Group 1: The Volstead Act is a violation of our liberty!

Kennedy Says
VOLSTEAD ACT
CAN BE MODIFIED

Would Permit Sale of
Light Wines and
Beers

James E. Kennedy of Burlington democratic candidate for Congress against F. G. Fleetwood of Morrisville, and to succeed Congressman Frank L. Greene of St. Albans further defines his position as a “wet” candidate. He says in an open letter to Editor Cushing of the St. Albans Messenger:

If I understand you correctly you are of the opinion that it is impossible to modify the Volstead Act, liberalize it, as it were, to the extent of permitting the manufacture and sale of wines and beers and remain within the prescription of the Eighteenth Amendment. I feel that you are wrong in this respect. Even the most ardent advocates of the Volstead Act fear that modification may take place and by some of the zealous advocates of the law absolute repeal is feared.

A no lesser person than William H. Anderson, Anti-Saloon League superintendent in New York, has said:

“Prohibition is cracking some places.

If beer and wine is legalized, that will be collapse.”

Anderson says nothing about it being impossible to modify the Volstead Act. He fears modification.

You say there must be an enforcement act. I agree with you, but if the enforcement act is beyond enforcing then it nullifies its intent and is useless.

And this is the kind of an enforcement act we have at the present time and have had since Oct. 28, 1919—an act that has created a near-army of law violators, an increase in crime and an increase in drunkenness.

You ask me to define my plan of modification. I am well satisfied that the Volstead Act should be modified to permit the manufacture of wholesome beer and light wines which are in fact and in truth non-intoxicating, and therefore not honestly within the scope of the amendment.

Permit the average man and woman to legally be permitted to obtain the beer and the wine he or she desires and you will have, presto, deprived the bootlegger of his customers, for I am sure the average man and the average woman will be satisfied with the wholesome beer and the light wine that all should be able to obtain under a proper modification of the Volstead law.

Unless I am misinformed, and surely all the reading I have had on the subject proves what I am trying to say that the nations of beer and wine drinkers are not nations of drunkards, but on the contrary are the most temperate nations of the globe.

You must know that the law under which we are now living is growing up a generation of “hard” drinkers, i.e., drinkers of hard liquors, most of whom boast of the fact that they can “get all they want” and that they rejoice in defeating the law.

As an economic measure you will have to admit that the Volstead Act is a failure.

In your editorial you ask: “Do we want to turn our backs on the party of Lincoln?” and I say no, assuredly no. I, for one American citizen, am willing to stay with the memory of the man who said “A house divided against itself cannot stand,” and if the Volstead Act has not divided the house of America then I do not know what division is. With 63 per cent of the votes cast in the poll of the Literary Digest favoring modification of the Volstead Act to 37 per cent against modification, it would seem that there is a division and that the minority is present in control.

And, again, from Lincoln: “No man is good enough to govern another man without that other’s consent.”

Assuring you Mr. Volstead never had my consent, I am, very gratefully yours.

J. E. Kennedy.
Group 1: The Volstead Act is a violation of our liberty!

Personal Liberty

WE CAN'T WORK IF WE DON'T GET BEER

1st Verse

The war is over and the old world's free,
But we've lost our personal liberty
They took it from us while the boys were away,
The way they did it Why we had no say,
There's a snake in the grass lookout for the knave,
Who's trying to make the working man a slave
In the land of the brave and the home of the free
We've lost our personal liberty.

Chorus

We can't work if we don't get beer
When you're tired and weary a body needs a cheer.
The poor man's club for you and me,
We want our personal liberty.

2nd Verse

Now somebody's wielding the old slave sword,
And blocking the path that was made by the Lord
They're taking the joy right out of our life,
And paving the poor man's road with strife
For the tail is a wagging the faithful dog
And making this country look more like a morgue,
For the rich man can buy, but for you and me
We want our personal liberty.
Group 2: Prohibition will improve our nation!
THE LIPS THAT TOUCH LIQUOR, SHALL NEVER TOUCH MINE.

Words by SAM. BOOTH.

Allegro, Moderato.

Music by GEO. T. EVANS.

1. The Demon of Rum is abroad in the bowl, Who love their good name as you love your own soul, O maidens, with

2. The homes that were happy are ruined, and land, His victims are falling on every hand, The wise and the gone, The hearts that were merry are wretched and lone, And lives full of

3. O mothers, whose sons tarry long at the fathers, and brothers, and beaux; Whose lives you would rescue from simple, the brave, and the fair, No station too high for his promise of good things to come, Are ruined and wrecked by the
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The Crime of the Cities—Chicago

By CARL S. LOWDEN

IS THERE any crime wave in Chicago? How did it get there? What’s keeping it? These questions are not easily answered. Certainly widespread vitiation exists along with impairment of the machine for disciplining lawbreakers. There is confusion, duplication of effort, ineffectiveness.

Why?

“The illicit handling of liquor,” says Attorney-General Edward J. Brundage, “has been corrupting every force in the community, and the vilest of concoctions have been sold at prohibitive prices.”

Henry Barrett Chamberlin, operating director of the Chicago crime commission which is the business man’s own “booth” for the detection of lawlessness, stoutly maintains that there is no crime wave in the city. “We have been told,” he says, “that the crime situation is an emergency demanding attention. It is not. Crime is an established business here. It has been centralized, organized, and commercialized.”

Chamberlin quotes figures to substantiate his contention. In a comparison of 1919 with 1920 he points out that murders decreased fifty-one per cent, burglaries were reduced by ten per cent, and robberies show a falling off of six per cent.

As a matter of fact, automobile killings are combined with the murder figures, the result is startling; for the entire complexion of the situation changes markedly. The decrease becomes an increase of eighteen per cent.

President Edwin W. Sims of the crime commission also dwells upon the murder record. For each million of population Chicago loses an annual 112 by violence, whereas Canada loses thirteen and Great Britain only nine. Because the thefts, burglaries, and robberies totaled 13,466 in 1919, Chicago now has the highest burglary insurance rate in the entire United States.

Neither Chamberlin nor Sims struck at the root of the crime menace. Business men are careful, cautious, and shrewd; they know the value of the dollar, and they do not desire to give any offense that may react upon them. Is that the reason, I wonder, why “moonshine” and bootlegging and the traffic in liquor are often winked at?

The crime commission praises Chief Charles C. Fitzmorris as “one of the best heads of the police department Chicago has ever had.” Mayor William Hale Thompson appointed Fitzmorris last November tenth and gave him a free hand; since that time the new chief has weeded out thirty-four men and put the entire department on its toes. He has instituted a drive on crime, not on “bootleg,” which is the greatest contributing cause of the deplorable lawlessness in this city but upon crime itself. He avers that every recent crime of importance was committed by persons crazed with drugs.

There have been sundry rumors that the city police department is not wholeheartedly fighting the liquor traffic. The Prohibition Enforcement Bureau, the Federal organization, is not much more than a skeletonized machine. It has a big job on its hands. It has four states, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin, to watch over; and it has a woefully inadequate supply of men at its headquarters for Chicago alone.

The intent of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution included the idea of cooperation. Apparently the Federal forces are going it practically alone in Chicago.

Frank D. Richardson, prohibition commissioner for the four states, says the accomplishments of the first year under the Eighteenth Amendment have been satisfactory in view of the smallness of their forces. The arrests numbered 4,481; 50,000 gallons of bonded spirits valued at three and one-half millions and fourteen hundred stills were destroyed. Richardson is pleased by the reduction in the number of disorderly conduct cases from 36,633 in 1919 to 32,305 in 1920.

The foregoing figures are encouraging. But Ralph W. Stone, prohibition agent for Illinois, handed out some figures of the other kind when he said that two and one-half millions of spiritus frumenti blanks had been issued to doctors in seven months, thereby releasing about 200,000 gallons of liquor. He thinks that approximately seventy-five per cent of this was used as a beverage. In fact, he attributes the greater part of the bootlegging in Chicago to the abuse of the prescription system by physicians and druggists.

In the past the permits for the removal of liquor from the warehouses could be issued by Stone or by Richardson. They have now taken steps to amalgamate their offices in order to keep a double check on and to reduce the outflow of permits. Much of the liquor taken out on permits never reaches the supposed destination. The loaded trucks are diverted to cabarets, restaurants and soft-drink houses, which the newspapers and the sophisticated citizens openly call saloons. Mayor Thompson avers the Federal people are largely responsible for liquor sales inasmuch as they handle the permits. Certainly the whole permit system must be revised if the Eighteenth Amendment is ever to have any real meaning in this city.

At Richardson’s office I was told that most of the “moonshining” must be attributed to foreigners. When pressed for further information on the identity of these violators, an assistant in the office named Greeks, Slavs, Serbs, Russians and Italians. Many of these are Jews.

“Of what nationality,” I asked, “are the liquor dealers in Chicago?”

“About ninety per cent of them are Jews.”

“That much?” I queried doubtfully.

“Well,” came the answer, “I’ll say, conservatively, seventy-five per cent.”

It is against the law to make public the names of liquor dealers. When arrests are made, however, the names appear in the newspapers. From one such list I extract, as a sample, the names beginning with the letter S, as follows: Sabatello, Sambur, Sass, Sbarboro, Schafer, Schillaci, Schoene, Schultz, Schwenck, Schermack, Shoop, Silverman, Sirovatka, Smeja, Soens, Soldewish and Sommerfield. Some of the foregoing are noticeably German.

At the office of United States Attorney Clyne I was informed that Jews constituted eighty per cent of the wholesale liquor dealers in Chicago. As I could not get a glimpse of the list, I am not prepared to say how accurate either of these estimates is; I could not verify them nor ascertain whether there had been any under or over statement.
The Crime of the Cities—Boston
By FRED C. GREEN

STATISTICS compiled by Federal officials in charge of prosecuting prohibition violations in Boston indicate that eighty-five per cent of such offenders are not native-born Americans. Of the foreign groups Jews and Italians predominate, with Jews ahead of all others.

These statistics apply not only to Massachusetts but to Rhode Island and Connecticut as well.

More Jews are arrested for "bootlegging"—peddling liquor by the pint or quart from suit cases, rag bags, and so on, than people of any other nationality; where enforcement officers raid places in which stills of magnitude are being operated it is generally a Jew who is either in actual charge of the plant or is back of it. Plots that have come to light which involve large shipments of contraband from across the Canadian border are, in the majority of cases, backed by Jews.

This applies to the smuggling of whisky and other liquors in freight cars, where the bottles or cases are camouflaged in sacks of potatoes, bales of hay, bales of rags or other merchandise. Recently two entire freight cars, filled with liquor that was billed as scrap leather and wool waste, were shipped from Montreal and seized in this vicinity. Two Jews, members of a Montreal firm, were arrested in Boston for their alleged part in this smuggling.

The Volstead Act provides only a fine for first offenses. Such a fine is regarded as a part of the overhead expense of carrying on an exceedingly lucrative business. The only thing that frightens such offenders is the possibility of a prison sentence, and in many cases they get around this by giving a fictitious name if they are arrested a second time.

These foreigners are not of the "second generation" variety. The majority of them have been in this country seven or eight years. Many of them come from countries where graft and bribery are prevalent and these, as soon as they come under the ban of the law, attempt to bribe the representatives of the government.

Although prohibition enforcement has thrown an enormous load on the Federal courts the work of prosecuting such cases has not been blocked and there is no confusion, unless it is the slight amount due to the necessary duplication of work under the present system.

The United States commissioner, whose office corresponds to that of a lower court judge, has no power to impose a penalty. He hears evidence in preliminary hearings and if he does not find the offender guiltless may order him held to await the action of the Federal grand jury or else to go before the United States district court.

In either of the last two findings it is necessary to submit the evidence a second time, thus making two bites of a cherry. Unless conspiracy is involved, first-time prohibition offenses are misdemeaners. There is a movement now on foot to give added power to the commissioners in order to enable the Federal lower court to dispose of as many such cases as possible.

For second offenses jail terms may be imposed. In Boston, at present, the prosecutors are going through their files, sorting out a list of the worst offenders, to whom heavy fines or jail sentences are to be meted out, in an effort to set a warning example.

The prosecution here is directed by Herbert A. Horgan, who has been made a special assistant to the Attorney-General. He was formerly legal advisor to Prohibition Enforcement Agent McCarthy. Special assistant United States district attorneys are also to be appointed. During the war Mr. Horgan was connected with the Army Intelligence Department as the head of a bureau at Washington to investigate disloyalty among foreign-born citizens. This work gave him an unusually good insight into the foreign mind and he has an interesting suggestion as to how prohibition violations among our foreign element may be cut down.

He believes that if the foreign-language press of the country would take the matter up and propound to its readers, in their native tongue, just what the law means and what violations of it may incur in the way of penalties, including the loss of citizenship if the second papers have not been taken out at the time the offense is committed, it would do much good. This idea could be carried out, also, from the pulpits of the foreign churches and through other media that would reach those who do not read American newspapers.

"Bootlegging" on a small scale and the operation of small stills are found to a greater degree in our industrial centers where foreign colonies are established. But the big "rum-running" projects, operated by organized gangs and in a systematic way, through chains of cities and towns from the source of supply to the distributing point, are backed by large capital and in the majority of cases Jewish brains are responsible.

The writer was shown the file in the office of the prosecuting officials and the cards therein bear out the statement as to who leads in violating the law.
Group 4: The Volstead Act should be modified!

Yesterday’s Poll Reveals How Ex-Service Men Want Bonus Paid.

Out of 143 blanks filled out by service men and received by The Evening World yesterday, only one comes from a man who is opposed to financing a general bonus by legalizing beer and light wines and taxing them. The man who voted “No” added no opinion to his ballot. One woman stenographer of an overseas base hospital voted “Yes.”

Thus far the ratio of those who favor modification of the Volstead act as an excise tax outnumber those who would rather meet the demand for a bonus out of a general sales tax or a bond issue or by deferring payments on Liberty bonds with the repayments of loans by the Allies is over 85 to 1.

From Connecticut comes a suggestion that there are former soldiers who are dissatisfied with the American Legion’s policy of not permitting its officers to run for political office and of keeping clear of party politics.

Robert L. Givens of No. 58 Sixth Avenue, Brooklyn, who was twenty-five months in the navy, writes from Connecticut:

“Most all the service men I know have lost faith in the United States Senators regarding the bonus and Prohibition question.

“As a result there is a movement under way in this State to organize all service men into a political body which will vote according to the service obtained for them by the politicians.

“Have been in this city for two years and 99 per cent of the veterans want the bonus.

“The service men I speak of are well educated and intelligent citizens, either American or Irish-American.

They do not wish to see the country burdened by further taxation, but feel that a modification of the Volstead act will injure no one and bring in more than the desired revenue which is needed for the bonus.

William Donnan of Brighton Beach, Corporal in Motor Transport Company 418, says:

“I am in favor of the light wines and beers. The reason is that the bootleggers are running the country. Also it will pay the soldiers’ bonus without effect on the people.”

Edward G. Nelson of No. 1816 Palmetto Street, fifteen months in France as a Sergeant in the 466th Aero Squadron, says:

“As the Prohibitionists seem to have Congress baffled, why not fire the lot of them and put ex-service men in their places? Surely Anderson and his snoping gang have got anything on us.”

From Hinton, Va., Dewey O. Elliston, thirteen months in foreign service in the infantry, writes that he speaks for thirty-five former Regular Army soldiers. He says that down among the coke oven bootleggers in contagion: “for every bootlegger caught two new ones start up and be and they feel the soldiers will earn new gratitude from the rest of the population if the demand for a bonus leads to the abolishing of the bootlegger.”

Harold A. Herrick of No. 106 East 16th Street, overseas with the 77th Division, doubts the need for a bonus, out.

“If, however, there is no other way to modify the Volstead act, which at the present time is not only being broken by all classes of citizens, including members of the bench and bar, but is rapidly destroying a prosperity for all laws, then I favor such legislation as will enable beer and light wines to be sold under proper beers. What a possibility there would be for nullifying the whole 18th Amendment if light wines and beers were taxed? If they keep on they will be (as has been done in some communities) taxing gambling houses, disorderly houses and crime generally to raise a soldiers’ bonus. Absolute prohibition and temperance is the only salvation for this country.”

John Lavegha, No. 110 Sands Street, Brooklyn, is gruffly frank in voting yes:

“I was drafted overseas to fight for liberty and democracy. Before we left we had wine and beer. And when we came back we got Prohibition and no bonus. Give us back our wine and beer and they will pay for the bonus and beat the bootlegger.”

Walter F. Brentene, Sergeant, 59th Engineers, overseas eighteen months, like many other veterans who urge an amendment of the Volstead act, is a total abstainer, but:

“As a veteran of the World War, I am of the opinion that we should have a voice in this matter as to whether we shall have beer and light wine or not. We went many miles from this country to defend the flag and returned to find that a few men who are supposed to represent us put something over while we were away. We men who defended the flag in this last war did not have any say and I think it is about time we woke up.”

“As for myself, I do not care if beer and wine return as I never did partake of it, but because I do not care for it does not mean others should be deprived of it.

“There are thousands with me who are in favor of a modification of the Volstead act to tax the sale of beer and wine to pay the bonus.”

George Gemralle of No. 587 West 177th Street, six months in the air service, sent in the “Yes” signatures of six beside himself.

“Mighty sorry,” he says, “I have not much spare time to give this wonderful idea, as I know there are millions other ex-service men who think the same as the few whose names I sent you.”

Louise McHales of No. 352 East 49th Street, eighteen months overseas with Company F, 59th Engineers, and wounded, says:

“I am unconditionally in favor of the repeal of the Volstead act, or, if this cannot be secured, for an immediate amendment of the act legalizing light wines and beers.

“What do I want with the bonus? If a married man, am desirous of securing a loan, under one of the options, for the purpose of building a home for myself. I do not desire any

BONUS OR BOOTLEGGER?

VETERANS’ OPINIONS ON A BONUS BY AMENDMENT OF VOLSTEAD ACT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Army</th>
<th>Navy</th>
<th>Marine</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1051</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Group 5: The Volstead Act cannot be modified!

[By J. H. Secrest, formerly assistant secretary of state and member of State Liquor License Board of Ohio.]

By constitutional amendment and statutory enactment, Ohio has constructed a system of licensing the traffic in intoxicating liquors. Briefly, the system provides there shall not be more than one saloon to each five hundred population; that the traffic shall not be licensed in any locality while any prohibitory law is operative therein; license shall not be granted to any person who is not a citizen of the United States and of good moral character; provisions were incorporated to eliminate brewery domination of the traffic; licenses are renewable each year and are revocable upon second conviction for violation of laws or regulations; licenses are granted by, and local administration is had through, county liquor license boards, the members of which are appointed by a state commission who may review their acts, and the members of the state commission are appointed by the governor.

Has it proved a success? Let me set forth its purposes. The advocates of license, in urging its adoption, gave assurance that:

1. It would stop agitation by solving the liquor question.
2. It would destroy brewery domination of the traffic.
3. It would destroy bootlegging, the speakeasy and blind tiger.
4. It would afford control of the traffic which could regulate the saloon and saloonkeeper, thus destroy the baneful influences of the saloon, and, through the inhibition against the immoral character, it would put the traffic in respectable hands.
5. It would remove the saloon from politics.

In January of this year the city of Columbus was startled with one of the most revolting murders in its history. The woman's body was found in a room strewn with empty bottles. Within the last few weeks, in Dayton, another murderer, when apprehended for his crime, cried, "I did it! I did it! I was drunk!" In Lima a mob crazed with drink, attempted, and almost succeeded in lynching the sheriff. Wherever booze is sold in the state, similar revolting instances may be found — but why multiply them! Who doubts, unless it be those who profit by the traffic, that the baneful influence of booze can be eliminated so long as the traffic is permitted, whether licensed or unlicensed?
Group 6: The people are to blame for everything that’s happening!

The first full year of national prohibition, completed to-day, finds John Barleycorn alive and kicking. In fact he is kicking so hard that the nation is faced with a live issue that will last for many years to come.

In general the results of the first dry year for the nation are an intriguing and entangling mass of facts, figures and opinions, advanced convincingly from many points of view.

There is one outstanding and generally agreed fact. The United States is not dry. Even the most ardent supporters of prohibition agree that it is not. Prohibition Commissioner John F. Kramer, officially the highest authority and privately a supporter of the law, says that it will never be. At the same time he declares prohibition is here to stay, but with a fight.

Liquor in one form or another can be purchased everywhere. This is not successfully denied. Any citizen, anywhere, with the price can prove it. Those who think otherwise say that this proves that prohibition does not prohibit. Those who think dry law is right and price is the barometer. If the latter contention is right, the war is inevitable. The barometer is going up. The price in some places is $25 a quart, which to a large percentage of the citizens is already prohibitive.

41,000,000 Proof Gallons Consumed In Year, Not Counting Home Brew

However, there is one outstanding official fact in the record of the first year’s operations. In 1920 the American people, or the imbibing portion of the people, drank or in some manner consumed approximately 41,000,000 proof gallons of distilled spirits. This is the official total compiled by the Internal Revenue Bureau. It does not include the untold and uncounted gallons of home brew and various and sundry liquors intoxicating to more or less degree that were brewed, distilled or concocted at home or made and peddled by bootleggers.

Kramer Blames the Average Citizen for Laxity in Dry Enforcement

Commissioner Kramer holds the view that this generation may not see the full results of prohibition, but “our children will.” He holds the view that the law is effective and good and that prohibition will soon be tight. On the popular side of the question he had this comment to offer:

“The trouble with prohibition enforcement has been that the average American citizen has not acquiesced in it and the public press has generally given no indication that it was in favor of the law. Everything has been written and spoken to discount such enforcement and to ridicule the officials charged with carrying out the law.”

Deets Pickett said that there was no doubt that enforcement was effective and becoming better. “The work,” he said, “has been hard. There is no doubt that half of the force should be fired, but it has many conscientious and sincere workers.

Former drinkers and saloon men should not have been hired, but the force is being pruned and Commissioner Kramer is doing great work.”

The general results of the first year are perhaps better summarized from the dry side by Wayne B. Wheeler, general counsel and legislative superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of America, who, has been through every stage of the light. The whiskey runners and those engaged in other illicit transactions have no spokesmen, Mr. Wheeler said:

“The first year of prohibition has revealed what a strange hold the liquor traffic had on the social, economic and political life of the nation. In the light of these revelations it is little short of a miracle that this organized evil was ever outlawed.

“It takes an individual considerable time to sober up after a long debauch. It takes a nation of more than a hundred millions a proportionately longer time to get on its feet, get the poison out of its system and have normal self-control after a hundred years’ debauch.

“The first year has accumulated evidence that the liquor traffic is the most lawless, corrupt institution in the nation. It has always defied regulative, restrictive and State prohibition legislation. The cretins believed that when prohibition was written into the Constitution it would recognize the organic law of the land. True to its criminal past, it has defied the Constitution of the United States and the laws enacted to make it effective wherever it could bulldoze or corrupt local or Federal officials into giving its protection. Taking advantage of the fact that the habitual user

... of alcohol will resort to almost the same methods to secure this narcotic drug that dope fiends do to secure opium, the liquor traffic has encouraged every phase of lawlessness at a time when this was a peculiar menace to the nation.

“After every war there has been a wave of crime. When wages decline and the cost of living is high and there is unemployment there is always additional lawlessness. Taking advantage of this condition, the liquor traffic has tried to fan the flame into a conflagration. In some places they have partly succeeded. In New York, New Jersey and in some other places there has been an organized, systematic effort to bring the enforcement of the prohibition law into disrepute. Federal officers have been corrupted and local public sentiment encouraged to make light of defiance of law.”

“Upon sober second thought the people of these centres will realize that they are playing with fire. Permitted violations of the prohibition law will encourage lawlessness all along the line.
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