Springfield, Illinois
September 26th 1930

Dear Miss Tarbell:-

A few days ago the October issue of the Delineator, which, my wife takes, came to our home, and I noticed the third name among the contributors, was one that always arouses pleasant memories, so I told my wife I would read aloud Ida M. Tarbell's article. Even though I felt inclined to write what came into my thoughts at the time I decided to wait a few days and reread it again before doing so. I have taken time tonight to carry out that plan and trust you will at least glance over this before consigning it to the ample waste basket, very writer of your prominence must have at hand. I will at least have the satisfaction of relieving my own mind.

I was glad to see you used in the most part individual cases, and that is an advantage. Too much is general and not enough specific. When masses of people and millions and often billions of dollars are so freely discussed, it is far beyond the comprehension of most people.

The case of the ~~of the~~ drunken woman of the next door stoop, came very close home to me. For several years my wife has employed an Irish cook, from time to time, and nothing could please her better than to keep her permanently, if she could be kept sober, as she is one of the most competent workers she has ever had, but in spite of her promises and even vows on her bended knees, appealing to the Holy Virgin and the saints, that she would not drink again, after a few pay days she returns in such a condition her retention is impossible. I have gotten her out of the City Prison and paid her fine, but she cannot be impressed to rely on that Divine help, that took away the appetite and upheld my father, as I told you some time ago. I enclose a similiar case of more recent years, and every Salvation Army or Gospel Mission Hall can cite hundreds of similiar ones. Those who have not experienced it, cannot realize the strength of that terrible appetite. At least you must agree that the 18th Amendment and the Volstead law are not cause of your or our cases.

In your next case, the reputed wealth of the bootleggers is not the rule among them, as Judge Fitzhenry of our U.S. District Court has testified to in most of the cases that come before him, and he has handled a great many. I know there are exceptions, but their career is generally short, as is the case with most criminals.

The guess of Mr Gebbart as to the amount spent for booze may be as near the mark as any body else, and anybody elses may be as good as his, for in all cases it is merely a guess. As he deals in Billions, we will dismiss that as not in the line of specific cases.

I think your next case was the tampted woman, out of her job and offerred a glittering reward to solicit for booze orders. I am glad your kindly advice

Digital Images, 2010. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library.

strengthened her to resist, and how blessed it would be if when others under the temptation to sell their soul and body for temporary gain, could have such a friend as you proved to be, to go to help in trying times.

The case of "Jimmie" is not an uncommon one. But it seems to me your decuction and flaming charge "that the crime of crimes is what prohibition is doing to our youth" is hardly fair. Were conditions better in the days of the licensed saloon? I just read today the report of a commission made after a survey of the dance halls in Chicago in 1912, of the number of these resorts, the ages of their patrons and the fact that in nearly every place well patronized bars were conducted. You can find similiar reports made that far back and even farther, even in New York, if you care to do so. They certainly were not the result of prohibition. Yet you seem to blame t the delinquency of youth today to the 18th Amendment and the Volstead law. They must be repealed to save our boys and girls. The enclosed statement of the criminals in Illinois shows the average age is higher instead of lower. But I am not to refer to statistics. even in the face of the charge of the New York judge.

You grow eloquent over the suggestion of Dwight Morrow that the country goes back to try over again the plans that have been tried and failed. He is no doubt a capable and agreeable man, and Will Rogers says he could have been nominated if he had run as a Bolshevik. He may be like many who off hand want the 18th Amendment and enforcing laws repealed so personal liberty will not be interfered with. But when when asked if they want their sons, employees or customers to do the drinking are indignate at the suggestion. If he has no son, he has a fine son-in-law, and certainly would not want him to be the one to consume the "stuff". They all say "The Saloon MUST NOT COME BACK." Theywant Uncle Sam to be the Saloon Keeper. Thank God he has gone out of the partnership, and will not go back in. You remember not very long ago, any enlisted man in the Army could be detailed to act as bar tender in the Army Canteen, wether he wanted to or not. And in the Navy grog rations were served to all the men. Would you want to see those days back? Well they will not be. I am glad the Saloon was outlawed by the votes of the men. Now with the added votes of women, it will never return. Once it was LEGAL, now an OUTLAW hiding away in out of way places and transporting its liquor under cover of the night.

When President Atterbury of the Pennslyvania System applies "repeal" to the prohibition regulation on his lines, which I have always understood was the pioneer along that line, then people might consider his effort to repeal the 18th Amendment consistent. Also when the DuPont's make it a condition for emplyment in their powder factories that the men must drink booze, their anxiety to make others do so, may impress the people that their only desire to restore the government to revenue from

Digital Images, 2010. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library.

intoxicating liquor, to be something more than a desire to remove the necessity for their firm to pay millions in income taxes.

These considerations brings to mind the fact that when Prohibition Party was organized in 1869 to fight the giant liqour traffic they were confronted by a age long institution entrenched behind three apparently impregnable fortifications, APPETITE, GREED and LAW. The traffic was legal and every seller was entitled to a PERMIT FROM THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT to carry on his body wrecking, Home destroying, soul damniug business. Its efforts were ridiculed, but it kept up its work, backed up by the prayers of the Godly women of the W.C.T.U. The two principle planks for which we fought have been incorporated in the Constitution, the 18th and 19th, as well as others which were first proposed in the platforms of the Prohibition party. What I want to emphasize by this is, that the LEGAL SCANCTION behind which the liquor traffic was apparently so securely intrenched, has been captured and is now erected against the liquor traffic itself. Those who are now so fiercely endeavouring to regain their former defence, by appealing to States Rights, will find their efforts futile. That plea was settled on the battle fields of 1861 to 1865 FOREVER. Appetite and greed are still facing the enemies of the liqoor traffic.

The matter of greed includes not alone the ones who make and sell the accur= sed stuff, but they are now reinforced by the millionaires who are willing to encour= age and finance them, in order to blind the voters to again permit the government to share in the debauchery of its citizens for part of the plunder of the trade. Canada is trying this now, and each year demonstrates more clearly the folly and destruction of this plan.

In a former letter I asked you why you with your brilliant mind and wide literary experience did not help frame a substitute to improve conditions, but did not see any suggestion from your pen. Also no other oppon ent of Prohibition has offerred anything that has not been tried and failed. I see Senator Wheeler, who claims he was a former dry, has pronounced the present laws a failure.

WE now have the first President who has given any constructive encourage= ment to enforcing the law. Naturally what chance has there been, with two Departments at loggerheads over the details, and many of the officers in spirit opposed to the principle involved, and state and local politicians still trying to defeat its suc= cess. Yet in spite of it all I have been surprised that so much has been accomplish= ed in the space of ten short years. Those of us who have been in the fight, knew what we were up against. Some of Anti-Saloon views, vainly thought all that had to be done was to tell the liqoor crowd, NOW BE GOOD, and they would immediately obey. I need not tell you that the first resistance to the governement under our first President was from the WHISKEY crowd, when Washington had to call out 17 000 troops

Digital Images, 2010. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library.

to enforce a reasonable excise law. From that day to this, no law to regulate the traffi has ever been respected by those who make and sell intoxicating liquor. Those who attemp to enforce the law will be treated, as President Hoover is now being, by the Rascob's and their dupes. They regard no law of God or man when it goes against the liquor busi= ness. In spite of their appeals to some detatched and misconstrued paggages in the Bible its condemnation of strong drink and wine are unmistakable and clear.

I was greatly surprised at your suggestion that the friends of the 18th Amendment should now meekly surrender the fruits of a century of struggle. We are not like Davy Crocke coou and "come down if you are going to shoot". The other fellows are now up the tree and we "have the gun". I acknowledge that many so called drys have gone to sleep on the job, but as they see their supposed ally and friend , the Republican party, taking the same attitude as the Democratic party, they will wake up and show the same spirit of John Paul Jones, with a sinking ship and many casualities in men, reply to the call to surren der, "We have just commenced to fight. Apparently the position of the Whig and Democrat on the slavery issue are being reenacted, and there will be a rearrangement of forces, and a new party with a new Lincoln , who did care wether the slavery question was voted up or voted down, will arise, and his prediction come true, "Happy that nation that neither slave or nor drunkard" are held or made by law.

If you have read so far, I ask in closing that you read the enclosed articl from the September issue of The Presbyterian Magazine, by Lawrence F. Abbott. Can you suggest any other than these four methods?

Your sincere friend

Isaac R. Diller

Digital Images, 2010. The Ida M. Tarbell Collection, 1890-1944, Allegheny College Pelletier Library.