

Economical Security is dependent upon the individual. Man seems to be the only one of Nature's creatures that strives for ease and security. The very nature of the desire makes for imposition of one upon the other. Our people have gotten to a place where it seems evident that they do not care to provide security for themselves but elect to depend upon a security furnished by some other person or agency. Civilization just cannot progress or maintain its present standard with such a notion among people. We wonder how it has come about that the descendants of the hardy, resourceful pioneers of this nation have come to such a stage. But the policy of the home, the policy of the mass mind is directly accountable.

It is natural for children (and for men and women) to play, it is unnatural for them to work. Work is a moral quality born of patience and restraint. It is one of the necessary steps toward civilization. No great undertaking, no great discovery nor any great man was ever accomplished or produced except upon hardship and toil. Hardship and toil are strength builders, character builders. Yet the American home (and now all agencies of government) are using every effort to protect the children of this country from either hardship or toil. What is the result-- what is the very necessary result? Weakness. Softening of the moral and mental fibers of our children's makeup. Around the American home is thrown every encouragement that impresses children with a desire for ease and soft living. With a desire for "show" and "pretention". The substantial affairs of a human life are neglected. Every member of society will rally to the call for additional play grounds for the children but not a home in the country think of providing work for its children. Every effort is put forth to shield the children from such a practice. The result is a natural distaste for work and labor. A weakened and softened physical and mental makeup that unfits our children for their necessary fight for substance and security. Through the home influence our children are fitted for a reliance upon government or charity in some form. The home turns loose upon society a bunch of crybabies that will turn toward anything that will protect them from work and strife to become self secure. We have heard our farmers saying for a quarter of a century " I dont want my boy to have to work like I did". That sentiment is in every home at every fireside. Yet nothing worth while, no character of any consequence, was ever developed except upon hard work.

When Spain acquired the great wealth of the Aztecs and the Peruvians it was one of the great nations of the world. The wealth gave it ease and made it soft. The great nation dwindled down to a fourth rate nation, and today it is spilling blood in payment of a foolish life of ease and comfort, yesterday.

Our mental and moral health demands a given amount of hardship and toil, of those "natural shocks" that flesh is heir to, of anxiety and trouble. That represents the same thing to the mental makeup that rough food does for the body. It is necessary for a strong body. We are all striving for amusement, for ease and for soft living, yet, the very consummation of that desire means degradation. The poverty threatened home lives in peace and contentment with its mutual responsibilities, but let money and easy living and surplus time come to it and discord and turmoil is the result. I see it every day in the court room.

The average home is a breeding place for nonentities and it isent the children's fault, it is their misfortune. The parents should seek in the very early years of a child that self sufficiency, that annurement to hardship and toil, that it was born into this world for. But the very reverse is true, the child is shielded from every problem, is taught to play and not to work, and guarded and petted and then turned into the business of life totally unfitted for self preservation.

We are constructing a "cross" for the nation to bear and forming a "crown of thorns" for our children to wear.

What do the most people that you know want to get out of life? Ease, comfort, safety and pleasure. Are they willing to make the sacrifice that will insure those things? Not one out of a hundred. Are they willing to work and save and cut expenses and practice self denial to get those things? Not on your life. Are they being taught the necessary methods to pursue in order to accomplish their heart's desire? Not at all, but the very reverse. What they want is for some kindly Providence to deliver it into their hands without an effort on their part.

Most of us look upon danger and anxiety as disaster. But it is not. It is the promptings of the inner man toward safety. Take the young fellow who feels secure in his new found job; he spends all his income, happy in that security, and makes no preparation for the future. But on the other hand if he be threatened with the loss of the job at any time he begins to save so that he will have a few dollars on hand when he loses that job. Now if he can do so under the urging of danger he could also do so in security. The danger, then, becomes a safeguard to him.

What is the matter with our citizenship is that they have no anxiety for the future, see no danger signals ahead. Or if they do they are so filled with present day living that they ignore the signals, willing to take a chance not realizing that all chances are against them. Then they go into old age helpless and dependent- placing the blame of course, not upon themselves where it belongs, but upon conditions, their health, the government, the grasping, greedy competition or what not. They refuse to prepare for the rainy day while the sun shines and cry for assistance and old age pensions. Or on the other hand in the heyday of their prime they spend all their substance upon the petting and coddling of their children, protecting them against work or the soiling of their hands, and go into old age penniless and a pauper. And those children so raised are unwilling, or unfitted because of the pampering, to return the accommodations. Through their selfishness they encouraged their children to play and not to work. Then everybody yells for government help.

The time to save is when you are making; it cannot be done when one is not making or producing. Why is it that people are unable to see that with the coming of age the earning power becomes lessened? Is it because they do not care? The trouble is we are all contending with each other in our pretensions. We just haven't got the manhood and womanhood to stand up to our better judgment. We don't want the Jones to have better clothing, or better cars or a better home than we have, even if we have to mortgage our future to contend with them. We are more interested in what the other fellows have than in what WE CAN AFFORD. The result is an invitation to disaster.


We cannot all be Fords or Edisons or Rockefellers but we can do things just as amazing within our scope. We can save a few dollars out of even a small salary if we are strong enough to defy pretention and practice self denial. Soon those few savings begin to count, we begin to feel independent; we can have things that in the past we denied ourselves, and have them without endangering our future. That is security, that is safety. Security and safety that we prepared ourselves.

We can be justly proud of that accomplishment; much prouder than we would be of a car purchased on time or fine clothes for the family that represents a new heart strain in the payment. **WHAT WE ARE REFUSING TO DO IN THIS COUNTRY IS TO ACT UPON JUDGMENT.** Our sentiments are predominating.

If we are going to have a "planned society", if we are going to tax the industrious to provide for the shiftless, then let us "plan" society with some thought to justice.

If some of the citizens are going to be taxed in order to provide sustenance for some others, then, in all justice, let us "plan" so that no family will be greater than two children to the home or one, perhaps, so that those who are going to work to keep up the extra family will know just about what his burden will be. Protect the "provider" by restricting the "beggar".

If we are going to have a "planned society" through the efficiency of very efficient "politicians" then let us prescribe just how many people are to be born into the nation each year; into each state and political subdivision, each year to the end that the nation will not become over populated. To the end that the soil will be sufficient for all the needs, to the end that the facilities that "government" is going to provide toward living conditions will not be destructive. If we are going to regulate and plan what one man's "charity" must be then in all good conscience let us plan just what his "budget" will be. Some thought should be given to that side of the question.



If we are going to improve upon God's arrangement; if we are going to repeal his admonition that "every man must eat by the sweat of his face" and "plan" the matter so that some will eat without sweating; then at least we should plan a small bit for the "sweater"; we should give him some consideration. Of course, it may be that such "planning" will throttle the progress of civilization and destroy ambition, that ambition which pushes us forward in each generation, but what do we care about the future? We are here today and cannot be bothered with the future, let it take care of itself. The fact that we are pushing bigger and better problems over on the future generations shouldn't be allowed to bother us, of today.

Russia has "planned" its society; Germany and Italy and Turkey are "planning" theirs. Surely we are wise enough to "plan" ours. Our leaders are as great as theirs. Of course a little thing like liberty or freedom for the individual must not be allowed to stand in the way. If we are going to plan this matter out of the "great thoughts" of our leaders then we should gladly surrender any claim we may NOW have upon liberty or a free government. What do we care about liberty if we are going to have our lives "planned?"

The leaders should plan it so that every family will have a sufficient number of acres of land; and then plan what the man and his family should raise; plan further what he is to get for the surplus above what he needs for himself and his work stock; plan out just where he shall sell it. Then his home should be planned for him, the citizen should be required to cudgel his brain about the color of wall paper, the size of rooms or location of the well. Then there should be planned for him just when he should have a child, and whether it should be a boy or a girl. Then, of course, the government should plan that child's life. It should, and probably would, be taken away from the parents and raised in a government institution so that its life may be properly "planned." Then the religion of the family should not be neglected, the government should look into the matter and decide just what Church is best adapted to the needs of that particular family and plan their attendance on it.

Now, this all may be classed as irony, but the fact remains that if we are going to "plan" society; if the government is going to provide social security to the people, then it should do it in a big way. There shouldn't be ANYTHING left to chance or the abilities of the individual.

If the "more abundant life" so much spoken of these days is to be provided by government, then it is doomed to failure. Were the people strictly in favor of such a procedure, which must be so if success is to follow, then each locality of this nation could provide such care for the indigent as it deems necessary and just. In the hands of such authorities there would be less likelihood of graft, overreaching and the maintenance of the unworthy.

Such things as "social legislation" could be provided by each locality, municipality, county and state. If the people were in favor of it, if it were not the hallucination of so-called leaders, such things would be provided by the political subdivisions of the various states or by the state, itself. There is sufficient power in the state, county and municipal governments to attend to this matter. Or if there is not, if there be some constitutional inhibition then the people, if in favor of such legislation, could very easily remove it in the several states.

The fact about the matter is: that the people, the great mass of people are not in favor such stupidity. The people, if left to their own choice, would never vote such measures. But the people are tricked into such things by glib tongues who deceive them into believing that some other locality will be the great contributor to the necessary funds. Some other class of citizenship will be forced to pay the bills. If every one realized that each one must in some manner contribute to such tactics with their earnings the people would never consent. But when a state, for instance, proposes measures that are "social" the average citizen does not think of his locality providing funds for such an emergency, but thinks in terms of the state at large. His selfish, his desire to shift burdens to the shoulders of others, influences him to vote for the measure. Why should Seminole county be forced to contribute to the subsistence of the indigent of Alfalfa county? Just because it has a larger population or for the time being is more wealthy? Why should New York be forced to contribute to the indigent of Oklahoma? Those are problems for each of the several states. If such things are to become practical and successful, then they must start at the fountain head, which is the local unit. If that local unit expects to shift its burden to some other local unit then it will never be successful. Sooner or later the people will revolt under such a scheme. The fact remains that the people ARE ONLY IN FAVOR of such things when they think they are shifting the burden to some one's else shoulders. When they eventually find they are carrying their part of the burden then will come the revolt.

The money expended in such measures is not the great item; the great item of it all is that the naturally shiftless will be encouraged in their practice. Their children will be imbued with the same thought. Being encouraged along such lines this class of citizenship will be more likely to propagate their kind to a greater extent than is now being done. They can then better afford to do so. Soon, as a natural result, society will become lopsided. No measures are advanced, no thought is given, to prevent such a condition. If such means are going to be applied to our citizenship, then we must adopt other means than we now have to prevent our ultimately becoming a nation of beggars, idiots and cripples. With our herds; cattle, sheep, hogs, horses etc., we would never think of such a practice. If we are going to regulate society, why not REGULATE it? Why bend all our means to the receiving or giving end and shamefully neglect the preservation of quality by making it easy to increase the quantity?

If society is going to be regulated it must be done as a whole and with thoughts to every side of the question. If we are going to encourage the birth of people who will be unable to provide sustenance for themselves, then we must take steps to regulate the birth rate in just as effective manner.

The moral laws came about because of the experience of different peoples. Such laws are evolved because of the different problems, needs and conditions of different peoples. They were evolved for the protection of the young and inexperienced rather than the matured individual who had ceased to "take chances."

If the youth of our land were shown the menace attached to moral follies upon their future well being they would keep such rules for their own protection. But youth must have reasons, good reasons, before they form a judgment. The bare statement of a fact or assumption, means nothing to them. Their lack of experience precludes the necessary imagination to understand the full import of the assertion. But, if the facts of the case were presented to them in an understanding manner, they would protect themselves. Just to state that to be "good" will bring happiness, means nothing to a boy or girl. The reasons why "good will bring happiness" will mean something to them.

If the boys and girls of this nation were informed that eight hundred men out of every thousand in the environs of New York city were afflicted with blood and venereal diseases; and that as a result ninety five per cent of the major operations upon women was the result and that the children born in those homes were sixty three percent afflicted and in some way crooked; and that of the ninety five percent of operations sixty five percent resulted in death; then those children would understand the necessity of the moral code. And when it is further understood that the demand for remedial medicines for such afflictions is made upon the druggist in more than ninety percent of the cases, by those of our kind in the early twenties, it would be further enlightening to the youth. They would understand such a statement, they could follow out the reasons for self restraint and self denial. THEY WOULD PROTECT themselves.

Youth takes chances, it is the nature of the young. With maturity such tendencies are narrowed down to a slight minimum. So we conclude the morals and its code are for the benefit of the young; it is our duty as matured people to set a good example for their guidance.

Of course that portion of the code that has to do with truth and honesty may be more difficult of explanation. It is hard to explain, except by example and continual preaching, the meaning of the terms "it is easiest to speak the truth because no further explanation is required" and is difficult to explain to the child that to be truthful and deal fairly requires no excuses to be made. By precept and example are these things impressed. But those of mature years and ripened experience understand and for the good of the child every opportunity should be taken to impress the salient fact upon the young. How much sorrow and grief; how much anxiety, that undermines health, might be averted if these precepts were diligently inculcated into our race.

It is better to reach such understanding through reason than by fear. If fear were available as a deterrent to a breach of the code, then legislation might be applied more forcefully to the conformity. But legislation cannot shape the morals, that is a matter of education. From the home, and the school, the church and society must come such teachings.

If all could be taught to live by the Golden Rule and do unto others as they would be delt by, then what a happy and restful place to live this old world would be. There would be no need of expensive governments, no cause for wars; no courts, no taxes, no prisons and no hangman's gallows. The nation would be great beyond all expectations. Contentment and peace would be the heritage of every child.