

# The Point of View

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

As the prohibition serial progresses, new developments occur which call for a review of the facts. Mr. Wick-ersham is reported to have criticized the neglect of education and the reliance on force and penalties to enforce prohibition. This is a just and timely reflection. Again, he is reported to have disclaimed a purpose to consider the merits of prohibition, believing that the committee appointed by President Hoover, of which he is chairman, was confined to the consideration of the most effective way to enforce the Eighteenth Amendment.

Why not consider the merits of prohibition? If the committee is restricted by the order of appointment, why should not the President extend the authority of the committee to go into the merits of prohibition? Does not the President entertain beliefs on the merits of prohibition? If not, why not? Has the success of prohibition been so pronounced as to exclude the discussion of its merits? On this point a brief review of the facts is relevant.

Prohibition has not succeeded in stopping the use of alcoholic drinks. Is this not a fact? It has not kept its promise to empty the jails and prisons. They are full now to overflowing and the dockets of the Federal courts are loaded with cases charged with violation of the Volstead Act. Are not these facts? Not only are these facts, but Congress has been asked by the Attorney General to appropriate seven million dollars to build more prisons. Is the future so bright for success of the Eighteenth Amendment that discussion of its merits is useless? There is not a man or woman of ordinary intelligence in all this country who does not know that these statements are literally true.

Facts of the highest importance may be related away beyond the limits of this paper. A few of them only can be given at one time.

The suddenness of the change demanded by the Eighteenth Amendment would alone explain its failure to make good its promises. The people of this country had indulged the love of a stimulant and had been accustomed to its use from colonial days. Its use had not been terminated by State prohibition nor by local option. Personal habits are not changed by sumptuary laws. Suddenly the legal supply of liquor was cut off. The Congress should have known the consequences sure to follow any such attempt. The legislation following the Eighteenth Amendment did not destroy the desire for an alcoholic stimulant, so widely distributed over the civilized world and indulged in from remotest periods of history. The Congress had precedents to guide it in any sensible legislation to help the cause of temperance. In Grant's term the Congress was confronted with extensive frauds on the public revenue from the \$2 tax per gallon of whisky. Bear this in mind—the possible profit of \$2 per gallon had practically filled the hilly regions of several States with moonshine distilleries and had tempted officials into frauds in the conduct of legal distilleries. The Congress could have ordered the appointment of an army of United States marshals to enforce the collection of the \$2 tax and have filled the jails and prisons with the sturdy mountaineers tempted by the tax to add to their meager enjoyments. What did the Congress do? Reduced the tax to 50 cents and took the profit out of moonshining. Even this did not wholly stop moonshining, but reduced the use of illicit whisky to permit the collection of the revenue.

The English Parliament had reduced the tax on whisky to protect the revenue. Why did our Congress enact w

ass" will attend to their own local business. Restore orderly government to displace the present saturnalia of vice and crime. Squelch the boot-legger, speakeasy and spy. Bring peace to the land and try mercy for cruelty. Reduce taxes by reimposing the proper tax on distilled spirits. Above all, get rid of the corruption fund and prepare the way for the return of peace, contentment and of justice and morality. Then forget that such folly was ever attempted in the land of the free and the home of the brave. J. M. ATHERTON, Louisville.

## THE PROHIBITION

To the

por

ber

tio

the

is

be

co

in

pr

cu

m

pr

fo

in

ca

T

p

g

f

r

a

f

t

t

i

c

r

c

t

c

k

v

h

u

le

b

st

et

an

ju

sa

cc

vc

nc

of

di

Cr

se

in

th

If

lo

w

"

la

yc

ki

th

sc

ea

de

w

pl

fo

lk

or

th

in

in

ag

ar

w

pi

th

re

w

w

w

w

w

w

w

w

w

w

w

w

w

such attempt. The legislation following the Eighteenth Amendment did not destroy the desire for an alcoholic stimulant, so widely distributed over the civilized world and indulged in from remotest periods of history. The Congress had precedents to guide it in any sensible legislation to help the cause of temperance. In Grant's term the Congress was confronted with extensive frauds on the public revenue from the \$2 tax per gallon of whisky. Bear this in mind—the possible profit of \$2 per gallon had practically filled the hilly regions of several States with moonshine distilleries and had tempted officials into frauds in the conduct of legal distilleries. The Congress could have ordered the appointment of an army of United States marshals to enforce the collection of the \$2 tax and have filled the jails and prisons with the sturdy mountaineers tempted by the tax to add to their meager enjoyments. What did the Congress do? Reduced the tax to 50 cents and took the profit out of moonshining. Even this did not wholly stop moonshining, but reduced the use of illicit whisky to permit the collection of the revenue.

The English Parliament had reduced the tax on whisky to protect the revenue. Why did our Congress enact legislation which they must have known would create indirectly, but surely, a profit of \$25 to \$30 per gallon on every gallon of whisky sold to an educated clientele in violation of the law? What power forced this legislation? It is true the Eighteenth Amendment had been ratified and made a part of our Constitution. Should this fact have convinced the Congress that they could drive the descendants of the Anglo-Saxon into servile obedience to an obnoxious law? Lurking unfortunately in the public mind is the idea that it is fair to beat the Government. In taxes and in customs and in all relations of life this idea exists and when possible is acted on. Congress had no good reason to believe that idea would be suppressed by the Volstead Act.

Somewhere and somehow there came into this country a star chamber—masquerading in the name of religion and proclaiming a new article of religious faith—the use of alcohol in any form was a sin. Respect for the minister and the desire to preserve harmony in the church and the fear of criticism, or the loss of business and the confidence of millions of voters in the promises of the leaders, presented an array of power which scared the politicians into obedience. On the other hand, shrewd party leaders caught on to the political use to be made of the star chamber by a sympathetic alliance, and the country is today under the control of that alliance. Politicians using the preachers and the preachers playing politics—what a mess we are in!

Bait the trap and catch all who yield to the temptation; tempt the people with a gigantic corruption fund and pounce down on the victims; arraign them in court; inflict severe penalties; handcuff them and carry them off to prison; make felons of them, leaving their wives and children to suffer. Is this fair? Is it merciful? Is it merciful? And all done in the name of temperance and religion. Is it honest?

The gloomy pictures of the past are gross exaggerations, painted by signing artists to mislead the public mind. A quick survey of the country contradicts the impression these specimens of propaganda were intended to create. This country has grown from 3,000,000 to 100,000,000 of population in 150 years; it has been raised from poverty to wealth and power; it has displaced ignorance with education. Was this done by a drunken ancestry? Did the people who accomplished this carry a poison in their veins? Were they benumbed by a narcotic? A few were—only a few—never more than today.

If every man and woman will take a hasty review of life and recall the past in partial detail, each will have a fairly correct history of the past. I was born and reared amid distilleries, with whisky in almost every home, and I cannot count over a half-dozen drunkards in my neighborhood. The people were sober and industrious. It may surprise the zealous prohibitionists to know we had churches and schools and camp meetings where the Bible was read and the old ship of Zion was sung by a Christian people.

Now for the remedy—repeal the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. Restore the rights of the States so the "sons of the wild jack-

Historical Society



# The Point of View

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## THE PEOPLE'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE INCREASE OF CRIMES.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

Prohibition will be referred to in this paper as one of the causes of unrest and discontent so prevalent in this country but this is not a contribution to the prohibition serial.

Why so much lawlessness in the United States? Many causes conspire. Is there a basic cause? What percentage of crime is malum per se and what percentage is malum prohibitum?

In the administration of law, crime is an act which renders the doer liable to punishment. How far is the public responsible for the number of criminals? Is an act which is not prompted by criminal intent a crime?

Criminals may be divided into two classes—the real and the artificial. In the real, there is a criminal intent. In this class, there is at this time an increase in this country. The causes which contribute to real crimes are numerous—too numerous for detailed examination in the Point of View. The inequality of natural endowments and the perversity of human nature are among the efficient causes. Society has never been without its criminal class and probably never will be.

How far is the public responsible for real crime by its constant addition to the class of artificial criminals—the expansion of the malum prohibitum list of crimes? Why this expansion? Every law which imposes a penalty for its violation adds to the criminal class. The increase of this class renders the administration of law more difficult and gives to real crime a harmful encouragement and a doubtful respectability.

Including in one class violations of law with criminal intent, violations without criminal intent are not conducive to the enforcement of law. Conviction in a court and confinement in a prison with the prison garb along with real criminals lowers self-respect and creates in the mind a feeling of resentment which is a step toward real crime. It is not possible to pass over prohibition as the leading factor in creating and enlarging the criminal class.

The high degree of punishment imposed for violation of the Volstead law and confinement in prison are proofs of the estimate the boni-homines place on drinking a cocktail or a mint julip. Here is an exaggerated conception of wrong. Here is an evidence of the existence in the prohibition mind of a strong dash of Puritanism. The course pursued by the Anti-Saloon League and the consulting politicians; by the Sampson-Miller incident; by the attitude generally of the rank and file of prohibitionists, tends strongly to corrupt the public sense of justice which is so essential in enforcement of law.

Repeal the Volstead law and release the so-called criminals convicted of its violation and the list of criminals will be immensely reduced. Widespread discontent over a law is invariably attended with violations of the law. Where rests the responsibility? The people are morally bound to obey. Admit it. There is a reciprocal obligation on the legislature and on the people and neither is excusable for ignoring this obligation. The people do not reach conclusions on the merits of a law by any conscious process of reasoning. Instinctively they approve or disapprove. They may dislike a law and obey it. If they disapprove they find in the law more than dislike and they are unable to reconcile disapproval and obedience. With the people those acts would be inconsistent.

Approve and obey—not disapprove and obey—is the natural course. Obedience gives support to a law which they disapprove and makes its repeal or modification more difficult. They do not act on this principle in the conduct of life. Violation cannot be justified, but is it criminal? Every Government must decide its action for itself. What course have Governments pursued in the face of

I a L O T R p fi p fe k I bo A al te tt al av so ci ar er ca wo he mi bu fat dic pag mi em pre and sity Ch enc the gui abc oth I ber of up me otl ba be ma ch W yo sh fe ba ar m T ir m p h i h d r tr u w fi b p c w sl p se al m sc w is a M of kn an ba gra me 7 "T Jo 14 bu ev of for tic gal of the cat left ter nat eit

is sity of human nature are among the efficient causes. Society has never been without its criminal class and probably never will be.

How far is the public responsible for real crime by its constant addition to the class of artificial criminals—the expansion of the malum prohibitum list of crimes? Why this expansion? Every law which imposes a penalty for its violation adds to the criminal class. The increase of this class renders the administration of law more difficult and gives to real crime a harmful encouragement and a doubtful respectability.

Including in one class violations of law with criminal intent, violations without criminal intent are not conducive to the enforcement of law. Conviction in a court and confinement in a prison with the prison garb along with real criminals lowers self-respect and creates in the mind a feeling of resentment which is a step toward real crime. It is not possible to pass over prohibition as the leading factor in creating and enlarging the criminal class.

The high degree of punishment imposed for violation of the Volstead law and confinement in prison are proofs of the estimate the bonifhomines place on drinking a cocktail or a mint julip. Here is an exaggerated conception of wrong. Here is an evidence of the existence in the prohibition mind of a strong dash of Puritanism. The course pursued by the Anti-Saloon League and the consulting politicians; by the Sampson-Miller incident; by the attitude generally of the rank and file of prohibitionists, tends strongly to corrupt the public sense of justice which is so essential in enforcement of law.

Repeal the Volstead law and release the so-called criminals convicted of its violation and the list of criminals will be immensely reduced. Widespread discontent over a law is invariably attended with violations of the law. Where rests the responsibility? The people are morally bound to obey. Admit it. There is a reciprocal obligation on the legislature and on the people and neither is excusable for ignoring this obligation. The people do not reach conclusions on the merits of a law by any conscious process of reasoning. Instinctively they approve or disapprove. They may dislike a law and obey it. If they disapprove they find in the law more than dislike and they are unable to reconcile disapproval and obedience. With the people those acts would be inconsistent.

Approve and obey—not disapprove and obey—is the natural course. Obedience gives support to a law which they disapprove and makes its repeal or modification more difficult. They do not act on this principle in the conduct of life. Violation cannot be justified, but is it criminal? Every Government must decide its action for itself. What course have Governments pursued in the face of extensive discontent? They have usually tried conciliation. Why no disposition to conciliate the discontent over prohibition? Here is a departure from the historical record, which cannot be explained on purely civic basis. The departure must come from the effort Puritanism is making to force its mandates on the people. Doubtless, the reform zeal in this instance coalesces foully with Puritanism. The times are not favorable for the success of any form of fanaticism. The people are thinking of expanding rights and enjoyments, and not of restrictions. The increase of wealth; the increase in the comforts of the average life and these co-ordinating with the spirit of our civilization predispose the people to object to the reintroduction of Medieval ideas. Their objection has been sustained by the immense addition to our criminal class which restriction has caused. A reign of terror has always been accompanied by increase of crime. It is so in this country and will be so as long as we continue to enlarge the list of wrongs and enact laws to punish fictitious crimes. Every law which carries a penalty for violation increases the criminal class. A sense of right and wrong presides in the conscience of mankind, and cannot be altered by legislative edicts. Every attempt to alter will increase and not decrease the criminal class.

Louisville. J. M. ATHERTON.



SEEKING FR

# The Point of View

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

Can the liquor traffic be controlled by the States? If the public mind was not entangled and confused on this one question the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment would be assured and hastened. The confusion will be cleared up if the public will apply the ordinary rules of common sense to its solution. In the first place, the declaration of the Anti-Saloon League that the traffic could not be controlled should not be accepted as a fact. It was not an independent and disinterested statement. The avowed purpose of this cabal of reformers was the abolition of the saloon, while the concealed purpose was prohibition. The ultimate aim was not to check the abuse but to prevent the use of drink in any form at any place and in any quantity. It is in the interest of temperance, sobriety and morality, regulation would be preferred by a vast majority of the people. Regulation would exclude the introduction of religion into the settlement of a social question, as it would carry the confession that temperate use was not a sin. Prohibition could not be made a politico-religious issue unless regulation was disposed of. Hence the attack on regulation as utterly impossible.

The saloons were the places where the consumer could buy a drink, and the admission that such places could be controlled was fatal to the purpose of this militant body of political agitators whose plan of operation looked to an appeal to religion to bring the ministry and the religious element into support of prohibition. These leaders knew the politicians would fall in line if a powerful body of voters could be given the appearance of a fixed public opinion. They knew also that public opinion would not approve the open alliance of politics and religion. The reformers were adroit politicians and relied on creating a sympathetic alliance to support prohibition to get rid of the saloon which they were compelled to condemn as beyond control.

As no honest effort to control the liquor traffic, and especially the saloons, was ever made in the United States, there can be no historical evidence to sustain a statement. The issue must, therefore, be decided by the application of the ordinary rules of political procedure, the primary rule of which places administration of law with the majority. Did the inebriates constitute a majority? Is it possible that Watterson's red noses and the disorderly characters could defy the officials, supported by a large majority of the substantial citizens? All saloons were not lawless, and every law-abiding saloon was opposed to the lawless saloons.

Here again is a palpable explanation of the failure to close lawless saloons—partisan politics in the days of crooked and corrupt politics. Votes, and not individual conduct, absorbed the attention of both political parties. A safe assumption is that public opinion will not again tolerate corrupt politics, and partisan politics must not be allowed to use the sale of liquors for political party purposes.

Control of the liquor traffic by the States proposes a policy of construction, while prohibition rests upon the policy of destruction. In his veto of the veteran relief bill, President Hoover uses the following language: "No government can proceed with intelligence that does not take into account the fiscal effects of its action." Did prohibition take into account the fiscal effects it produced? It destroyed the national revenue of several hundred millions from a moderate tax on liquors. It destroyed the local revenues where liquors were sold. The revenue from liquors was from voluntary action. The loss has been

the reduction to the col fare.

It seems situation question back to 5 of people than are the com a great duced fa having a

If Mr. for a w duced I citizens quickly his head in other Louis

To the

I hav think, we present through

It is th sociations panies a to finance payments who care core.

I believe ficial to all mediately ions of doll weekly and institutions.

The build banks, etc., receiving lar which at pre The home- ter position pay taxes at penses, and h from sacrifici partly paid for a direct bearin ers as they h values.

Louisville.

## SPENCER'S

To the Editor

Constant re about a genera tions are with

Spencer Cou to stand up in that, even thou sess a "soul," Standard Oil

And she stand in appreciation tions of the for less truck load the latter, with of the drouth-s section.

Taylorville, P

## A CHURCH'S

To the Editor of

I thank you ceived on Sund of those so mat present burdens certainly noble such papers to their influence took great pleat Haldeman Aven morning your gured that they ated by the ch glad indeed to your kind and lieve the situat Louisville.

## Manhat

Days

By WAL

New York, P

that Charles painter, found side his studio a solidly dress like neither an wasn't.

"Is your na

asked when M

he Ethiopian laka on of the Sudan. suspected Great not allow it to s the stretch of ard its rights it erican company, present has only ng toward actual

every is practiced s a basis for pro- ced labor is the exception in the the pretext for vious object is to an Government development and territory from ay of an outside

e State Depart- of Nations will on the use of that an Amer- reputation in o sustain has t for the work ee against hu- guarantees also iopia.

## AUSTRIA

disarming the n may be re- ve on the eve general elec- may also be ashadowing a ould the vote Austrian Hit-

which suc- dustry in Sep- gh lacking a is holding ons, contains one of whom, is command- scist military wehr. In a Stahrenberg and his party ent as a step- the Fascists ce, if neces-

disarmament ce of Fascist at's author- e Left Wing llowing the ain its arms ation. The sts' militia, to be; the ected.

Rome may march on was con- he Socialist and waiting n, Johann for any escapes a t intimidat- it will not s.

s, President mouthpiece c. Defeated e pulls him- s to inform ping victory Hoover Ad- nse a revolt nistration. way of ex- attributes it as the re- on and the ts." But if nst business ice of farm it, however



Rome may march on was con- ne Socialist and waiting n, Johann for any escapes a t intima- , it will not s. s, President mouthpiece c. Defeated e pulls him- s to inform ping victory Hoover Ad- nse a revolt nistration. way of ex- attributes it e as the re- on and the ts." But if nst business ice of farm lt, however r Adminis- t was not a r Adminis- against the Administra- = and the Re- ttee's Bob breach and ysmic rout y was not ndication." r's friend, etter. Mr. result was over Ad- has dis- a vindica- nominates ether and n compe- the morn- or smoke, coaches, a e may be nistakably ng on the nts often io. Wild us dinner ave to be bbit. e end of Cooper is tradition ars Ohio can Gov- and three of whom of them ect White with him e denied ne Presi- his work ing Day ight fol- Jefferson, the sepa- that he g procla- knocked Commit- esn't ap- aim. He key who. ezzar the moaned, ne? me? er, every- f he is so

inebriates constitute a majority? Is it possible that Watterson's red noses and the disorderly characters could defy the officials, supported by a large majority of the substantial citizens? All saloons were not lawless, and every law-abiding saloon was opposed to the lawless saloons. Here again is a palpable explanation of the failure to close lawless saloons—partisan politics in the days of crooked and corrupt politics. Votes, and not individual conduct, absorbed the attention of both political parties. A safe assumption is that public opinion will not again tolerate corrupt politics, and partisan politics must not be allowed to use the sale of liquors for political party purposes. Control of the liquor traffic by the States proposes a policy of construction, while prohibition rests upon the policy of destruction. In his veto of the veteran relief bill, President Hoover uses the following language: "No government can proceed with intelligence that does not take into account the fiscal effects of its action." Did prohibition take into account the fiscal effects it produced? It destroyed the national revenue of several hundred millions from a moderate tax on liquors. It destroyed the local revenues where liquors were sold. The revenue from liquors was from voluntary action. The loss has been made up by compulsory taxes on other industries. In fifty years or less the national revenue from liquors would pay the public debt without the collection of a dollar by compulsory taxation. On the other hand, millions upon millions of compulsory taxes have been used to defray the costs of prohibition. This cost has been made up to a large extent by fines on citizens for misdemeanors, leaving women and children to suffer and furnishing irrefutable evidence of the extent of violations of law under prohibition. On the material side, the destruction has been complete. The gains in the spiritual and economic side, if any, will not compensate, as Dr. Hibben says, for the loss of moral fiber resulting in evasions and violations of law. These losses are chargeable to prohibition, which offers no compensation beyond the promise to enforce the law in future, with a continuation of its destructive policies and without regard to the fiscal effects of its action. The army of Federal police must be supported for all time and be a perpetual drain on the national treasury, while the bootlegger and speakeasy and spy will fatten on the corruption fund the law has established. If prohibition of liquor succeeds, will its leaders be content to cease the work of destruction? Does fanaticism perish by success? Never, and the religious ingredient will attack many forms of amusement, which the people now enjoy. The Puritan hates pleasure, which, in his eye, is as sinful as liquors in the eye of the Anti-Saloon League. A satisfactory plan for the sale of liquor must be provided, for the legal sale alone will stop the illegal sale. The corruption fund must be abolished if a reign of law is to follow the existing reign of vice and crime. The name of the place of sale is immaterial. And equally so is the plan, as the sale under any satisfactory plan can and will be controlled. Experience will quickly point out the best plan. The abatement of the rising passions of the people will be a gain of transcendent value to the future of the republic. The restoration of the rights of the States will relieve the Federal Government of functions it can never discharge and will leave it free to consider problems of national interest. Universal peace among nations will not bring happiness to this country if its domestic policies continue to array neighbor against neighbor and to excite passions of the people. I propose to submit a plan for control of the liquor traffic, but will precede its submission by a few general observations. Louisville. J. M. ATHERTON.

**FIVE-CENT FARES.**

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal. Our excellent friend, Allen Carter, takes advantage of the wonderful medium of The Courier-Journal to give information to the public about the Louisville Railway Company, which is all very interesting. I am wondering if Mr. Carter has read in the papers of the reduction in street car rates to 5 cents by the three lines in Pittsburgh, and also if he has read where at least six lines in New Jersey have reduced the fare from 10 cents to 5 cents, feeling that

To the Editor of I thank you received on Sunday of those so mat present burdens, certainly noble such papers to their influence, took great pleas Haldeman Aven morning your gured that they ated by the ch glad indeed to your kind and lieve the situati Louisville.

**Manhattan Days**  
By WALT

New York, that Charles painter, found side his studio a solidly dress like neither an wasn't.

"Is your name asked when M identity: "Did Hotel in 1900

Mr. Falls t Yes, 1900 was to New York, the Mills Hotel asked why th

"Because," lent me \$3, a it back, with

Twenty-seve Mr. Falls did and he didn't

"If I lent y "I must have didn't have n pretty hard-k want any inte

"Well," said it to me and good advice."

"My heavens "Was I giving

"It was good "I wish I'd ta

When you kn the banner—a a handle on i around doing j ly I got a job park. Then, on ticle in a maga ever you were better learn t chances were t doing the rest

"That made years old and going to stay in get nearer the money and fi the concessions pretty well and I own the conc big parks. One good many tho I never forgot first I didn't later I was terr to mail it. I and give it to y illustrations in that you didn't always meant t it is. If you e amusement pa one of those cessions for re

During the in Wall Stree of a small b York who ne friends were e hesitated to went on for he couldn't took a cert concern one minded, and

"Will you amount," na the usual n told him of

About thi dropped ou many, the tated: cons market kep heart, he w brokers. It an honest n the worst. I who looked t was. They h instead of w sold the stock of money, but ing.

be interesting to  
such men as Whiteford Cole, Presi-  
dent Downs or General Atterbury,  
who no doubt have given the subject  
the serious thought it merits. B. A.  
Louisville.

#### THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

In reply to the "Prohibition Serial"  
from Dr. Peyton Ligon on the first of  
July, I ask him why he garbled a  
quotation from my serial of June 15?

I give the correct words of my  
serial: "I was born and reared amid  
distilleries, with whisky in almost  
every home and I cannot count over  
a half-dozen drunkards in my neigh-  
borhood. The people were sober and  
industrious."

The Doctor omits the words "and  
I cannot count over a half-dozen  
drunkards in my neighborhood. The  
people were sober and industrious."

Why this omission? Is not my mean-  
ing obvious? Here were the most  
favorable conditions for developing  
drunkenness — numerous distilleries  
and whisky in almost every home, but  
there were very few drunkards. The  
people were, under these conditions,  
sober and industrious. I am not re-  
sponsible for the inability of the  
Doctor to catch my meaning. The  
Doctor then adds "If I get the mean-  
ing that Mr. Atherton intends to  
carry, he means to tell the readers of  
this column that plenty of whisky in  
every home is an aid to displace pov-  
erty with wealth and power . . ."

Thousands will probably read this  
serial who did not read my serial of  
June 15, and may be misled by the  
garbled quotation in the Doctor's se-  
rial. Comment is useless. The in-  
ference the Doctor pretends to draw  
and the thought he ascribes to me  
are inconsistent with the M. D. he  
adds to his signature.

Under these circumstances discus-  
sion is useless. J. M. ATHERTON.  
Louisville.

Historical Society



11 Dec. 1930

# THE COURIER-JOURNAL, LOUISVILLE, THURSDAY

politicians. His special appeal to the young men and young women of England may rally to him a number of new voters. The Fascist idea in England may be taken up by the new generation as it was in Germany.

It is the optimism of youth, however, to expect that the young Socialists with twenty followers in the House of Commons can become a formidable force to oppose the Laborites on the one hand or the Conservatives on the other. The most he can accomplish is to weaken the hold that Ramsay MacDonald now has on the trade unionist party, and even this is hardly likely.

The Moseley schism, like the Esherbrook-Rothermere split in the Labour party, is conspicuous and audacious, but it will hardly affect the election results whenever the elections are to be held.

## BILBO IN EFFIGY

Hanging must have been too good for the effigy of Governor Bilbo, in the opinion of University of Mississippi students, who hoisted a pair of pajamas, stuffed with cotton and labeled "Governor Bilbo," and burned them on the campus.

This demonstration might have been used for an exhibition of youthful energy but for the action taken by the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of Southern States a few days ago. That body suspended from membership every public educational institution in the State—the University, the Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College, Mississippi State College for Women and Mississippi State Teachers College.

This was the answer of Southern educators to the autocratic conduct of Governor Bilbo in regard to their faculties. He is charged with having compiled a "blacklist" of officers and instructors who had incurred his displeasure and filled their places with his favorites. Complaint was made at Washington with a view to having Federal co-operative funds withdrawn from Mississippi colleges until the merit system was restored.

If the feeling expressed by the student body at "Ole Miss" should find a sympathetic response among the alumni the seed of public sentiment hostile to the Governor's interference would be widely scattered over the State. It is not probable that the Southern Association acted without provocation or without proof.

The optimistic statement of Col. Leonard P. Ayres, the Cleveland financier, on the business outlook should help to dispel the mental fog in which so many have been groping. Most observers agree that the business low-water mark was reached some time ago and that the tendency from now on must be upward, but sometimes it takes public voicing of an obvious fact by an acknowledged authority to give impetus to a movement already begun.

To the perceptions of the average individual the depression dates from the stock market crash a year ago; but Secretary Mellon says it started in June, last year, when the record peak of industrial production slumped off sharply, and, he adds, significantly, stocks began to pass from "strong hands" to "weak." That is shrewd investors sold out their holdings to speculators. They may be buying them back from speculators now.

One of the powerful influences

## The Point

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

### THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal. May I use Point of View to remind the editorial staff of your sprightly satellite, The Louisville Times, that circumstances alter cases? In an editorial Saturday, the sixth, The Times said that "industrial alcohol was poisoned before prohibition," leaving ample room for the inference that it is justifiable now if it was done then. Before prohibition the country had a supply of pure liquor, including pure whisky, and the use of alcohol as a beverage was very limited. No deaths from poisoned alcohol or certainly very few occurred: now deaths from this cause are quite common. This practice could not be commended before prohibition. The explanation of this practice, before prohibition, is that users of alcohol poisoned it to prevent their own workmen from drinking it. It was a factory act, now authorized by our great Government and our Congress. It was cruel then; it is simply inhuman now and exposes the extremities to which a great Government can be made to resort to by impracticable reformers.

This is a good time to correct another claim of the dry leader—that the consumption of liquor has fallen off under prohibition. If it has, it has occurred among the temperate and sober masses who did not drink to excess and who use less now because they do not choose to risk the use of the stuff with which the market is now supplied. The consumption has not fallen off among the young people nor among the intemperates. This is known to be a fact ignored by dry leaders.

The superiority of the women speakers over the men is generally acknowledged and "Humiliated Male" in Point of View is indorsed by public opinion. Why such feeble defense of the Eighteenth Amendment by such eminent speakers? They dare not publicly avow the controlling motives and purposes of the would-be Richelieus and Talleyrands of American politics. These male speakers dare not attempt to defend the mutilation of the Constitution: the abuse of the respect and reverence paid to that immortal paper; the attack made by this mutilation on the rights of the States and on the inalienable rights of the citizens of the States. These male Goliaths consumed the allotted time in denouncing the evils of intemperance, which nobody disputes; in holding up an exaggerated picture of these evils, for which rotten politics was responsible; in slyly and by innuendo comparing the temperate use of liquor to the most heinous crimes—murder, rape, incest and prostitution. The laws imposing penalties for these crimes were restrictions on personal liberty and justified prohibition; the three women, Mrs. Sabin, Mrs. Nicoll and Mrs. Miller, were not embarrassed by the want of known facts. They spoke from deep conviction, and not from under cover of concealed purposes. They condemned the methods of the dry leaders as intemperate and intolerant. They condemned the use of religious convictions by designing preachers and selfish politicians to fasten on this country an impossible public policy. Why was legislation written into the Eighteenth Amendment? Why did not the authors of that amendment confer on Congress the right to prohibit, or control the liquor traffic? Congress could repeal or alter and amend the law on change of public opinion. The new article of faith—the use of alcohol is a sin—must be put beyond the power of the people to repeal or alter. The power must be conferred on thirteen

find that issue for Federal Springs which is ever since for roads this one ments, and another

Surely st. State of D time that this comm Caesar's." th Louisville.

### DARK TOB

To the Editor To the Bank Western K The mark is a keen d farmers and in the farme 5 cents per jected tobacco would probab pound.

There is no question of w Western Ken The questi "What are w same"

We have a with a large our Governm stabilizing the The Governm millions of dol We who prices of tot of producing 7 1/2 cents p

This is a make. That called at Pad an organization Board to com the way of loo porations at le cost of product I cannot bel sure of the to face their coun this low price ing down of cr country and t ing all that t like it is safe unless the price Most of the a Government ues on grades cut.

Kuttawa, Ky.

To the Editor I will certa much if yo lines, as wh tact with t a different v tion. I must of other wo mouth for my spirit w much pess my bit to l

Today I fice to pay the count with a sig vantage o myself. A for home on the here is w say:

No one w means a jo "Buy now get a job. "Buy now dends.

Boost emp your home. h "Buy now." prices since 15 Employment now," it will help

I know if every these sayings it ce "Goodby Hard Time Of course, I know of poor fellows with their pockets, but on there are still thousa working almost every to spend their mone something may hap Well Mr Worker stu



Leonard P. Ayres, the Cleveland financier, on the business outlook should help to dispel the mental fog in which so many have been groping. Most observers agree that the business low-water mark was reached some time ago and that the tendency from now on must be upward, but sometimes it takes public voicing of an obvious fact by an acknowledged authority to give impetus to a movement already begun.

To the perceptions of the average individual the depression dates from the stock market crash a year ago; but Secretary Mellon says it started in June, last year, when the record peak of industrial production slumped off sharply, and, he adds, significantly, stocks began to pass from "strong hands" to "weak." That is shrewd investors sold out their holdings to speculators. They may be buying them back from speculators now.

One of the powerful influences against the much amended bus regulation bill in Congress was the Pennsylvania Railroad, which owns 50 per cent of the Greyhound Corporation, operators of busses over 7,000 miles of territory. The bill set out to subject busses to the same regulation as railroads, but wound up by forbidding railroads to own or operate bus lines. Under regulation, such prohibition is superfluous.

London has been trying out a new safety device on automobile bumpers, consisting of a motor-operated, revolving cylinder of wooden slats, which lowers automatically upon contact with an object and pushes it ahead until the car can be stopped. Presumably it rolls the pedestrian over gently and paddles him. That really is severe enough for the first offense, anyway.

The Chicago Chamber of Commerce announces that banks and large business houses refuse to have anything to do with Mayor Thompson's million-dollar raffle to promote prosperity. Small, unorganized retailers are buying the tickets, because they have "no means of protecting themselves." This has all the earmarks of a "prosperity racket."

Governor Sampson denounces, as of December 9, dynamiting outrages which have been going on since July in the West Kentucky mining fields. Can't keep such things a secret from our Governor forever.

Henderson County has abolished the foolish bounty of 15 cents for each crow head brought to the Fiscal Court. Wonder if crow bounties were ever profitable to anybody but powder companies.

Wilbur Glenn Voliva probably thought it was now or never when he started on his world tour to prove his pet theory. The world is as flat now as it is ever going to be.

Some of the Senators don't seem to have "a sweet tooth." Sugar coating doesn't make a candidate for the Tariff Commission any more palatable to them.

No doubt President Hoover regards the "lame duck" Congress as the liveliest body with its kicks he has ever encountered.

For a "lame duck" session, this Congress certainly can run through the taxpayers' money.

Why do Christmas bills and city taxes have to come at the same time?

allotted time in denouncing the evils of intemperance, which nobody disputes; in holding up an exaggerated picture of these evils, for which rotten politics was responsible; in slyly and by innuendo comparing the temperate use of liquor to the most heinous crimes—murder, rape, incest and prostitution. The laws imposing penalties for these crimes were restrictions on personal liberty and justified prohibition; the three women, Mrs. Sabin, Mrs. Nicoll and Mrs. Miller, were not embarrassed by the want of known facts. They spoke from deep conviction, and not from under cover of concealed purposes. They condemned the methods of the dry leaders as intemperate and intolerant. They condemned the use of religious convictions by designing preachers and selfish politicians to fasten on this country an impossible public policy. Why was legislation written into the Eighteenth Amendment? Why did not the authors of that amendment confer on Congress the right to prohibit, or control the liquor traffic? Congress could repeal or alter and amend the law on change of public opinion. The new article of faith—the use of alcohol is a sin—must be put beyond the power of the people to repeal or alter. The power must be conferred on thirteen agricultural States to control the domestic policy of thirty-five States. The amendment must forever defy the will of the majority—the tail must wag the dog. Is this American democracy? No, it is the work of shrewd politicians and ambitious preachers. To undo the terrible wrong inflicted on this country by the repeal of this amendment is the purpose of the earnest women who spoke from the heart in contrast with the silly twaddle of the eminent men.

The cry of wet, of whisky, to silence the courageous women has lost its force. They intend to carry on until the destructive amendment is repealed. The legal sale of liquor alone can stop the illegal sale. Country life and city life cannot be shaped in the same mould. The States, with the aid of their political subdivisions, can control the liquor traffic and can protect the youth of our State from the illegal traffic.

If the Eighteenth Amendment was repealed today Congress could restore to the Federal Treasury \$400,000,000 now going to Capone, Moran, etc. A deficit would not exist and increased taxes would not be laid on the people, now heavily burdened by taxes. The country is struggling with unemployment and business depression, and both are intensified by prohibition, and both would be materially relieved by repeal of the destructive amendment.

Puritanism is not good for business. J. M. ATHERTON.

Louisville.

#### CHURCH AND LABOR FORUM.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

The church and labor forum has affiliated with Louisville and Jefferson County Taxpayers' League and will hold monthly meetings to discuss some issue of public interest.

Such prominent speakers as the Hon. Burton K. Wheeler will speak here at the adjournment of Congress. Laurence B. Finn, attorney of Bowling Green, Ky., has accepted a date in January and will speak on the "Cause of Panics."

Next Sunday's forum subject, at 3 p.m., at the Central Y. M. C. A. will be "Ideal City Governments." Mr. Edward J. Miller, president, Louisville Water Company, has accepted an invitation to speak upon the water company and its value to the public.

Rev. Lloyd W. Benedict will preside as chairman.

J. L. STARK, Secretary, Louisville. Taxpayers' League.

#### BAD ROADS.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

I had occasion a few days ago to take a trip to the Big Spring Valley in Meade County. I know Meade County well, and the land in this valley is of the finest in the county, yet the roads over which I traveled in a Ford car were a disgrace to a civilized community.

The vast amount of stock, tobacco and merchandise that is transported over this impassable road is tremendous.

Knowing that some of the people in this community were the biggest taxpayers in the county, and knowing that there were other roads being built in this county, caused me to make a little investigation. I talked to several men of the community and

my spirit was much pessi

my bit to l

Today I fice to pay the count with a sig vantage o myself. A for home on the here is w say:

No one w

means a jo

"Buy now

get a job.

"Buy now

dends.

Boost emp

your home. h

"Buy now."

prices since I

Employment

now," it will help

I know if every

these sayings it ce

"Goodbye Hard Time

Of course, I know

of poor fellows with

their pockets, but on

there are still thousa

working almost every

to spend their mone

something may hap

Well, Mr. Worker, stu

sages and you will ur

we don't spend we

that much harder to

Let's all start and

that we can spare, as

will pay us big divid

I know next month

with a smile instead

face that I have been

"Three cheers for n

Louisville.

#### INTERPRETERS

To the Editor of The

At a recent sessio

States Senate, the C

Barney T. Phillips,

the following prayer

"Almighty God,

the dawn its inalle

night its quenchle

its potentialities, a

sun its vesper hym

hearts of ours, we

of human joys an

with sorrow,

waters blown

laughter, tha

all colors of

us their ric

kindness of o

our way with

viewless str

the dark of nt a

the world's shi

music the

men call death.

I am sending y

literary production

erence, but it doe

when this prayer

enly Throne, it

mittee of interpre

is all about.

#### INCONSISTE

To the Editor of

I note in a

Times of Decem

citizen of our c

trust, embezzled

Street business

a two-year je

amended charge

given a positio

jail.

In the same

was given two y

the State Peni

of the sum of

Such camou

encourage dece

scale, and the

the guilty part

But thank

that in the r

impartial Ju

jury where j

to all in the

where the ju

present day

decisions an

laws of just

earth, and

Architect of

to make me

In my o

cases cited

theft, and

flicted wi

Louisv

M

Stag

mende

ping.

Act

on w

own



Dec-22-1930

R-JOURNAL, LOUISVILLE, MONDAY

# The Point

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.  
Considered solely from the political point of view, the most inventive genius, or the most subtle sophist, finds difficulty in detecting one simple happy result of prohibition. Ask a leader of either party if he considers national prohibition an asset or a liability and he can give no confident reply. He can only reply an asset in some sections and a liability in other sections. The controversy has disrupted, to a large extent, all parties and has made party government difficult, if not impossible. The leaders cannot agree on any broad intelligent public policies and count on indorsement by a united party. Prohibition is directed at individual life. Every voter feels a controlling interest in the laws which bear directly on his life and his personal habits. Instead of a judicious consideration of the political policies, the voter injects wet or dry into his conclusions and with millions of voters this emotion controls the vote.

Ask a Republican leader—Senator Fess or our Bob Lucas—how many wet Republicans will desert the party on a dry platform and vote for a wet Democrat, and no candid answer can be expected. Reliable knowledge cannot be had, not even by a poll conducted by the Literary Digest.

Ask a Democratic leader—Mr. Ras-kob or our Jouett Shouse—how many dry Democrats will bolt the party ticket on a wet platform, and no definite or reliable answer can be expected.

The leaders of both parties are confronted with a large and influential block of voters who subordinate every political principle, or policy, to national prohibition. This one fact places a premium on the acute political strategist and places the patriotic statesman at a discount. Leaders of both parties must keep an eye on Dr. McBride, and his league, and an ear to the ground to listen to the voice of the militant army commanded by the McBrides, Cannons and Wilsons.

A striking illustration of the power of a militant minority is furnished in the eventful days preceding the War Between the States of 1861. The slave owners drove the seceding States into open rebellion against the Union, and yet there were six non-slave holding white men to every slave owner in these seceding States. The militant army of the league under the leadership of able and experienced politicians on the stump, and of eminent preachers in the pulpit, threaten the integrity of both parties as the resolute army of slave holders threatened the integrity of the Union. Herein lies the seed of a new irrepressible conflict to follow the determined efforts of opposing convictions. What a temptation is laid before the leaders of both parties to play for the support of these conflicting convictions—the one rallying around the noble experiment and the other defending not the pleasure of drink, but the right of the individual to the enjoyment of the inalienable rights guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence—a conflict between good intentions, with a strong religious backing, and civil rights enjoyed from the dawn of free government.

This prospective conflict can be averted by denationalizing the forces arrayed on both sides, by which the liquor question drops out of national politics and ceases to be either an asset or liability.

The love of power and the dread of defeat are strong in human nature and hurry candidates on to extremes, even to the belief that the end justifies the means. The difference between the results to be achieved by national and State control of the liquor traffic cannot be of sufficient importance to justify the destruction of honest party government.

Decentralize the liquor question and

law would the major State and of all those ment.

The ge present B. Harri

gressive ments si

unequale tion of a bond

pose being of n the com

needed posed b survey

planner its rec a mode

organiza system enorm

sewer the F the i

clans that for t

than We

Harri despi is es

Pr have appr sum

port. Al publ conc

part lieve find

carri sior its

L

"T

T

I

"pr of

voe cut

it the

und if

the

Rep to

sch had

live Jeff

ville as

is a Ker

poli ers

car and

abo out

F

I

mr

fro K.

ser cl

qu sic

M la

ga of

C

hu m

ce w

tw Tl dr



es can  
e sea-  
f this  
everely  
which  
those  
a em-  
great  
source  
almost  
golden  
be a  
oper-  
action  
itable  
coal  
has  
hell,  
will  
the  
Jef-  
ani-  
River  
ville-  
vent-  
dedly  
the  
the  
cer-  
beau-  
a of  
the  
ville  
in  
and  
ved.  
ubs,  
iti-  
did  
and  
ame  
er-  
ty-  
not  
be  
ary  
eral  
ay.  
al-  
ur-  
an  
ur-  
pon  
ad-  
be  
ac-  
im-  
It  
al-  
to  
nati  
oad  
42.  
om-  
As-  
hop  
sey  
et-  
the  
blo-  
em-  
sing  
me-  
an-  
and  
pli-  
heir  
nan  
Or-  
ney  
am-  
ance  
the

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

#### THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

Considered solely from the political point of view, the most inventive genius, or the most subtle sophist, finds difficulty in detecting one simple happy result of prohibition. Ask a leader of either party if he considers national prohibition an asset or a liability and he can give no confident reply. He can only reply an asset in some sections and a liability in other sections. The controversy has disrupted, to a large extent, all parties and has made party government difficult, if not impossible. The leaders cannot agree on any broad intelligent public policies and count on indorsement by a united party. Prohibition is directed at individual life. Every voter feels a controlling interest in the laws which bear directly on his life and his personal habits. Instead of a judicious consideration of the political policies, the voter injects wet or dry into his conclusions and with millions of voters this emotion controls the vote.

Ask a Republican leader—Senator Fess or our Bob Lucas—how many wet Republicans will desert the party on a dry platform and vote for a wet Democrat, and no candid answer can be expected. Reliable knowledge cannot be had, not even by a poll conducted by the Literary Digest.

Ask a Democratic leader—Mr. Raskob or our Jouett Shouse—how many dry Democrats will bolt the party ticket on a wet platform, and no definite or reliable answer can be expected.

The leaders of both parties are confronted with a large and influential block of voters who subordinate every political principle, or policy, to national prohibition. This one fact places a premium on the acute political strategist and places the patriotic statesman at a discount. Leaders of both parties must keep an eye on Dr. McBride, and his league, and an ear to the ground to listen to the voice of the militant army commanded by the McBrides, Cannons and Wilsons.

A striking illustration of the power of a militant minority is furnished in the eventful days preceding the War Between the States of 1861. The slave owners drove the seceding States into open rebellion against the Union, and yet there were six non-slave holding white men to every slave owner in these seceding States. The militant army of the league under the leadership of able and experienced politicians on the stump, and of eminent preachers in the pulpit, threaten the integrity of both parties as the resolute army of slave holders threatened the integrity of the Union. Herein lies the seed of a new irrepressible conflict to follow the determined efforts of opposing convictions. What a temptation is laid before the leaders of both parties to play for the support of these conflicting convictions—the one rallying around the noble experiment and the other defending not the pleasure of drink, but the right of the individual to the enjoyment of the inalienable rights guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence—a conflict between good intentions, with a strong religious backing, and civil rights enjoyed from the dawn of free government.

This prospective conflict can be averted by denationalizing the forces arrayed on both sides, by which the liquor question drops out of national politics and ceases to be either an asset or liability.

The love of power and the dread of defeat are strong in human nature and hurry candidates on to extremes, even to the belief that the end justifies the means. The difference between the results to be achieved by national and State control of the liquor traffic cannot be of sufficient importance to justify the destruction of honest party government.

Decentralize the liquor question and scatter the forces into harmless squads, and its power to annoy, disturb and threaten the councils of State and the proceedings of national conventions and the conduct of Presidential campaigns will be at an end.

Would not this result gladden the patriotic heart all over this republic? Louisville. J. M. ATHERTON.

law would  
the major  
State and  
of all those  
ment.

The ge  
present B  
B. Harri

gressive  
ments si  
unequal  
tion of t  
a bond  
pose bei  
ing of n  
the com  
needed  
posed b  
survey  
planner  
its rec  
a mod  
organiz  
system  
enorm  
sewera  
the F  
the i  
cians.  
that  
for t  
than

We  
Harri  
despi  
is es  
Pr  
have  
appr  
sum  
port  
Al  
publ  
conc  
part  
lieve  
fing  
can  
sior  
its  
L

"TI

T

I

"pr

of

vo

cut

it

the

und

if

the

Rep

to

sch

had

live

Jeff

ville

as

is a

Ker

poll

ers

car

and

abo

out

F

# The Poin

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

The letters of the Honorable Jeff Davis in Sunday's issue of July 12 were read with great interest by open minds. He was an able man, educated in the Jefferson schools of politics and lived before "personal liberty" was discarded as a myth by many governed by emotion and not by reflection.

The Kentucky branch of the Woman's Organization for National Prohibition Reform is to be congratulated on the recovery of the letters; so strong, so tolerant and so free from emotion. The good women leading the fight for repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment have shouldered the burden in the effort to convince the women of the folly and futility and waste of prohibition. Prohibition rests on emotion, more strongly developed in women than in men. All feel but all do not reflect on the extent feeling should control reflection. If no alcoholic liquors are made, none can be used—this is obvious and allays the mother's anxiety and gives prohibition a fallacious indorsement. Law cannot take the place of parental discipline and so far as misplaced confidence in the law leads to relaxation of parental discipline children suffer a positive injury. The law is restrictive but only to a limited extent is it instructive and reformative.

Day by day the issue becomes more manifest. The militant dries now denounce personal liberty as mere "twaddle"; as an exploded humbug. In truth, sovereignty of the people depends on and consists of the sovereignty of individuals. Destroy the latter and the former dies a natural death. Prohibition transfers sovereignty from the people to a central authority, and a new form of government is set up in place of the form adopted by the statesmen who framed the Federal Constitution. The individual was the reality to be protected and was recognized as the unit of which national sovereignty was composed. The rights of the States were considered essential to the protection of the individual over whom the Federal Government should exercise a closely limited authority. Why was Delaware made the equal of Pennsylvania and Virginia in the United States Senate? The system of reasoning to justify the repudiation of personal liberty is not only rotten logic but positive misrepresentation. In making the individual the unit to receive a proportionate share of national sovereignty and enjoy the benefits and pleasures of personal liberty, the divine right of Kings was rejected and the right to govern lodged in, and diffused among, the people of the States.

But argument is wasted on emotion. Even facts are denied or distorted. Laws to punish crimes, murder, rape, forgery and all serious misdemeanors are held to justify prohibition. To drink alcoholic liquors is a sin. Peace on earth and happiness in heaven are the rewards of total abstinence. Moral reform is held out, on militant banners, as a shibboleth to distinguish the moral from the immoral; the saints from the sinners. The cry of whisky, saloon and reaction is heard to hold the dries in line and to intimidate the advocates of personal liberty, State rights and home rule. One of the most effective weapons used to support prohibition is this persistent system of intimidation. It was introduced fifty years ago and is employed now to silence the opposition to prohibition, and it has a powerful effect in suppressing the open expression of opinion by millions who use liquors in private and want to be classed with the reformers.

Intimidation did not silence Jefferson Davis, the statesman, in his debate with Bishop Galloway, the theologian, as it had not driven to cover the three most eminent leaders, Washington, Jefferson and Franklin. Courage to express the opinion honestly entertained would dissolve the coalition between state and church; would remove the liquor



individual was the reality to be protected and was recognized as the unit of which national sovereignty was composed. The rights of the States were considered essential to the protection of the individual over whom the Federal Government should exercise a closely limited authority. Why was Delaware made the equal of Pennsylvania and Virginia in the United States Senate? The system of reasoning to justify the repudiation of personal liberty is not only rotten logic but positive misrepresentation. In making the individual the unit to receive a proportionate share of national sovereignty and enjoy the benefits and pleasures of personal liberty, the divine right of Kings was rejected and the right to govern lodged in, and diffused among, the people of the States.

But argument is wasted on emotion. Even facts are denied or distorted. Laws to punish crimes, murder, rape, forgery and all serious misdemeanors are held to justify prohibition. To drink alcoholic liquors is a sin. Peace on earth and happiness in heaven are the rewards of total abstinence. Moral reform is held out, on militant banners, as a shibboleth to distinguish the moral from the immoral; the saints from the sinners. The cry of whisky, saloon and reaction is heard to hold the dregs in line and to intimidate the advocates of personal liberty, State rights and home rule. One of the most effective weapons used to support prohibition is this persistent system of intimidation. It was introduced fifty years ago and is employed now to silence the opposition to prohibition, and it has a powerful effect in suppressing the open expression of opinion by millions who use liquors in private and want to be classed with the reformers.

Intimidation did not silence Jefferson Davis, the statesman, in his debate with Bishop Galloway, the theologian, as it had not driven to cover the three most eminent leaders, Washington, Jefferson and Franklin. Courage to express the opinion honestly entertained would dissolve the coalition between state and church; would remove the liquor controversy from national politics, and substitute education, industrial pressure, self-control and self-respect in place of the policeman, the prison, the raiding of private homes and all the abominable agencies of force to regulate the lives of a people.

No State of this Union and no country of this wide world has adopted prohibition after full discussion free from the intrigue of emotion and religious interference which silenced opposition to the Eighteenth Amendment. About 1850 Ohio voted into her Constitution a provision prohibiting the granting of a license for the sale of liquor in that State. After several years of actual test, the Legislature passed the Dow law imposing a fine on liquor sales and thus evaded and ignored the State Constitution. Iowa did practically the same thing in its Mullet law.

Facts upon facts can be piled up mountain high to prove that no nation and no State of this Union has adopted prohibition after open discussion. Maine made no honest effort to enforce prohibition. I know personally whereof I write. In 1886 Michigan defeated State prohibition after full open discussion by 5,000 majority, Texas followed in 1887 by 95,000 majority, Tennessee by 40,000 majority, Oregon by 8,000 majority, Pennsylvania by 165,000 majority, in 1888 West Virginia by 20,000 majority, in 1889 Massachusetts by 30,000 majority, and in 1890 Nebraska by 30,000 majority. The only States in that decade, or in and about that period, voting prohibition were the two Dakotas, so thinly settled that no discussion was possible.

"Protect the soldier boy," "win the war," "save the grain and coal"—these were familiar catch phrases leading to the submission and adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment. The example and the voice of the past were brushed aside by the alliance of politicians and political preachers. Kentucky lost about sixty millions of taxable real estate in addition to the loss of tax on whisky in bond, and the license cities lost the revenue from licenses. The United States lost about \$400,000,000 annually from taxes on liquors. With what result have these losses been incurred? Congress has been packed by representatives pledged to obey the Anti-Saloon League and powerful religious denominations pleading good intentions as justification. The complaint is against bad judgment; against mixing religion and politics, and against personal interest and selfishness, and against the use of a great controversy as a football of politics. Good intentions are welcomed and encouraged to build up character and to teach temperance and inculcate morality.

I write from what I have personally observed, not from propaganda grossly exaggerated.

Louisville. J. M. ATHERTON.

# The Point

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

I assure Mr. Turck that I had no reference to him in my comments on political preachers. I referred to religious leaders who had openly entered the political arena and were bringing religion into politics, and were not abiding by the principle that Church and State should be kept inviolably separate.

Mr. Turck is not happy in indorsing the invasion of personal liberty by national prohibition, by citing the prohibition of crime. No sane citizen upholds crimes and even the intemperate are not criminals in public estimation. With conscientious determination to aid in fighting the evils of intemperance there is practical unanimity. But, as has been repeatedly said, total abstinence and temperance are not synonymous terms. They are radically different, and the difference is well known by the people. The public mind is riveted to efficiency in the industrial field and naturally applies the same test to laws and is inclined to approve the laws which yield the best results. In controlling the liquor traffic the question, lying at the very threshold and within the province of students of law and political science, is the relative qualifications of the Congress and the States. Assuming that we are beginning de novo, from which of these two may the best results be had—from Congress or the States? Which of these two has the superiority as controlling authority? Calling experience as witness, neither has succeeded to the satisfaction of the public. If this be admitted, we must practically begin de novo and decide between the two on the capacity of the two to control the traffic. The one promising the best results should be selected, accepting efficiency as the test, and efficiency to be judged by results.

Students of law and political science are especially interested in a wise discussion. Exclude both State and personal rights and come squarely down to imposing the duty to control on the power best equipped to exercise control. Total abstinence is simply one method of control to be considered when divorced from religious convictions which preempt the mind and banish every feature of impartiality. Presenting this as a basic question, of a purely practical character, to be debated and decided to promote the public welfare and public security, the fog which obscures prohibition may be lifted and the advisability of settling one question at one time is apparent.

This is not written to invite a discussion with Mr. Turck, but for the consideration of all readers of the Point of View interested in law and political science to help in the final settlement of the question. Having duly turned the question over in my own mind, I cast my vote for State control, through which home rule can be utilized, reserving the privilege of printing remarks in the Point of View hereafter with the editor's permission.

Louisville. J. M. ATHERTON.

PARKING PLACES FOR VISITORS.

only draw chan Su five every was locat by a bridg high parki guide I t rious and t A 7 g He NEG

Te Wh

larger

take

respo

vario

The

out

men

tasks

in th

selves

wher

vent

facili

oppo

ment

redu

discr

man

and

cate

must

the

hous

whic

inad

unto

men

he

know

adm

suffi

hurr

who

and

subj

In t

barr

app

The

is de

to t

deve

He

dark

ing

it b

cult

discr

being

in s

that

this

rend

Negr

has

cult

who

work

have

the

it u

Ti

who

ente

prov

Neg

a

dra

writ

ciat

for

it t



# The Point

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## THE PROHIBITION SERIAL

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

To drop the discussion of prohibition is to surrender the effort to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment and to acquiesce in the slow, steady progress of concentration of power in a government of limited authority. The editor gives warning to the reader by the heading "Prohibition Serial" and the readers who are tired of the discussion can skip the letters under that heading. In explanation of my own letters I do assure all readers that I write only to give open minds, young and old, facts and the conclusions which I believe the right use of reason must reach from these facts. I know my long connection with the liquor traffic operates to excite both distrust of my motives and the correctness of my statements. I can't help that, and in reply remind the readers that my connection with, and my peculiar relation to, the traffic, gave me especial opportunity for observation of details which make up the true history of the controversy and could not be within the knowledge of the masses who formed opinions on hearsay. All I ask of the most critical and suspicious reader is to disprove my facts and refute my arguments.

I was studying prohibition when thousands of preachers were studying theology and knew little or nothing of the actual conduct of the traffic. In common with the mass of people, I entertain the highest respect for the "cloth," and have a smattering of church history, and of the good religion has conferred on the human race, and the hardships, under ambitious leadership, it has inflicted. But I do feel at liberty to meet political preachers on an equal footing. They must learn they cannot carry pulpit ethics into politics, but must adopt political methods, to be effective, when they engage in politics. The road is short from the pulpit through the lobby to the bucketshop.

From a Point of View letter printed a few weeks ago under the heading, "Democrats," written by Dr. Turck, I quote the following: "Prohibition represents so much more than the control of intoxicating liquor traffic that a party that persists in fighting prohibition forfeits permanently the support of all those who believe in all that type of social welfare legislation of which the prohibition of intoxicating liquor traffic is but one example." What does this mean? Coming from a man of Dr. Turck's ability and position it is notice that legislation will be enacted to give legal force and effect to other alleged reforms of "that type." Space will not permit speculation as to the things the Doctor and his following have in contemplation. Establish the principle underlying prohibition; law can control and regulate private life and local customs and concentrate the power to enact and execute the laws in Congress, and the only limit to the laws of "that type" is the ability of the reformers to organize a majority to legalize their wishes.

This principle changes our whole constitutional fabric and will perpetuate the social disturbances of today. No mental telescope is required to see an array of blue laws in the political sky. Political leaders must look after the political threats which are here dismissed with the suggestion that propriety might suggest that the Doctor prove he is in before he threatens to get out and stay out.

Louisville. J. M. ATHERTON.

HOSPITALS AND CHIRO

diffi  
Amer  
such  
it ca  
coun  
This  
our  
prac  
gram  
this  
"Hos  
peop  
Th  
to er  
tution  
medic  
of th  
taine  
State  
of th  
has  
politi  
medic  
would  
main  
if he  
will  
practi  
chiro  
regula  
being  
Amer  
allied  
subje  
board  
their  
tor, v  
tic, c  
cann  
vanti  
ment  
seem  
docto  
some  
deni  
their  
have  
cons  
heal  
La  
I  
lett  
oth  
the  
a  
pro  
of  
the  
cri  
co  
pe  
gr  
be  
is  
la  
pr  
pe  
co  
m  
in  
19  
by  
to  
m  
in  
vig  
hi  
th  
do  
th  
th  
us  
ca  
no  
re  
fa  
En  
ins  
rat  
ha  
er  
wa  
cru  
in  
da

to every judge, to every lawyer, to every citizen, within the good old State, until the law is changed. The decision will give comfort and courage to every corrupt politician and election officer.

Terre Haute, Ky.

CLINT RAYMER.

#### THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

Senator Norris of Nebraska made the following statement a few days ago: "I want something to take the place of the Eighteenth Amendment before I vote to submit its repeal to the people. Nothing has been suggested. We would just have chaos with repeal." Suppose the people of this country wanted to vote on repeal? Has the Senator grown into such an autocrat that he will refuse the people the right of repeal? He may be the autocrat in Nebraska, but as a Senator of the United States he has no right, moral or political, to substitute his individual opinions for the will of the people of this country.

The Senator did not pretend to designate the chaos he refers to. Nor is he supported by the facts when he says "nothing has been suggested." This is a deliberate misstatement of the facts. Repeal would restore to the States the right to regulate their own domestic affairs. Repeal would restore to Congress the power to reimpose the tax on liquors and put back into the Treasury of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars contributed by voluntary acts of a large part of the people of this country.

The liquor traffic may be readily divided into two parts: The manufacture and importation, and the sale prior to prohibition. The Congress controlled the manufacture and importation and the States controlled the sale. Congress had no difficulty in imposing the tax. The Congressional Record and the records of the Internal Revenue Department furnish documentary evidence on the subject.

There are living in this country tens of thousands of men familiar with the manufacture and importation of liquor. They will bear witness to the facts in the Capitol. Where is the Senator?

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

Has the Senator controlled the sale of liquor in the States? If so, why not control the manufacture and importation? If a man is to control the sale of liquor, he must also control the manufacture and importation.

makers and the people. May it not occur that the former is mistaken, or is a law-making body infallible? The edict has gone forth from the wise men of the past during the whole period of recorded history that the habits and customs of a people cannot be controlled by law. Liberty and force were never rocked in the same cradle. They are not congenial playmates. They have never lived peaceably side by side. Wisdom of the law is its enforcement. Force invites force, and the march of freedom through all the ages has resulted from disobedience to unjust law.

The wets can safely issue a challenge to the dries—produce a single statesman or a single prominent reformer, from Jesus Christ down to President Hoover, who advocated the suppression of intemperance by the use of force. Every age and practically every reformer and every worthy citizen have grieved over the evils of intemperance. Not one defends it, and yet not a reformer of the past down to Dr. McBride, Senators Shephard and Norris, have organized a military force, led by Federal police, to invade the States of this Union and send their citizens to prison in distant States. Name one civil administrator or one eminent reformer in the whole range of history who ever suggested the club as a remedy for intemperance and claim at least one precedent.

Dr. Osler took off his overcoat on a cold day and put it on a drunkard, saying, "You may drink yourself to death, but you shall not freeze to death." Restrain, encourage and reform the drunkard as far as human sympathy can go. Why attack the rights of sober people with the distant, forlorn hope of protecting the drunkard?

If there lived a man possessed of all the qualifications to enforce prohibition it was the great Oliver Cromwell. He was a Puritan, with great military and administrative ability and unlimited power in a small open country. What was his opinion of prohibition? Ex-President Roosevelt introduces the quotation from Cromwell with the following sentence: "There is profitable study for many people in the following—the quotation from Cromwell's letter to the Governor of Edinburgh Castle—your pretended fear lest error should creep in is like the man who would keep all wine out of the country lest men should be drunk. It will be found an unjust and unwise jealousy to deprive a man of his natural liberty upon a supposition he may abuse it. When he doth abuse it, judge."

Conclusion, written nearly 300 years ago, condenses the argument in a few sentences. It rings as true on the day it was written as it does today.

J. M. ATHERTON.



is not likely to be because of any extended effort upon the part of Secretary Lamont and Col. Arthur Woods, but on account of the inevitable economic upturn, according to Mr. Raskob.

### TURCO-HELLENIC PEACE

The whole-hearted welcome given on Sunday to Premier Venizelos of Greece by Istanbul, formerly Constantinople, marks a new era in the world. The ancient city received its bitter enemy with open arms. Greek and Turkish flags were intertwined for the occasion. Centuries of strife and hate were obliterated, and a new day definitely dawned upon the Eastern Mediterranean.

The mission of Venizelos is officially to bury the hatchet. At Angora he will sign the treaty of friendship between the two nations which after months of negotiations was formulated in Athens this year. He will also subscribe to a commercial pact which will unite the countries by a mutually advantageous trade agreement.

Strange as it may seem, peace between Greece and Turkey has been the principal object in Venizelos' foreign policy since his return to public life little more than a year ago. The veteran statesman who now is bent on friendship with Turkey was in his younger days the unrelenting foe of the Turk. A native of Crete, he was born under Ottoman rule. During his Premiership in 1912 he launched the war that resulted in the liberation of his native island. Again in 1917 he forced his country on the side of the Allies and against the hated Turk. Then followed the disastrous campaign in Asia Minor and the utter rout of the Greek army and the Greek civilian population in Turkey. More than 1,500,000 Greeks were expelled from Asia Minor and forced upon the war-worn and depleted little Hellenic country.

That the present move is not an empty gesture is amply demonstrated. When the treaty of friendship was drafted, the Parliament at Athens countermanded a long-standing order for an armored cruiser, which was to be purchased from Germany. Greece thus provided the world with the unique example of peace being followed by actual reduction of naval armament, the reverse of which has been the case with the signatories of the Versailles treaty.

### MUSSOLINI PUTS ON A SHOW

While President Hoover was extolling the London Naval Treaty as bringing the world closer to mutual trust and confidence, Premier Mussolini was vociferating that "hypocritical nations talk peace while preparing for war." While the American Chief Executive was voicing the hope that France and Italy would unite in the movement against competitive armaments, the Italian dictator was declaring that "today even as yesterday the prestige of nations is determined absolutely by their military glories and armed power."

The Fascist chieftain was not replying to Mr. Hoover, however. He was not thinking of the United States. He was referring to the Eu-

## The Point of View

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

### THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

It is with honest regret I feel that obligation to truth and sincerity demands notice of the sermon of Dr. C. T. Wilson delivered in Jeffersonville Sunday night. The public has not forgotten the speeches made by Mrs. Willebrandt in the Presidential election of 1928. On November 4 election of members of Congress occurs in all States and of a United States Senator in Kentucky. The inflammatory "prohibition" question has been allowed to lie dormant in Indiana and Kentucky in order that the voters may vote without passion or prejudice from a subject which, in its very nature, is not political and which has divided both parties. The final decision of the people should be made on the merits of prohibition and not on the use to be made of it to promote the success of either party. The dispassionate consideration of public policies and of the comparative qualifications of candidates is not possible when the voter devotes the front page of his mind to one extraneous matter in which religion has intruded its unwelcome interference. Off and on in Kentucky sly and tricky attempts have been made to arouse religious feelings by Senator Robison. How does it happen that Dr. Wilson selects this time to preach on prohibition across the river?

But this is not written to call attention to such an obvious fact. It is written to expose the construction Dr. Wilson places on the Bill of Rights or provisions of the Constitution of the United States. He enumerates a list of these provisions and then adds these words, "In fact the Federal Constitution is a prohibition document." The misapplication of the word prohibition, as used in the Eighteenth Amendment, to the other provisions quoted is too apparent to require exposure. Every provision quoted or listed by Dr. Wilson is intended to protect and to guarantee against invasion of State and personal rights by Congress except the Eighteenth Amendment. Not a single one of these provisions is prohibitive in the sense that the Eighteenth Amendment is prohibitive. The conclusion the doctor draws in the one sentence, "in fact the Federal Constitution is a prohibition document," is false, and the doctor must have known that it was false, but thought his audience would be deceived. The doctor cannot be excused on the plea of ignorance. His position forbids this. He evidently spoke deliberately and had prepared the list of so-called constitutional prohibitions in advance. The doctor was playing the part of the political demagogue and not of the dignified and worthy representative of a great religious denomination. Under the guise of religion the doctor perpetrates a double crime. He tries to arouse religious prejudice in a political contest and tries to do this by gross misrepresentation of the Constitution of the United States.

I do not pretend to be a saint, but I would not follow the doctor's example if by so doing I could repeal the Eighteenth Amendment. Truth stands first in the category of virtues, and without sincerity religion becomes hypocrisy.

Louisville. J. M. ATHERTON.

"AND AWAY HE FLEW."

# The Point

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## THE PROHIBITION SERIAL.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

Considered solely from the political point of view, the most inventive genius, or the most subtle sophist, finds difficulty in detecting one simple happy result of prohibition. Ask a leader of either party if he considers national prohibition an asset or a liability and he can give no confident reply. He can only reply an asset in some sections and a liability in other sections. The controversy has disrupted, to a large extent, all parties and has made party government difficult, if not impossible. The leaders cannot agree on any broad intelligent public policies and count on indorsement by a united party. Prohibition is directed at individual life. Every voter feels a controlling interest in the laws which bear directly on his life and his personal habits. Instead of a judicious consideration of the political policies, the voter injects wet or dry into his conclusions and with millions of voters this emotion controls the vote.

Ask a Republican leader—Senator Fess or our Bob Lucas—how many wet Republicans will desert the party on a dry platform and vote for a wet Democrat, and no candid answer can be expected. Reliable knowledge cannot be had, not even by a poll conducted by the Literary Digest.

Ask a Democratic leader—Mr. Raskob or our Jouett Shouse—how many dry Democrats will bolt the party ticket on a wet platform, and no definite or reliable answer can be expected.

The leaders of both parties are confronted with a large and influential block of voters who subordinate every political principle, or policy, to national prohibition. This one fact places a premium on the acute political strategist and places the patriotic statesman at a discount. Leaders of both parties must keep an eye on Dr. McBride, and his league, and an ear to the ground to listen to the voice of the militant army commanded by the McBrides, Cannons and Wilsons.

A striking illustration of the power of a militant minority is furnished in the eventful days preceding the War Between the States of 1861. The slave owners drove the seceding States into open rebellion against the Union, and yet there were six non-slave holding white men to every slave owner in these seceding States. The militant army of the league under the leadership of able and experienced politicians on the stump, and of eminent preachers in the pulpit, threaten the integrity of both parties as the resolute army of slave holders threatened the integrity of the Union. Herein lies the seed of a new irrepressible conflict to follow the determined efforts of opposing convictions. What a temptation is laid before the leaders of both parties to play for the support of these conflicting convictions—the one rallying around the noble experiment and the other defending not the pleasure of drink, but the right of the individual to the enjoyment of the inalienable rights guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence—a conflict between good intentions, with a strong religious backing, and civil rights enjoyed from the dawn of free government.

This prospective conflict can be averted by denationalizing the forces arrayed on both sides, by which the liquor question drops out of national politics and ceases to be either an asset or liability.

The love of power and the dread of defeat are strong in human nature and hurry candidates on to extremes, even to the belief that the end justifies the means. The difference between the results to be achieved by national and State control of the liquor traffic cannot be of sufficient importance to justify the destruction of honest party government.

Decentralize the liquor question and scatter the forces into harmless squads, and its power to annoy, disturb and threaten the councils of State and the proceedings of national conventions and the conduct of Presidential campaigns will be at an end.

Would not this result gladden the patriotic heart all over this republic?

J. M. ATHERTON



and importing unassembled reduced freight rates. As this is being made useless by tariffs reciprocal trade. Says

that our former customers can no longer sell to us because of our prohibitive duty levels, we lose much of the marked their buying power from exporters are now suf-

more, harassed governmenting to balance their trade their revenue do not burden our products, the automobile, with cases which in some cases price of motor vehicles to where general use of them art and communication is

that if this trend is allowed to continue it will eventually wipe out all international denominating our own the first link in a vicious automotive trade, through Chairman Graham, rec- at the Department of mitted to enter into re- agreements with im- per nations abroad.

ing away at least part trade barrier erected ss of 1930, in which urties were guilty, can broken which the au- try shows to be re- national trade and rks of the unem-

## DIFFICULTIES

abinet, when it meets e confronted by an lties. The statement einrich Bruening that o longer meet either or unconditional an- ned under the Young ll the calculations of try looking to the the reparations t of default, should an cancellation be edoed the plans for ference. Also the quandary over the s leading members of parliamentary

dre Maginot, Min- the resignation of nister of Foreign ly weakened the r was one of the s of French mili- latter up to the e country toward oration. The one of the invasion of r was a leading no treaties and prochement.

problem is not to meet the Ger- what is termed ight to repara- crisis, with the for a minatory Teuton nation. the task of re- He is looking forming a na- parties, but the re not a unit in vielding attitude

a public life of blessing in dis- ran statesman. in the saddle. invasion has is little place act, Briand is is newspapers over repara- argued, owes to the con- and in the

# The Point of View

Communications should be brief, legibly written, preferably typewritten, on one side of the paper. The writer's name and address must be signed, not to be published without the consent of the signer. Publication does not imply approval by The Courier-Journal.

## A DEMOCRAT TO DEMOCRATS.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

As a Kentucky Democrat I submit a few suggestions to Kentucky Democrats. In thinking over the liquor traffic and prohibition fifty years ago. I formed the conclusion that neither the one nor the other was a fit subject for political control. I've adhered to this conclusion through many campaigns. These questions were forced into politics when the States ratified the Eighteenth Amendment and ultimately they must receive political treatment. The pressing question now before the Democrats of Kentucky is the position the national Democratic Party should take in the approaching national convention. It may appear impertinent for me to differ with Mr. Raskob in his suggestion of a referendum, but it should be postponed until after the Presidential election in 1932, and not written into the national platform. If incorporated in the national platform it will become a political issue, and an impartial judgment of the voters on either prohibition or the real political issues will not be possible. Enthusiastic wets will insist on a declaration against prohibition, and a referendum would be construed to be its equivalent in the campaign. The wets cannot afford to appear wanting in courage and confidence. They cannot afford to discourage the rank and file of their followers by apparent cowardice. Why not a plain declaration that the party does not consider prohibition a legitimate political issue in a national election? The Republican Party, under the leadership of President Hoover, aided by the Anti-Saloon League and an oligarchy of political preachers, are relying on a split in the Democratic Party over prohibition. In an effort to defeat prohibition, why take on the additional burden of defeating the Republican Party as an ally of prohibition? Any declaration by the Democratic Party on prohibition at this time will tend to solidify the Republican vote and to check the ferment in that party over prohibition.

Judging by the recent elections and giving due weight to all the available evidence, the wets are growing stronger month after month. Why take the chance of checking the tide now running in our favor by imitating the folly of the saintly politicians and political preachers, who sprung prohibition on the voters in the highly emotional condition caused by the war? The way to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment is to refuse to follow the example of its authors and rush into politics.

It is not the part of wisdom to force Democrats to decide between their religious convictions and loyalty to their party in a national campaign. It is equally unwise to force the same struggle on Republicans. History is written and cannot be unwritten, and needs no excuse, explanation or apology.

The Democratic Party has occasionally departed from a sound conservative position on fundamental issues under industrial pressure, but it has never attempted to force any fad or fancy on the people by exploiting the Constitution of the United States.

The Democratic Party has always demanded separation of Church and State, and has never authorized a moral police of the church to make saints out of sinners by law.

Let the Democrats recognize the changes of circumstances and conditions caused by prohibition as existing facts, and hold their party intact on the political issues presented by Republican misrule.

Defeat that party in 1932 and then determine the wise and judicious policy to be pursued on the prohibition issue. That issue should be finally disposed of on its merits, so that public opinion can be relied on to enforce reasonable laws to promote temperance and morality.

Louisville. J. M. ATHERTON.

## TEACHERS' SALARIES.

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

on such te prosperity.

Eighth—Educational system, teacher keep by further training. A discourage our own be Can we afford impair the advantages Ninth—Th are high, a mated, millic spent by the for their wor reasonable t time have r return on th a cut that them?

Tenth—T ing, self-ef is, has neve any crisis, stance is to inevita sary. B percent r without sentative is repugn Shall )

asking already has been all umh sung?

Louis

THE ) To The Gor



to every judge, to every lawyer, to every citizen, within the good old State, until the law is changed.

The decision will give comfort and courage to every corrupt politician and election officer.

Tevis, Ky.

CLINT RAYMER.

### THE PROHIBITION SERIAL

To the Editor of The Courier-Journal.

Senator Norris of Nebraska made

the following statement a few days ago: "I want something to take the place of the Eighteenth Amendment before I vote to submit its repeal to the people. Nothing has been suggested. We would just have chaos with repeal." Suppose the people of this country wanted to vote on repeal? Has the Senator grown into such an autocrat that he will refuse and the people the right of repeal? He may be the autocrat in Nebraska, but as a Senator of the United States he has no right, moral or political, to substitute his individual opinions for the will of the people of this country.

The Senator did not pretend to designate the chaos he refers to. Nor is he supported by the facts when he says "nothing has been suggested." This is a deliberate misstatement of the facts. Repeal would restore to the States the right to regulate their own domestic affairs. Repeal would restore to Congress the power to reimpose the tax on liquors and put back into the Treasury of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars contributed by voluntary acts of a large part of the people of this country.

The liquor traffic may be readily divided into two parts: The manufacture and importation, and the sale prior to prohibition. The Congress controlled the manufacture and importation and the States controlled the sale. Congress had no difficulty in imposing the tax. The Congressional Record and the records of the Internal Revenue Department furnish documentary evidence on the subject. There are living in this country tens of thousands of men familiar with the manufacture and importation of liquors who will bear witness to the facts of record in the Capitol. Where did the "chaos" the Senator condemns exist? It must have been in the sales under control of the States. Did it exist in Nebraska? If so, why did not Nebraska restore system and order within her boundaries? If a State is unable or unwilling to control the sale of liquor within her borders it was within her power to prohibit the sale and suppress the chaotic conditions. Nebraska is not content with her own freedom of action but nurses a desire to impose her impetuous will on other States.

Senator Norris represents an agricultural State in which the mass of her people are asleep in bed before 10 o'clock at night. Thousands are wide awake in the cities long after midnight—sober, well-behaved people. Why should the latter be forced to conform to the habits of the former? The wets plead for freedom of action in their habits and customs, subject to laws approved by the universal conscience.

It may be useful in forming correct opinion of conditions prior to prohibition, to recall the form and scope of the license laws regulating the sale of liquors by the States. One license, known as a day license, was in force generally, if not universally, in the States authorizing the retail sale. This license ran from about 6 a.m. to 10:30 to 11 o'clock at night. Between these hours the law required total abstinence. A very considerable part of the arrests for violation of the license law was made for sales during the closing hours of the night, and doubtless were classed under arrests for drunkenness in the Police Court reports. These violations were usually committed in the cities, as appetite is not regulated by the clock. A night license adjusted by every city to meet its own conditions would have avoided many arrests for one drink. Prohibiting the return of the saloon, on which public opinion is united, will simplify and facilitate the enforcement of quantity sale by eliminating the total abstinence provisions of the old law as a practical question. When the State was unable to prove that harm resulted from the technical violation, conviction was extremely difficult. Yet Senator Norris insists "nothing has been suggested."

That the whole country was not under one cast-iron law may have caused the chaos Senator Norris dreads. His conception apparently of order and system consists of applying one and the same law to the plains of Nebraska and the streets of our populous cities.

Where a people object to law, statute or constitutional, there is always grave suspicion the law is unethical. Two parties are involved—the law-

makers and the people. May it not occur that the former is mistaken, or is a law-making body infallible? The edict has gone forth from the wise men of the past during the whole period of recorded history that the habits and customs of a people cannot be controlled by law. Liberty and force were never rocked in the same cradle. They are not congenial playmates. They have never lived peaceably side by side. Wisdom of the law is its enforcement. Force invites force, and the march of freedom through all the ages has resulted from disobedience to unjust law.

The wets can safely issue a challenge to the dries—produce a single statesman or a single prominent reformer, from Jesus Christ down to President Hoover, who advocated the suppression of intemperance by the use of force. Every age and practically every reformer and every worthy citizen have grieved over the evils of intemperance. Not one defends it, and yet not a reformer of the past down to Dr. McBride, Senators Shephard and Norris, have organized a military force, led by Federal police, to invade the States of this Union and send their citizens to prison in distant States. Name one civil administrator or one eminent reformer in the whole range of history who ever suggested the club as a remedy for intemperance and claim at least one precedent.

Dr. Osler took off his overcoat on a cold day and put it on a drunkard, saying, "You may drink yourself to death, but you shall not freeze to death." Restrain, encourage and reform the drunkard as far as human sympathy can go. Why attack the rights of sober people with the distant, forlorn hope of protecting the drunkard?

If there lived a man possessed of all the qualifications to enforce prohibition it was the great Oliver Cromwell. He was a Puritan, with great military and administrative ability and unlimited power in a small open country. What was his opinion of prohibition? Ex-President Roosevelt introduces the quotation from Cromwell with the following sentence: "There is profitable study for many people in the following—the quotation from Cromwell's letter to the Governor of Edinburgh Castle—your pretended fear lest error should creep in is like the man who would keep all wine out of the country lest men should be drunk. It will be found an unjust and unwise jealousy to deprive a man of his natural liberty upon a supposition he may abuse it. When he doth abuse it, judge."

This quotation, written nearly 300 years ago, condenses the argument into a few sentences. It rings as true today as on the day it was written.

J. M. ATHERTON.

Louisville.

### THE PROHIBITION SERIAL

Society