

The Franklin Press

and

The Highlands Maconian

Published every Thursday by The Franklin Press
At Franklin, North Carolina
Telephone No. 24

VOL. XLVIII

Number 42

BLACKBURN W. JOHNSON, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

Entered at the Post Office, Franklin, N. C., as second class matter.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

One Year	\$1.50
Eight Months	\$1.00
Six Months	.75
Single Copy	.05

Obituary notices, cards of thanks, tributes of respect, by individuals, lodges, churches, organizations or societies, will be regarded as advertising and inserted at regular classified advertising rates. Such notice will be marked "adv." in compliance with the postal regulations.

A Happy Choice

ELECTION of the Rev. Robert Emmet Gribben as bishop of the Western North Carolina Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church, succeeding the late Rt. Rev. Junius M. Horner, was a happy choice that augurs well for the future of the church in this section.

Rev. Mr. Gribben possesses a rare combination of deep spirituality, broad vision, sympathetic understanding and, last but not least, practical common sense.

A man of constructive nature and missionary zeal, he should, if he is moved to accept the high appointment, render valuable service in strengthening his church and advancing the Kingdom of God in Western North Carolina. An inspiring preacher with a background of learning and experience, he is eminently qualified to lead his people to better things, clearer vision.

Since 1921 Rev. Mr. Gribben has been rector of St. Paul's church, Winston-Salem, one of the largest congregations in the Diocese of North Carolina. During the war he was a chaplain at Camp Sevier and since the war has served as chaplain for the American Legion. Although quiet and unassuming, he impresses one as a man of innate strength in every fibre.

If he accepts the appointment, he will be a valuable factor, not only in his own church, but to the spiritual life of this entire section.

Wanted—More Foreigners

OUR hat is off to Joseph Ashear. His new building on Main street and the Public Square improves the appearance of the town immensely. Furthermore, it is a valuable addition to the community's business facilities and it manifests a constructive spirit indicative of progress.

It is expected and hoped that it will bring a deserved profit for its owner, whose faith in Franklin and Macon county has caused him to make such an investment here. The building should serve to increase Franklin's reputation as a trading center for a large mountain region. Incidentally, it will mean a considerable sum to the county and town in the way of taxes. Whatever success Mr. Ashear achieves as a result of his new venture will be richly deserved.

Mr. Ashear is a long way from his native land. He came here from his native country, Assyria, with that faith in America which many immigrants possess—a firm belief that here he would find a land of liberty and justice. Starting with small means, he has built up a substantial business by dint of hard work, honest dealings and careful investments. He has always been a good citizen, furnishing an example to those of us who claim this as our native land. He has proved a good neighbor, ever ready to do his share of neighborly service.

We Americans are sometimes a bit egotistic and prone to boast of our "one hundred per cent Americanism." With a feeling of superiority, we sometimes say things uncomplimentary to foreigners.

But here is an object lesson, which has a parallel in almost every community of any size. Here is a foreigner whose deep sense of loyalty and love of country, transplanted to America, has made a distinct contribution to our community, county and state.

It should humble us a bit to reflect that the racketeer list is full of very American names. Few of them are foreigners, as we sometimes are inclined to believe.

We could name a long list of foreigners who have done well by America. A foreigner shot at Roosevelt, but it also was a foreigner who was the martyr to save the life of our President.

The average American needs to revise his opinion of foreigners and to be a little more humble in his estimation of himself. The Kingdom of God will never come until we stop looking upon each other as foreigners, until we act upon a principle of brotherhood.

Any community is richer for having citizens of Mr. Ashear's type, and we reflect that one of our needs is a few more such foreigners.

—N. C. D.

The Prohibition Forum

The Time Grows Shorter

LESS than three weeks remain before North Carolinians will go to the polls to vote on repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. In the interim before the election there will be only two more issues of The Press-Maconian. That means only two more opportunities to express your opinions on this momentous issue in "The Prohibition Forum."

Free and open discussion is helpful in arriving at the solution of any public problem.

Your friends and neighbors will be glad to read your opinions on prohibition. Don't be ashamed to voice them. Give others the benefit of your thought. Write a letter NOW to "The Prohibition Forum." We have two requests: Please write legibly on only one side of the paper and try to make your comments as concise as possible. We will publish all the readable letters for which space is available.

Against Repeal

BY MRS. J. W. C. JOHNSON

WHEN the best attempts of fact finding, employing scientific and non-partisan methods of research—like the Wickersham report and the research committee of the Federal Council of Churches, for instance—can give only tentative conclusions in regard to the effects of prohibition laws, it is not possible for partisans of either side to draw just conclusions from any statistics used without relation to all the factors involved.

For instance, the figures cited last week in support of repeal, showing the increase in the crime bill of North Carolina, prove nothing in regard to the failure of the 18th amendment. Too many factors enter into the commission of crimes to state categorically that any one cause is responsible. If we want to get back of the motives of the criminals operating in the crime wave that has swept over the nation since the early 1920's we will find one of the ugliest of human passions; namely, greed, the "love of money," the desire for easy, unearned wealth which "is the root of the evil." The fact that a criminal needs the stimulus that liquor gives to help him commit a murder does not prove that liquor was the primary cause.

Men are in the liquor business, legal or illegal, for the big money that is in it. Just as the men were in the Teapot Dome oil deal for the big money that was in it, Human rights and human life are as nothing in the face of greed. If we look back to the crimes committed by some of the highest officials of the nation in Harding's administration, and the efforts put forth to whitewash criminals at that time, we put our finger on one of the most powerful factors creating the spirit of lawlessness with resultant crime. When the source of government becomes corrupt, the poison extends down through the entire social fabric, to the smallest official. No wonder there is no respect for the law when so many whose duty it is to enforce the law are in league with the law breakers, and are law breakers themselves!

An excellent article in the new Encyclopaedia Britannica gives interesting statistics and reviews the working of the prohibition laws. This shows that the records do not exist over a sufficiently long period or over a sufficiently wide area to appraise the social and economic results of prohibition, "the problem being too complicated to isolate and measure the many controlling factors." However, answers from social workers, a group of people best situated to judge of the practical workings of the law, show a large preponderance of favorable replies as to the effect of prohibition in the homes of working people; better marital relations, less children's delinquency and malnutrition.

Likewise the Federal Council report, says the Britannica, "gives no support to the theory that prohibition has caused a moral breakdown among young people, and this conclusion is substantiated both before and since 1925. The wholesale charge that respect for law is being broken down by the want of observance of the prohibition law rests upon a gratuitous assumption."

Jane Addams, founder of Hull House, a social settlement in the slums of Chicago, testifies: "Here we used to watch whiskey and beer being left at saloons by the dayload. The poverty and suffering from drink were appalling. There is such a difference now, that it seems like another world. Our poor are moving away into better places. . . . Drinking has decreased and so has our work for rehabilitating families wrecked through intemperance."

Wilfred W. Fry, president of N. W. Ayer and Son, one of the largest advertising agencies in the world, in a statement under date of September 14, says, "We have cancelled our ten year old agree-

ment with the Canada Dry Ginger Ale, Inc., a highly valued client, following the client's decision to engage in the manufacture and distribution of beer and whiskey after repeal.

In explaining his position, Mr. Fry continues: "The return of liquor will divert an important share of America's mass purchasing power from essential commodities. This diversion may run as high as twenty per cent, based on pre-prohibition experience and the trend of economic and sociological conditions since the eighteenth amendment was adopted.

"The moral question involved in repeal can be left out entirely, but from a purely business standpoint, we still cannot see a very happy result in the return of liquor."

"It is true that revenue from alcohol will contribute many millions of dollars to Federal, State and local treasuries, but this contribution, in the main, will be made by that class of the public which can least afford to make it. This was true before prohibition, and it will unquestionably be true when prohibition is repealed.

"The liquor business has not changed. When the thirty-sixth state has been lined up, it will be run by the same old crowd in the same old way. x x x x

"Furthermore, we do not wish to classify our other clients with the liquor business."

Space does not permit our quoting other noted social thinkers and workers who deplore this backward step being taken by the United States, not only for the sake of our own nation, but for other nations who were watching with keen interest the working of prohibition in this country. Lady Astor, the Virginia-born member of England's Parliament, has always been an eloquent supporter of the cause of prohibition, speaking in this country as well as in Europe for the cause, and working for it in England for the promoting of better conditions among the poor and the protection of the child life of the nation.

Many who are advocating repeal in the hope of securing better conditions for temperance in America, should give pause when they read the following:

"The advertising of American brewers, now starting the country in the face and featuring attractive young women, is in line with the announced policy of British brewers," plainly declared by Sir Edgar Sanders, Director of the Brewers Society.

He says: "We want to get the beer drinking habit instilled into thousands, almost millions of young men who do not at present know the taste of beer. Unless you can attract the younger generation to take the place of the older men, there is no doubt that we shall have to face a steadily falling consumption of beer. It does look as if they (the working classes) . . . prefer to devote . . . surplus money . . . to . . . other attractions, and let the brewer go by the board."

It is regrettable that a recent beer advertisement, illustrating a young mother with a baby in her arms, and advising beer "for nursing mothers," employs unwarranted use of the name of the late Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, famous former Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, despite the fact that Dr. Wiley repeatedly warned the American people against the mischievous qualities of beer.

Under the headline "Duluth Drunkenness Arrests Jump 46 Per Cent During July," the Duluth Press says: "That drunkenness has greatly increased since the advent of beer is no longer seriously denied even by the wets who are in touch with conditions. . . . The liquor traffic's main hope is 'now that the facts may be kept from the general public. Hence the reticence of the wet press on the subject of liquor, arrests and the prevalence of drunkenness.' In going back to state control,

we have little to hope for in improved conditions. For the states separately cannot hope to cope with the liquor traffic when it is legally entrenched in neighboring states. Prof. Clark Warburton of Columbia University, says in "Economic Results of Prohibition," published October, 1932, page 262.

"Under prohibition, the working classes are consuming not more than half as much alcohol per capita as formerly," and "The expenditure of this class is probably a billion dollars less per year than it would be without national prohibition."

As regards our young people, let us hope they will be ruled rather by their admirations, by imitating their hero, Colonel Lindbergh.

The following item is from a cable news dispatch from Berlin, September 13:

At the Mayor's banquet in Stockholm, so the dispatch relates, a glass of "fire water called aquavit" was placed before the Colonel. . . . He took one look at the glass of aquavit and asked for milk, although, the dispatch concludes, "Such a choice was considered 'inconceivable' by his drinking fellow banqueters."

While the states are voting for repeal, it is an alarming fact that less than one-third of the total possible vote in twenty-nine repeal states has been recorded on that question. Thirty million men and women must be regarded as "stay-at-homes."

Can it be possible that America is having a national moral slump similar to Germany, but evidenced in a different way, by an indifference to so vital an economic and social question?

a distillery and made (the mentioned a famous old brand). There is plenty of it in my basement."

Later, at a Republican state convention this man, although he refrained from drinking himself, was frequently seen in the "entertainment room," where liquor of various varieties was freely dispensed. A few months later this same Republican politician was appointed to direct the national enforcement agency.

The record of prohibition enforcement is revolting to the senses of straight-thinking Americans. The great majority of the people, as manifested by the repeal votes in 33 states, are sick and tired of this "noble experiment," which has bred nothing but corruption and disrespect for law. The bone-dry still plead blindly for another chance to show that prohibition can be made effective. But hasn't twelve long years been a fair trial?

For Repeal

BY BLACKBURN W. JOHNSON

ALTHOUGH prohibition fails miserably to accomplish its purpose, it is costing the federal government (to say nothing of the state and local governments) millions of dollars each year and imposing an unnecessarily heavy burden on taxpayers.

The budget estimate for the Bureau of Prohibition of the Department of Justice for the current fiscal year amounts to \$10,250,000.

Such an expenditure would be justified, if it accomplished its purpose—to prevent the manufacture, sale and consumption of intoxicants; but the facts show that the liquor traffic continues with little or no abatement.

As Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, recently pointed out in an article in Liberty magazine:

"If we had wished to find a way to aid the liquor traffic, the Eighteenth Amendment has shown itself to offer the precise method by which we might best do so. Under it the traffic in alcoholic liquors has become nationwide. In the Wickersham report the lowest estimate of this traffic for a single year was \$2,815,000,000, which ranks it one of the country's greatest industries. This traffic is highly profitable and wholly free from tax, except as forced payments are made illegitimately by violators to public officials. If the federal and state governments taxed this traffic, we should not be called upon for any income taxes whatever."

While a large item of expense in itself, the cost of maintaining the Bureau of Prohibition is a mere drop in the bucket compared to the amount of revenue the government is losing because of its failure to derive any revenue whatsoever from the liquor traffic.

Revenue Lost

Suppose the excise tax placed a tax of 25 per cent, which would not be exorbitant, on all alcoholic beverages. Accepting the conservative estimate of the Wickersham commission as a basis for figuring, we find that such a tax would bring into the government coffers more than \$700,000,000 a year.

Instead, we have been throwing this revenue to the winds and paying out many millions of dollars more in futile efforts to enforce a law which is unenforceable by its very nature.

A "noble experiment," indeed—and such a costly one that this country can ill afford to continue it!

Now let us review the accomplishments of our expensive prohibition slayers.

During the fiscal years 1920 to 1932 inclusive, they brought a grand total of 595,104 cases in the federal courts, according to statistics published in the World Almanac. The number of convictions for this period is not given. But for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1932, there were 488 convictions for each acquittal.

The federal prisons have been filled to overflowing and in the last few years the federal government has found it necessary to appropriate \$7,000,000 for new or enlarged prison facilities. The Department of Justice reports that there are three times as many prisoners now as in 1921. Nearly two-thirds of the cases clogging our court machinery and congesting our prisons are said to be due to violations of the Eighteenth Amendment. All this means more unnecessary expense for the government. It is estimated that 56 per cent of all federal government funds for the administration of criminal justice goes toward prohibition enforcement.

Liquor Still Plentiful

Despite this record, however, intoxicants are still easily obtainable. Attracted by the huge profits in an unlicensed, unregulated and untaxed business, more and more men enter upon the nefarious careers of bootleggers, moonshiners, rum runners and hijackers. They are undeterred by the chance of arrest, conviction and a term in prison. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, the federal prohibition department seized 700 per cent more illegal liquor than during the first year of prohibition. But did that put an end to the liquor traffic. Indeed, it did not.

Writes the Wickersham commission:

"Whiskey of good quality is obtainable substantially everywhere at prices not extravagant for persons of means. It is true many persons cannot afford these prices and for them a large amount of cheap, poor grade, or even poisonous liquor is constantly produced and is in general circulation. The conclusion is that enforcement is not reaching the sources of production and distribution so as materially to affect the supply."

Doubtless, many of the employees of the Prohibition Bureau are conscientious, upstanding men of good judgment; but it is also true that many of them have had unsavory records and have deported themselves in shameful manner.

A Bloody Record

One of the darkest pages in our governmental records is the list of killings, many if not most of them utterly unwarranted. Time and again dry slouts have been reported firing on innocent persons, in numerous instances with fatal results. But whether the quarry be innocent or guilty, it is difficult to understand upon what ground a prohibition agent has the right to take human life, unless it be in self defense.

Records show that 175 civilians had been killed in connection with the enforcement of prohibition up to June 30, 1932. The number of prohibition investigators slain was 79, less than half the number of civilians.

Such a record, in our humble judgment, counter-balances any of the vaunted claims of extreme dries that prohibition has been a great civilizing influence. Indeed, a nation is in a bad way when it hires and arms men to menace the lives of its citizens.

Corruption

By its very nature, prohibition invites corruption in many forms and both in high and low places. The writer makes this statement, not from hearsay, but from his own knowledge.

I have seen policemen in a North Carolina city drink freely of liquor which they had seized in a raid and which they were holding as evidence. I have seen the chief of police of a large city curry the favor of a man of influence by sending him "choice stock" out of his own locker, which contained the best whiskey his men seized in their raids.

In Albany, N. Y., where the writer worked for several years, speakeasies and beer flats flourished openly, although a number of federal enforcement officers were quartered in the city.

On a corner near my rooming house was a neighborhood restaurant which, besides selling food, also dispensed beer. There were a number of German families in the neighborhood and the proprietor of the restaurant found that they demanded beer and, unless he could supply it, he might as well close his business. He prided himself in the quality of the beer he sold; in fact, sometimes he turned his customers away because he was unable to obtain beer which came up to his standards. He never sold hard liquors and never allowed lawlessness in his place. The writer admits frankly that he visited the place many times and found the food delicious and the beer delectable.

True and again prohibition agents came to the cafe for their meals. They not only ate heartily, but drank of the beer in large quantities. When they were through they paid the proprietor, not with money, but with smirking "Thanks." About once a year the proprietor was arrested for violating the prohibition laws. It was a matter of form, it seemed, for the dry slouts to turn him up ever so often. But he always managed to avoid going to prison.

Another incident which occurred in Albany:

A prominent Republican leader of the State of New York was talking with a group of newspaper men. Some of the reporters were saying him about his pronounced dryness.

"Well," said the Republican politician, "you know I have to stand by my party's platform. But you boys come to see me sometime. You know my folks used to own

A "BONE DRY" RECANTS

The Prohibition Forum, Franklin Press, Franklin, N. C.

In differing with the senior editor I wish to assure her that her ardent stand for the present law was once my own. I think the only reason she holds to hers is that she has no conception of the amount of alcohol consumed in this one trifling area, (it being the instant of Evil to sneak to cover when Good passes by), but which is a fair index of the nation-wide situation.

The city where I was brought up had very high license, so there were only a few saloons, well regulated. Neither I nor any member of my immediate family used stimulants of any kind. I first became aware of the horrors of the traffic in St. Louis, where the suffering of destitute women and children was appalling.

Traveling in North Carolina I recall especially the environs of various railroad stations. It is not likely that any lady ventured after dark on those squalid streets. When this state "went dry," I was very thankful, and I saw the same transformation take place in Miami when Dade county voted out the saloon. It did make a vast improvement; respectability re-possessed foul streets, and as there were, at first, no organized purveyors of poison, drinking actually did decrease. Then the experience during mobilization built up a great but deceptive hope in the hearts of millions of us, culminating in the eighteenth amendment.

What we "Drys" never considered, and WOULD NOT HAVE BELIEVED POSSIBLE, has happened. Otherwise eminently respectable citizens have leagued themselves with criminals for the sake of a drink; arguing their right to any beverage they desire, and never acknowledging that you cannot render ONE law impotent, without jeopardizing ALL. Exactly what has happened, as our crime wave demonstrates, rolling higher and higher, day by day and year by year.

If you suggested to a neighbor that he was backing a chain burglary system, with a few incidental murders thrown in, he would be rightly indignant. Yet that same man will brag of his patronage of the arch fiends of bootlegery. That is why prohibition has no chance of being enforced. Mr. and Mrs. John Doe and the junior Does, millions strong, are supporting the greatest criminal organization the civilized world has ever known. They have straddled their country in its most vital spot, the Constitution—turned traitor to assuage a thirst.

Since it is proven that neither patriotism, nor religion, nor charity toward their fellowmen, will dissolve this sinister partnership, we "Drys" are forced to abandon our glorious hope, and do what we can to salvage our country's honor, to restore confidence in our courts and security to our highways.

Let us vote to restore liquor, sold through dispensaries, and continue to work for genuine temperance through the coming generation. Kipling was wrong about "the white man's burden" which is not responsibility for the black or brown or yellow man, but the curse of his own insatiable thirst.

With all respect to Madame Editor, I continue to remain her admiring friend.

BONE DRY

Letter-Press

Friends of Mr. Bryson, as well as The Press-Maconian will appreciate this message of good will from across the continent.

"Sedro Woolley, Wash. "Oct. 9, 1933.

"Editor, Franklin Press, "Franklin, N. C.

"Dear Sir:

"The Press is still a welcome visitor to our place, so find enclosed a P. O. money order for \$1.50 for which please set my subscription ahead for another year.

"Best wishes to you, and all my old friends in good old Macon county.

"GEO. E. BRYSON."