

New York Prohibitionist



Think NY Vote Dry

November 2021

Volume 4 #9

A Vision for the Future

In these trying times, the Prohibition Party of New York continues its work to advocate for positive policies and advance social reform. We offer a vision for a better future for New York. A vision for a new approach to governance focused on moral principle, public service, and advancing the public wellbeing. A vision of a state filled with healthy, prospering communities, and greater opportunity for all New Yorkers. If you are interested in helping to make a positive impact on your state and your community, consider joining the Prohibition Party of New York.

"We all should rise, above the clouds of ignorance, narrowness, and selfishness."
Booker T. Washington

State Party Conference Call Held

On November 6th, the New York Prohibition Party held a statewide conference call for party members and supporters to discuss state party efforts going into the coming year.

Here is a summary of the main things which occurred during the conference call:

We had discussed looking to further develop the state-level party organization and fill positions. R.T. Cooper had volunteered to be considered for state vice-chairman.

We had discussed looking to develop cooperative connections with local and state-level organizations that work on issues of interest to the party. This includes looking into finding ways to work with education and prevention groups, anti-alcohol groups, anti-tobacco groups, anti-drug groups, anti-gambling groups, and groups advocating for ballot access reform. State Chairman Makeley will be looking to get into contact with various groups in the state. Robert Emery had volunteered to look into anti-gambling and anti-tobacco groups in the state for

those who might be interested in collaborating with us.

We had discussed looking to try to organize local events to inform people about the harms of alcohol and tobacco. Mr. Cooper had mentioned that he was looking to organize some events next year in the Binghamton area.

There was some discussion of legislative advocacy efforts going forward. The party will continue to look for opportunities to advocate in favor of positive legislation and against policies that would negatively impact New Yorkers. This month and next month are an important period that will be a good time to try to contact state legislators and encourage them to propose bills that we would like to see passed.

There has been recent news about an effort by some to try to get the state legislature to undo the anti-democratic changes to ballot access laws that were snuck into last year's state budget. We will look to see what we can do to help in this effort.

We have some members who are working on developing new informational writings. We will have more news on these in the future.

We had discussed the party's efforts to run candidates for local offices. Mr. Makeley is looking into running for a position on his local school board next year.

These were the main points for the conference call. Overall, we had some productive conversation about the party's efforts going forward into the coming year.

"Organize, agitate, educate, must be our war cry." Susan B. Anthony



Statewide Proposals Decided by Voters

On November 2nd, New Yorkers across the state voted on 5 statewide ballot proposals. Proposal 1 proposed making several changes to the state's process of redistricting congressional and state legislative districts. Proposal 2 proposed amending the state constitution to add a section recognizing the right to clean water, clean air, and a healthy environment to the state bill of rights. Proposal 3 proposed removing the requirement that voters had to register at least 10 days before an election, so that the state legislature could opt to set a closer deadline or establish same-day voter registration. Proposal 4 proposed expanding the legislature's authority to set the standards for allowing absentee voting, so that the legislature could widen the number of acceptable reasons for requesting an absentee ballot or even establish no-excuse absentee voting. Proposal 5 proposed increasing the NYC Civil Court's jurisdiction from civil cases involving up to \$25,000 in value to cases up to \$50,000 in value.

A more detailed description of each of these proposals can be found in our October Issue: https://615c4beb-b241-4f4a-a6b4-a074dc02ce34.filesusr.com/ugd/2cc7be_881b65ece7c44f5893448b5ec29cbedd.pdf

New Yorkers voted overwhelmingly to pass Proposal 2 and Proposal 5, while the majority of voters rejected Proposals 1, 3, and 4. As a result, the state constitution will be updated to include additional protections for the environment and

public health, and the New York City Civil Courts will expand their jurisdiction. The things included in the three rejected proposals will not occur for the time being. Though it is possible that supporters of those changes may try to get them placed on the ballot in some future election at least a couple of years from now.

Sources: https://615c4beb-b241-4f4a-a6b4-a074dc02ce34.filesusr.com/ugd/2cc7be_881b65ece7c44f5893448b5ec29cbedd.pdf
[https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_1_Redistricting_Changes_Amendment_\(2021\)](https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_1_Redistricting_Changes_Amendment_(2021))
[https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_2_Environmental_Rights_Amendment_\(2021\)](https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_2_Environmental_Rights_Amendment_(2021))
[https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_3_Remove_10-Day_Advance_Voter_Registration_Requirement_Amendment_\(2021\)](https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_3_Remove_10-Day_Advance_Voter_Registration_Requirement_Amendment_(2021))
[https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_4_Allow_for_No-Excuse_Absentee_Voting_Amendment_\(2021\)](https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_4_Allow_for_No-Excuse_Absentee_Voting_Amendment_(2021))
[https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_5_NYC_Civil_Court_Jurisdiction_Amendment_\(2021\)](https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_5_NYC_Civil_Court_Jurisdiction_Amendment_(2021))

New York Moves Towards Better Protecting Public Health and Environment

New York has taken a step towards better protecting public health and the environment. On November 2nd, New Yorkers voted overwhelmingly to pass Statewide Ballot Proposal 2. As a result, the New York State Constitution will be amended to add a section recognizing the right to clean water, clean air, and a healthy environment to the state bill of rights. By adding this provision to the state constitution, it more clearly establishes the state's responsibility to protect both the health of the environment and the health of New Yorkers, and more clearly establishes the authority of the legislature to pass legislation towards that end.

The passage of this proposal is in some sense a victory for us. The principles of protecting public health and protecting the environment will be more clearly established in the state constitution, bringing it more in line with our vision of good governance. It helps to provide an additional basis for arguing in favor of bills, laws, and policies that would improve protections for public health, improve environmental protection, and restrict the ability of greedy corporations to harm New Yorkers. Given that the alcohol, tobacco, and other intoxicating industries often engage in practices that are damaging to land, water, and air, advocating for restrictions against them based on their environmental impact, could provide an avenue for enacting policies that would help to improve public health, the protection of natural

resources, and making clearer air and water.

Though the overall impact of this amendment remains to be seen. It remains to be seen what new legislation and policies will end up being advanced following it. It also remains to be seen how courts will interpret the right to clean air, water, and a healthful environment and thus what bounds will be set on the state legislature's ability to enact policies based on it.

Sources: [https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_2_Environmental_Rights_Amendment_\(2021\)](https://ballotpedia.org/New_York_Proposal_2_Environmental_Rights_Amendment_(2021))
<https://www.gothamgazette.com/state/10879-new-york-voters-constitutional-amendments-redistricting-voting-rights-clean-air-water>



Paul Pearson Passes

It is with a heavy heart that we must report that Paul E. Pearson of Jamestown, NY, had passed away on November 21st. Mr. Pearson was one of the notable prohibitionists in our state. For years, he had served as a board member of the Prohibition Trust Fund Association, helping to allocate money to support the Prohibition Party's efforts and the efforts of other temperance and prohibition supporting organizations.

Paul was born on February 21st, 1940, in Falconer, NY. He was the son of Edwin V. and Ethel Adams Pearson. He was a graduate of Falconer Highschool. He had operated Pearson's Market for over 50 years with his father, drove tractor trailer for Covenant Transport for 11 years, and after retirement, he worked at Brigiotta's in the deli for over 10 years. He attended Kidder Memorial United Methodist Church in Jamestown. He is survived by his wife, four children, ten grandchildren, 3 great grandchildren, his brother, a niece, and three nephews.

Source: <https://www.post-journal.com/obituaries/2021/11/paul-edwin-pearson/>

More Local Communities Move to Opt Out of Marijuana Sales

More communities in New York have been taking local action against marijuana. As we have mentioned, local communities have until the end of the year to vote to enact local bans on the sale of recreational marijuana. Last month, we had reported that over 220 communities have moved to opt-out of recreational marijuana sales. Since then, the number of local communities opting out has grown to over 360. Hopefully, even more communities will take action before the end of the year.

Sources: https://615c4beb-b241-4f4a-a6b4-a074dc02ce34.filesusr.com/ugd/2cc7be_881b65ece7c44f5893448b5ec29cbedd.pdf
https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1Vwy9IK6NunsR7NbtD_SwtMIPTR-cBHOu&ll=42.468412063760255%2C-77.90013315525844&z=9

Advancing Education

"Education plays a crucial role in our society. A quality education can aid in the intellectual and moral development of the population. It can aid in the development of knowledge, reason, and character. It can aid in the development of good citizenship and help enable people to be informed and active citizens of our republic. It is important for providing the skills and knowledge needed for people to pursue a variety of careers, to advance their own prosperity, and provide the work needed for the prosperity of our society.

It is to that end that the Prohibition Party supports the development of quality education in this country. That it supports a strong public education system, and educational options to help meet the different needs of children. That it supports a quality general education that teaches reading, writing, mathematics, science, history, and good citizenship. And that it encourages states to advance efforts to make tertiary education (including colleges, universities, vocational schools, and job training programs) affordable for all Americans.

There are a variety of ways in which Prohibition Party members can work to advance these ends. By paying attention to state legislative efforts, supporting bills that would help improve the quality of schools and libraries, and supporting bills to improve the availability and affordability of education. By being involved with your local school, library, college, or non-profit that helps to

advance education. By supporting efforts in local schools to educate youth on the harms of alcohol and other drugs. By running for your local school board. There is much that can be done on the grassroots level.”

Prohibition Party National Secretary
Jonathan Makeley

If there's a regulation that's saving 10,000 lives and costing one job, it's worth it.

The Need for Restricting Commerce

The prosperity of a society is not merely based in its material wealth, but in the wellbeing, quality of life, security, and cultivation of its people. The conduct of business and commerce is a major aspect of economic activity. It's important for the provision of many products and services and employment of many people. But the conduct of business and commerce is not necessarily a good thing, and does not always benefit the public. Its quality is pendent on what is being done, the merits of it, and its effect upon people. The primary function of a business is to generate profit an income for those who run it. In the process, it may end up benefiting others and the public at large. But that is not always the case. If those engaging in commerce are overcome by greed, indifferent to moral responsibility, and/or indifferent towers the effects their actions have on others, and are not restricted by ethical standards, they can end conducting business in ways which are dishonest, which cause harm to people, and which negatively impact society at large. Both history and present-day societies are full of examples of the evils that can come when greed and inhumanity are allowed to operate. Whether that be the antebellum institution of slavery (which abused and exploited millions of people for the profit of slaveholders), the alcohol and tobacco industry killing millions of people a year worldwide with their poisonous products, the inhuman exploitation of people by human traffickers, or any number of other unjust and exploitive actions.

Our republic was established so the people of our society could come together to protect our rights and advance our common interests. It was established not merely to protect us from the tyranny of a monarch, but to protect us from the

tyranny of abusive actions of individuals and private entities. When someone's actions cause harm to people, violate their human rights, or commit some grave wrong, they become a matter of public interest. The people have the legitimate ability to come together to establish rules restricting behaviors, to protect their lives, rights, and vital wellbeing against the abusive actions of individuals and private entities. This principle applies to the actions of people in business and commerce. This is why there needs to be laws that regulate and restrict business and commercial practices. A well designed and well enforced system of commercial laws (which sets standards of honest business practices, combats fraudulent behavior, promotes fair relations between employers and employees, and businesses and consumers, sets rules for the protection of the health and safety of people, prohibits harmful products, and prohibits the inhuman exploitation of people for profits) can work to greatly reduce various social ills and improve the wellbeing and prosperity of the public.

This understanding has long been expressed by supporters of alcohol prohibition. Alcohol is a toxic substance, which harms people and society. The commercial alcohol industry not only produces and supplies the harmful substance which causes these damages, but promotes its increased and continued use through, and works to oppose efforts to combat the harm of alcohol, for the sake of their own profit. As such, prohibitionists have advocated for laws to ban the commercial production and sale of alcohol. The principled prohibitionist is an enemy of unrestricted commerce and greed, and a friend of honest business and ethical legislation.



“If a store has contributed to community problems, we don't want it back.” Karen Bass, 1992, in reference to liquor stores in Los Angeles

Revelations on Alcohol Industry Misinformation Campaigns

A new study has come out in the Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs on how the alcohol industry has used corporate sponsored social aspects organizations to engage misinformation campaigns regarding alcohol and misdirect efforts to address alcohol problems. Researchers looked through documents within Truth Tobacco Documents Library for information regarding alcohol industry social aspects organizations (public relations organizations and other organizations that were meant to shape how the public and policy makers viewed and treated alcohol) from the end of national prohibition to contemporary times. They found that over the past several decades, the alcohol industry used public relations organizations to try to mislead members of the public and policy makers about the nature of the effects of alcohol, by framing alcohol-related problems as being caused merely individual excess and alcoholism, rather than a problem rooted in the general effects of alcohol. In the mid-20th century, alcohol companies worked to create a coalition throughout different sectors of the alcohol industry, so that they could coordinate and finance efforts to influence the public and lawmakers.

The alcohol industry used propaganda to mislead members of the public and policy makers into thinking that prohibitionist policies and other social level approaches weren't appropriate for dealing with alcohol problems, and that the alcohol industry didn't need to be restricted. The alcohol industry has funded carefully selected scientists to create studies designed to support their narrative at the expense of scientific integrity, so that they could create the appearance that their narratives were scientifically supported. In more recent decades, there has been a growing body of scientific research that have worked to shed light on the harms of alcohol and which have challenged and debunked claims of health benefits from alcohol that were the product of studies funded by the alcohol industry. In response, the alcohol industry has worked to engage in misinformation campaigns to limit public knowledge of research that challenges their narratives. The alcohol industry also

used its wealth and influence to try to shape public education in schools regarding alcohol: so that they could spread narratives that normalized alcohol use and played down the negative effects of drinking. The alcohol industry has used public relations and lobbying efforts to influence lawmakers into not enacting policies that would adversely affect alcohol industry profits and into enacting policies designed to benefit the alcohol industry. Overall, the study sheds light on some of the ways that the alcohol industry has spent the past several decades attempting to mislead the public, undermine science, and corrupt public policy for their own gain, in a manner similar to how the tobacco industry has.

Here are some of the notable passages from the study:

“There has been a scientific consensus for decades that the most effective ways to reduce alcohol harms are by increasing price and reducing availability (Babor et al., 2010; Bruun et al., 1975; Edwards et al., 1994), as they reduce overall consumption in the general population, which in turn reduces a wide range of problems, from liver disease to homicide and other forms of violence (Babor et al., 2010). Alcohol companies deny the value of reducing overall consumption and instead propose targeted approaches (McCambridge et al., 2018). National governments across the world have been slow to implement known effective policy measures, in part because of industry influence”.

“Alcohol industry “social aspects organizations” are corporate social responsibility initiatives that claim to contribute to reducing alcohol harms even though they oppose effective interventions, and subtly frame alcohol-related issues in line with industry interests”

“The LBI objectives were to fund scientific research to bolster the image of the industry and its products and to prevent distilled spirits from being regarded as the cause of alcoholism (see Box 1; Boxell, 1964). This approach was closely mirrored in H&K’s well-known work for the tobacco companies”

“LBI formed a Scientific Advisory Council in 1959 under the stewardship of carefully chosen scientists, including the disciplines of medicine, biochemistry,

education, physiology, psychiatry, psychology, and sociology (LBI, 1966). Like the TIRC, LBI identified itself as the “public relations and research organization of the liquor industry” (LBI, 1966), with funding scientific research central to the public relations strategy.”

“H&K evaluation identified extensive partnerships on alcohol education in schools and influence on legislation in the United States, alongside the research funding provided”

“Among the key stated conclusions were that the public accepted that alcoholism was a disease, and that prohibition or other restrictions on the industry were not appropriate responses (Boxell, 1964). The emphasis H&K placed on the importance of science as foundational to the industry’s public relations was thus very similar for both the distilled spirits and tobacco industries, and in both cases the programs were directed by H&K ... Science was mobilized to shape perceptions of the product, which in turn had key implications for public policy.”

“The internal DISCUS approach to public service advertising campaigns explicitly built on earlier historical continuities, defending the image of the product and denying the need for policy measures”

“Tobacco and alcohol interests, particularly at the instigation of the former, conceived of themselves as facing a common enemy of anti-product forces, which they associated with the “colossal failure” of prohibition (of both tobacco and alcohol, as vividly illustrated in Anderson, 1996). They conflated any public policies seeking to influence the overall level of consumption with prohibition.”

“Alcohol industry trade associations such as DISCUS and FIVS continue to promote the policy positions they have advocated for decades in opposition to the existential threat posed by population-level alcohol science, while at the same time espousing rhetorical commitments to evidence-based policy.”

“H&K was founded on the importance of managing the science in highly similar ways to the approach they developed for the tobacco companies, reproducing a playbook of key messages that have

endured for decades. The key tenets were accepted by other parts of the alcohol industry in facing the common enemy of public health and social welfare. The alcohol and tobacco industries have been deeply interwoven for decades in facing strategic threats to business interests. The science, which shows that the more alcohol consumed in a given society the higher the prevalence of a wide range of related problems (Babor et al., 2010; Bruun et al., 1975; Edwards et al., 1994), is unsurprising, yet it is still strongly attacked in alcohol industry public relations, as are the policy measures indicated by the evidence”

“This study adds to existing lines of evidence on the policy-related functions of the International Center for Alcohol Policies (Jernigan, 2012). Social aspects organizations have been shown here to be designed to manage public policy issues in order to safeguard business interests and not to act in the public interest, as is claimed”

“It is challenging to contemplate just how profoundly the alcohol industry may have biased what we think we know about alcohol.”

“This study changes our understanding of the alcohol industry, elucidating similarities and inter-relationships with the tobacco industry. Public health interests should be especially vigilant in respect of the subversion of science through efforts to unravel the consensus reached in the research community, to undermine the integrity of science by using research funding as an instrument of public relations, and to aggressively challenge research findings in the public domain. Contrary to the industry public relations narrative, enhanced personal awareness and attending to one’s own behavior are not sufficient to address the nature of the problem. It is not best prevented by education (Babor et al., 2010). Policy measures are needed that influence the social determinants of individual behavior and manage the alcohol industry in the public interest.”

You can access the full JSAD article on the study by this link:

<https://www.jsad.com/doi/pdf/10.15288/jsad.2021.82.740>

"The temperance movement centers on a recognition that alcohol is harmful to people and society, and a concern for the lives for the lives and wellbeing of people." Jonathan Makeley

Schrad, "Maybe Prohibitionists Were the Good Guys"

Recently, Politico published a new article by Lawrence Schrad titled, "Maybe Prohibitionists Were the Good Guys". In the article, he challenges the common anti-prohibitionist narrative where members of the American prohibition movement have been mischaracterized as villains. A narrative where those who supported the creation of national prohibition are portrayed as fanatical religious zealots, fringe elements, anti-democratic, and anti-freedom. Schrad points out that this narrative does not match with the actual history of the prohibition movement. He points out that the American Prohibition was one of the largest and most popular movements in American history, which included a diverse body of people, whose motivations for supporting prohibition were often based in a concern of the harms of alcohol and a recognition of the role that the alcohol industry's predatory behavior played in driving alcohol problems.

Here are some of the notable points and passages from the article:

"Drinkers are the good guys — we're told — prohibitionists are the villains. Trying to then explain how the 18th Amendment, which established the prohibition of alcohol in the U.S., was passed by bipartisan supermajorities in both houses in 1919, and ratified by 46 of 48 states — all in record time — usually devolves into hand-waving about women or the Great War, or outright conspiracy theorizing.

But what if prohibitionists weren't America's villains, but its heroes? What if we've been cheering for the wrong team?

The first thing to understand is that the temperance-cum-prohibition movement wasn't some quintessentially American lunatic fringe, but instead the most popular, most robust and most influential global social movement of the day, linked to the cause of liberation in every corner of the globe."

"from its very inception, the movement wasn't about sin-obsessed

puritans, but rather a backlash against "the most predatory and dangerous of all big businesses," in which unregulated liquor traffickers hooked their customers on a highly addictive substance, just like Big Pharma stoking the opioid crisis. In both cases, every market incentive drives the industry to maximize private profit by flooding the community with wares that destroy the public welfare."

"Abolitionists and African American communities likewise embraced temperance as necessary for individual and community emancipation — both white and Black — from liquor subordination."

"the movement for women's rights was born of temperance activism. Economically subordinate to their husbands, and legally powerless to oppose the saloons and dram sellers who preyed on their families for profit, women increasingly demanded political rights to defend their homes."

"All great reforms go together," Frederick Douglass claimed: Abolitionism, suffragism and temperance. The underlying political logic was the same: No American has the right to subjugate others for their own benefit. Prohibitionism wasn't an imposition, it was liberation."

"Teddy Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson and George Washington? That's all four of those great American leaders chiseled on Mount Rushmore — all arguably part of the prohibitionist movement to end the exploitation of man by man through liquor. Add them to a broad cross-section of Native American, African American and women's rights leaders, and you've got a surprisingly broad-based people's liberation movement that reflects the diversity and complexity of the United States itself — and nary an anti-democratic zealot among them."

"In the movie that is America, we're at the part where we're coming to realize that who we thought were the "good guys" at the beginning may not have been as good as we were told.

The counterpart is that perhaps the villains were not as bad as we were told, either.

Perhaps we've been rooting for the wrong team all along."

The full article can be accessed by this link:

<https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2021/11/21/prohibitionists-good-guys-523052>

Former Governor Cuomo Under Federal Investigation

There have been some recent developments regarding federal investigations into former governor Andrew Cuomo. Andrew Cuomo had resigned earlier this year following mounting revelations regarding his personal misconduct and misuse of position, in order to avoid being impeached from office. Even after his resignation, he still faces the prospect of being subject to criminal investigation and potential criminal prosecution for some of his misdeeds. More recently, it has been revealed that federal investigators have begun investigating accusations that Andrew Cuomo had sexually harassed multiple women. This work may build on the state-level investigation conducted by State Attorney General Leticia James, which concluded that Governor Cuomo had sexually harassed 11 women. Depending on how this investigation turns out, Cuomo could potentially end up facing federal charges. In addition, it has also been revealed that the Justice Department is moving forward to begin requesting information as part of an investigation into how Cuomo handled the coronavirus pandemic, including his administration misrepresenting the number of New Yorkers who died in nursing homes and Cuomo using state government resources to write a for-profit book on his handling of the pandemic.

Source: https://www.wivb.com/news/cuomo-under-fire/cuomo-under-federal-probe-over-sexual-harassment-covid-19-response/?utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=socialflow&utm_source=facebook.com&fbclid=IwAR34n15m8xFXQFxt0ST0dbwxEUuA5AMqvcxv4UxdhIncdazKjCFLmRTOE

