right for government to violate its duties and by an injustice destroy the rights, personal or human if there is a difference, of any class or per cent of its citizenship. Government to be just must protect all citizens; if it undertakes to exploit any class of citizens then it ceases to be government and becomes tyranny. If injustice is evoked for the purposes of the weak then the weak have no protection- the next time it may be turned around.

He asks "do we form a more perfect union by permitting policies that make the rich richer and the poor poorer"? This is to insinuate that it is being done, if so then it should be corrected, but correct in justice, not in injustice. Do we reflect credit upon ourselves in government by taking away from one class and giving to another? If corporations are to blame and exploit the people why not go to the base of the trouble and prevent corporations? They are but creatures of the law. Prevent incorporations and you strike the grievance down.

Then he complains about the times, about the poverty and the losing of homes and farms and property. Honor bright? Was such a condition brought about by the many or by the few? Were not those who lost on the stock market trying to get something without working for it? By directly taking something away from some other by indirection? Brains and judgment cannot be supplied by government of any form; that is something personal to themselves. All that government can do is to afford equal opportunities to all. This is done by our form, of course it cannot pick out a job for each one who is unable to think for himself.

"Do we establish justice when men who have labored all their lives creating wealth for others are thrown out on society to starve or steal?" Their opportunities were equal under the law. Shall we take from those who made good on their opportunities and give to those who refused to do so. Is improvidence to be rewarded at the expense of the industrious and the thrifty?

He says that the mistakes that have been made were for the benefit of humanity and good has been accomplished. Has good been accomplished or have we been simply thinking upon the surface with no care or thought for the future? Is it good to absorb all the assets of government to care for the improvident of the present generation and leave the unborn generations without resources and with a greater problem on their hands than we have on ours because of the encouragement we have given to thriftlessness? Is it good to burden the unborn with bonded indebtedness to care for the present fancied need?

The trouble with our would be statesmen is: they would surrender the stability and security of the future to a present immediate fancied need. They, for a fancied need of the present, would surrender our children's liberty and freedom. They will not come out direct and attack those provisions that have to do with personal freedom, but they will by either thoughtlessness or design, circumvent the provisions that afford protection and security. Necessity has been recognized as the mother of invention, by our present day conduct we are fast making an orphan of invention. At least in the minds of the weak.

He says: "You shout, Save the Constitution!"

"He say: Save human beings from the wretchedness of poverty." Would he do this at the expense of liberty and freedom? Does he mean, he certainly hints, that he believes it to be best to surrender the constitution if that be necessary to feed the needy. Food for today will be small recompense to our children for the loss of their freedom and liberty. Yet he took an oath to uphold the constitution, not to feed people to get votes.

And above all, he forgets that all the things he hopes to do to prevent the evils he complains of is within the power and authority of each and every state of the Union. That is where the fathers lodged it, because they had fought for local self government. The central government was set up to deal FOR the states with foreign powers and to regulate commerce between the states. All within the several states belongs to the sovereign power of that state. So said Jefferson at the time the central government was formed and it was never denied by any one. When we surrender powers to the central government we must give them up for ourselves and of our states. Local self government must be retained.

But hell, what is the use. The speech was so full of shoddy sophistry and buncheon that it riled me up. Having now gotten it off my system I feel better. I take you for a convenient "stooge" to vent my spleen upon. This not for publication or anything else. When and if you have read, throw it in the waste basket and forget it. I feel better.

Come down some time and see me.,

Respectfully.,

C. Guy Cutlip