



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.

"If you wish to draw off the people from a bad or wicked custom, you must beat up for a march; you must make an excitement, do something that everybody will notice." Lewis Tappan

State and National News

The Prohibition Party continues to move forward on the state and national level. On June 28th, the Prohibition Trust Fund Association held its annual meeting in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, and made grants to various temperance organizations. The Prohibition National Committee appointed Gerard Davis as the new state contact person for the Prohibition Party in Arizona. Mr. Davis plans on working to organize a state-level Prohibition Party organization in the state.

In New York State, the Prohibition Party of New York continues its work. The state legislature ended its regular legislative session in June, without taking action on several important issues. The bills which we were encouraging the legislature to pass that didn't get acted on in this year's legislative session will need to be reintroduced in next year's legislative session. Though the coming months provide opportunities to organize and prepare for the coming year. We can work to find more opportunities to promote our party, to work to recruit new

members, and to further develop our state organization. With the coming state legislative election, we can work to help inform voters about important issues facing our state, and about which candidates for the state legislature are known to either be supportive or oppositional on those issues. We can work to reach out to candidates for state legislature to encourage them to support positive legislation, should they be elected. Through the combination of various efforts, we may be able to expand our impact on the state legislative process in next year's session.

Study Shows rising Alcohol Cirrhosis Rates

A new study has come out indicating that alcohol-related liver disease is on the rise in the U.S. Researchers in the American Journal of Medicine published the results of their investigation of data regarding alcohol-related liver disease from 1999-2019. They found that deaths from alcohol cirrhosis had increased significantly over this period: from 6,007 recorded deaths (3.3 per 100,000) among Americans 25 and older in 1999, to 23,780 deaths (10.6 per 100,000) in 2019. This indicates that recorded deaths from alcohol cirrhosis have more than tripled over the past few decades. Researchers and medical officials have identified some likely factors in the rise in alcohol-related liver disease: including, increased heavy drinking among segments of the population, people starting drinking early in life, more drinkers consuming more sugary alcoholic drinks, and increased rates of obesity.

The study's lead researcher, Dr. Charles Hennekens had stated that "The hypothesis is that people are drinking more and starting earlier in life, "and that this, combined with other unhealthy habits, this "leads to fatty liver."



Dietician and diabetes educator, Amanda Lane, stated that these findings are in line with what is commonly understood in the medical community. Lane had stated that "alcohol is first processed in the liver", that "excess alcohol intake puts strain" on the organ, and extra sugar and "excessive carbohydrate intake is linked to fatty liver."

More research will need to be done to better understand the comparative roles that various factors have played in these increases. Though the high increase in deaths from alcohol-related liver disease goes to show that more efforts need to be taken to address the problem of alcohol use.

Sources: [https://www.amjmed.com/article/S0002-9343\(22\)00400-4/fulltext](https://www.amjmed.com/article/S0002-9343(22)00400-4/fulltext)
<https://www.eatthis.com/news-worst-drinking-habit-fatal-liver-disease/>

FDA Bans Juul Products, Extends Public Comment Period for Proposed Menthol Ban

The FDA has been moving forward to take more action against the tobacco industry. On June 23rd, the FDA issued marketing denial orders to e-cigarette manufacturer Juul, for all their products currently marketed in the United States. As a result, Juul must stop selling all of their current products in the U.S., and any company that resells their products must remove them from the market. This rule will apply to the commercial sale of these products, and does not prohibit individuals from possessing or using Juul

products. This decision was based on a recognition that dangerous chemicals present within their products could be detrimental to public health.

The FDA is continuing to move forward with its process of trying to ban the sale of menthol cigarettes and flavored cigars. In April, the FDA announced that it would be proposing the adoption of new product standards and regulations on tobacco products that would ban the sale of menthol cigarettes and flavored cigars. These increased restrictions on tobacco sales would help to reduce the negative impacts on public health, by decreasing the risks of youth starting smoking and helping encourage current smokers to quit. The public comment period was initially going to be from May 4th to July 5th. But the FDA decided to extend the public commenting period an additional month. The public commenting period will now go until August 2nd. It is important that those who support stronger policies against tobacco continue to make their voices heard, so as to increase the likelihood that the FDA will move forward with these proposed regulations.

Here are some links to information regarding the proposed rules and how to comment on them.

On Banning Menthol Cigarettes:
<https://www.regulations.gov/document/FDA-2021-N-1349-0001>

On Banning Flavored Cigars:
<https://www.regulations.gov/document/FDA-2021-N-1309-0001>

Sources: https://mailchi.mp/ab8c9293ec2/sttac-july-newsletter-115589067fbclid=IwAR3za83uBxpYzPvVvA3N2xR_WpUOjdBms6vIWg5rhhEFQZIRPKCKZyExdDZo
<https://www.charlotteobserver.com/opinion/article263245198.html>
https://615c4beb-b241-4f4a-a6b4-a074dc02ce34.filesusr.com/ugd/2cc7be_b161b4ac6c3d4471ac622826a94c46a2.pdf
<https://halfwheel.com/fda-extends-comment-periods-for-proposed-flavored-cigar-menthol-cigarette-bans/409817/>



“The future belongs to those who believe in the beauty of their dreams” Addie Philko

New York Alternative Parties Suppressed and Excluded from Ballot

The ongoing struggle for alternative parties to gain and retain ballot access in New York has taken a negative turn, as electoral repression threatens to make it so that no candidates other than the Democratic and Republican candidates will be on the ballot for governor for the first time in over 70 years.

As we have reported previously, in 2020, the Cuomo administration and its coconspirators in the state legislature passed a set of anti-democratic changes to the state’s ballot access laws, aimed at removing alternative parties from the ballot and eliminating most choices for voters. These changes included increasing the number of signatures required for candidates of alternative parties without statewide ballot access and independent candidates to petition to get on the ballot for statewide office from 15,000 to 45,000. It also changed the requirement for alternative parties to gain and maintain statewide ballot access recognition: changing the requirement from a party needing to get 50,000 votes in each gubernatorial election for 4 years of statewide ballot access, to requiring a party to get 130,000 votes or 2% of the total vote (whichever is more) in each gubernatorial and presidential election, in order to gain 2 years of statewide ballot access. Overall, making the requirement over 3 times as difficult as they previously were.

The previous ballot requirements had already been some of the highest in the country. These new changes work to make it almost impossible for alternative parties to run candidates for statewide office. Since the adoption of these anti-democratic changes to the state’s ballot access laws, four parties (Green, Libertarian, Independence, and S.A.M.) lost their statewide ballot access status. This leaves only the Democratic, Republican, Conservative, and Working Families Parties with statewide ballot access status. Though with this, the Conservative Party mostly nominates the same candidates as the Republican Party, the Working Families Party mostly nominates the same candidates as the

Democratic Party, and the Conservative and Working Families Parties will be backing the Republican and Democratic candidates for Governor this year.

Despite the difficult odds, several alternative parties attempted to petition to get their candidate on ballot for governor this year. Those were the Independence, Green, Unite NY, Libertarian, Freedom, New Visions, and Parent Parties. The Independence and Parent’s parties sought to place eventual Republican nominee Lee Zeldin on their ballot line. Unite NY sought to get Harry Wilson on the ballot. The Green Party had once again nominated Howie Hawkins for Governor and the Libertarian Party nominated its 2018 Gubernatorial candidate Larry Sharpe. The Freedom Party sought to place Skiboky Stora on the ballot and the New Visions Party sought to place Carole Anne Seidelman on the ballot.

These parties’ efforts were further complicated by the fallout from the redistricting process. After the State Court of Appeals struck down the gerrymandered Congressional district maps designed by the state legislature earlier this year, a new set of Congressional district maps were created. The requirements for petitioning to get on ballot for state office include having to gather a minimal number of signatures in at least half of the state’s congressional districts. So, when the Congressional districts were changed late into the petitioning period, it made it difficult for petitioners to know many signatures needed in gathered in each area. Typically, in this situation, a state would either reduce the signature requirements for the specific election, extend the time of the petitioning period, or suspend the distribution requirements. But neither the state legislature nor state courts took action to grant relief to alternative parties petitioning to get on the ballot (despite having the ability and legal precedent to do so).

Despite the lack of relief, several parties still did what they could to gather signatures and submitted petitions for statewide candidates. But their hopes were dashed, when agents of the state’s Democratic Party leadership issued challenges to all of the Gubernatorial

petitions. As a result, several petitions ended up getting denied. As a result, currently only the Democratic and Republican candidates for Governor are expected to be on the ballot for Governor. The Green and Libertarian Parties have ongoing lawsuits challenging the ballot access restrictions and seeking to have their candidates placed on the ballot. Hopefully, their legal challenges will succeed, so that the voters in the state can at least have some more options. But if they don't get judicial relief, we will end up having an election with only the Democratic and Republican candidates for Governor for the first time in 76 years.

The fact that we have gotten to this point shows how far our state's democratic system has eroded in recent years. The point of an election is for voters to be able to express their will regarding how their government should be run and who should be tasked to act as elected public servants. When restrictions are placed to prevent alternative parties and independent candidates from being able to get on the ballot, it undermines the ability of citizens to participate in the democratic process and express their will through voting. New York State has had a long-standing heritage of alternative party participation, where we have often had several different parties providing options for voters. But anti-democratic elements within the major parties have sought to end this: to create a system where the only people that voters have the option of voting for on the ballot are the candidates they approve of, where alternative voices are repressed and excluded from the electoral process, and where districts are so gerrymandered as to almost guarantee the election of certain candidates. Too many people within the state legislature and state courts have remained apathetic to this and have declined to action to help remedy this.

These anti-democratic elements which have distorted our state's political process need to be stopped. The citizens of New York who believe in the principles of democracy and free political participation must stand up and demand that the damages done to our electoral system be fixed. This should not only New Yorkers who are independents or members of alternative parties. New Yorkers who are Democrats and Republicans should take a

stand and demand that the leadership of their parties stop supporting and tolerating the desecration of our electoral system and that those who were involved in the conspiracy. The politicians that lead the conspiracy to change our state's ballot access laws deserve to be voted out of office and removed from any position of leadership they have in their parties. New Yorkers of all political affiliations should work to urge members of the state legislature to take action. We must work to repeal the 2020 ballot access changes and establish fairer ballot access rules, so that alternative parties and independent candidates have a reasonable opportunity to get on the ballot, and voters are more able to vote for the candidate of their choice.

Sources: <https://www.syracuse.com/politics/2022/07/nv-governors-race-will-have-only-2-candidates-for-first-time-in-decades.html>
<https://ballot-access.org/2022/07/02/new-york-newspaper-publicizes-that-2022-will-be-first-gubernatorial-election-in-eighty-years-with-only-two-candidates-on-ballot/>
<https://ballot-access.org/2022/06/11/two-new-york-petitioning-parties-blast-democratic-party-for-challenging-all-statewide-petitions/>
<http://yonkerstimes.com/seven-independent-political-parties-submit-petitions-to-get-gubernatorial-candidates-on-ballot-in-ny/>
https://615c4beb-b241-4f4a-a6b4-a074dc02ce34.filesusr.com/ugd/2cc7be_b161b4ac6c3d4471ac622826a94c46a2.pdf
<https://ballot-access.org/2022/06/30/june-2022-ballot-access-news-print-edition/>
<https://ballot-access.org/2022/06/30/june-2022-ballot-access-news-print-edition/>

Adding Insult to Injury for the Independence Party

The state legislature has added further insult to injury for New York's Independence Party. The Independence Party was one of the four political parties that lost statewide ballot access recognition in 2020, following the passage of a set of anti-democratic changes to the state's ballot access laws. This year, the state legislature passed a bill banning the use of the words Independent or Independence in the name of any qualified party. The bill does not ban candidates using independent nominating petitions from using the word on their ballot line, and the Independence Party could still use its name for its candidates seeking to get on the ballot using independent nominating petitions. Though if the Independence Party manages to regain its statewide ballot access and recognition by the state as a qualified party, then the Independence Party would be required to change the party's name.

Sources: <https://ballot-access.org/2022/06/15/new-york-legislature-passes-bill-banning-independence-and-independent-in-party-names/>
<https://www.syracuse.com/politics/2022/07/nv-governors-race-will-have-only-2-candidates-for-first-time-in-decades.html>

"Greatness lies, not in being strong, but in the right using of strength; and strength is not used rightly when it serves only to carry a man above his fellows for his own solitary glory. He is the greatest whose strength carries up the most hearts by the attraction of his own." Henry Ward Beecher



Supreme Court Case Threatens To Unleash Congressional Gerrymandering

The Supreme Court has taken on a case that could have a significant effect on the ability of state governments and courts to take action against the gerrymandering of congressional districts and voter suppression. The case, *Moore v Harper*, 21-1271, involves a dispute over North Carolina redistricting. The North Carolina State Supreme Court struck a congressional redistricting plan passed by the state legislature: ruling that the State Constitution prohibits partisan gerrymandering and ordered that new congressional districts be drawn. Some legislators are challenging the ability of the North Carolina State Supreme Court to evaluate election laws that affect federal elections, by using a faulty legal theory to claim that Article 1 of the Constitution forbids state courts from intervening in the matter.

The challengers are arguing their case based on the 'Independent State Legislature Theory'. Article 1, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution states that, "The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations." The proponents of the Independent Legislator Theory claim that this section should be interpreted to mean that the legislative houses of a state government have the sole power to set laws for federal elections, that no other parts of the state government have a say in those election laws, that state legislators are not required to follow the provisions of their

state constitutions, and that state courts do not have the authority evaluate state election laws for federal elections.

This is an absurdly narrow interpretation of Article 1 Section 4, that goes against both historical and modern understandings of it what means. There is historical evidence to show that the writers of the constitution meant the term legislature to refer to the entire lawmaking apparatus of the state government, and not merely the state legislative houses. The U.S. Supreme Court has already ruled in previous cases that the term “legislature” refers to all parts of a state government that are involved in exercising legislative power. As such, any part of the state government that has been granted a role in establishing and managing state election laws (whether that be executive officials, independent redistricting commissions, state courts, or other institutions granted a role by a state’s constitution and laws). Another problem with the independent state legislature theory is that it would effectively assert that a state legislature does not have to follow a state’s constitution when establishing districts or making laws for handling federal elections in their state. The power of state legislators is not limitless. The parameters of their power are in large part defined by state constitutions: which can outline the roles that state legislators (and other parts of the state government) play in the process of establishing election districts and state election laws, as well as set state constitutional standards that the legislature is supposed to follow when redistricting or changing state election law. Those state constitutions also generally grant state courts the power to review state laws, to ensure that they are consistent with the state constitution. In the case of North Carolina, the state constitution explicitly grants the State Supreme Court the power to review state election district maps and to order them to be redrawn if the maps don’t meet constitutional standards. Acceptance of the independent state legislator theory would undermine state constitutional order and balance of power within state governments, and would impair the ability of state courts to protect the constitutional rights of voters.

The Moore v Harper case is concerning. If the U.S. Supreme Court were to overrule previous court precedent and rule in favor of the challengers in this case, then they could end up granting formal recognition to the Independent State Legislature Theory in some form. In its more extreme form, this interpretation could give state legislators a far greater ability to engage in partisan gerrymandering in Congressional elections and engage in electoral suppression in Congressional, Senate, and Presidential elections (even if such actions violated state constitutions). It would make it so that state courts would no longer be able to intervene against congressional gerrymandering, state or other misuses of power by state legislators in federal elections. It could greatly reduce the ability of state courts to intervene against voter suppression laws, unfair ballot access laws, and acts of electoral suppression, at least when it comes to federal elections. Citizens would have to rely on federal courts to intervene. It could also bring an end to the ability of states to use independent redistricting commissions to design new congressional districts. Even in its more moderate form, this interpretation could block state courts from ordering the redesigning of Congressional districts found to be unconstitutional and constrain the ability of state courts to evaluate state election laws. Hopefully, the justices on the Supreme Court will be sensible enough to reject this misguided theory and uphold that state courts have the ability to evaluate and rule on the constitutional validity of congressional districts and state election laws.

Source: <https://ballot-access.org/2022/06/30/u-s-supreme-court-accepts-north-carolina-case-on-the-meaning-of-article-one-and-the-word-legislature/>
<https://thirtyeight.com/features/how-the-supreme-court-could-turbocharge-gerrymandering-just-in-time-for-2024/>
<https://www.governing.com/next/the-supreme-court-case-that-could-end-american-democracy>
<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript>
<https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/politics/why-republicans-want-to-redefine-one-word-in-the-constitution/ar-AAZeZF7ocid=msedgntp&cvid=2b3ce0d5b5e444d6a587e758215adf43>

“These words are addressed to the prohibitionists who believe in the principles here enunciated, and propose to support those principles at the ballot-box. We are enlisted for the war, and the struggle will be a long and desperate one before our principles can be fully engrafted upon the laws of the land.” John N. Stearns

Studies Links Marijuana Use to Heart Disease and emergency Hospitalization

Some new studies have come out regarding the negative effects of marijuana use and health. One study, conducted by researchers at Stanford Medicine, looked at the connection between marijuana use and heart disease. They found that the THC in marijuana causes inflammation of endothelial cells inside of blood vessels and contributed to atherosclerosis. Researchers looked at genetic and medical data from 500,000 people. They found that those who smoked marijuana at least once a month were significantly more likely to experience a heart attack, after controlling for other factors. They found that users were also more likely to experience a heart attack before the age of 50.

Another study conducted by a group of Canadian researchers looked into the rate of emergency room visits for marijuana users. Researchers looked at the medical records of 30,000 people. They found those who used marijuana were 22% more likely to end up in the emergency room, than non-users were. This increased rate of emergency room visits held, even after adjusting the analysis to account for 30 other potential contributing factors. The leading reasons for emergency room visits among marijuana users were found to be physical body injuries and respiratory problems.

Sources: https://med.stanford.edu/news/all-news/2022/04/marijuana-heart-disease.html?fbclid=IwAR1b-L_Nr1-buQPydKBEur-2XYCALyGFKtW4z8CRISddXPeVsmE6YwXgc
https://www.cnn.com/2022/06/27/health/marijuana-emergencies-hospitalization-study-wellness/index.html?fbclid=IwAR0Gk9L1UC9F3Wq8KwcfvzykMzqRwDaj_Cd1IodMxHm9W67Tkdwr1qt8
<https://bmjopenrespres.bmj.com/content/9/1/e001216>



New York Prohibition Party History

William J. Groo

William J. Groo was a lawyer, judge, and Prohibition Party politician. William Groo was born in 1831, in Sullivan County, New York. He was one of the five children of Samuel and Mercy Groo. In 1855, William married his first wife, Sarah Graham Lines, and they went on to have 5 children. William Groo entered a career in law. In 1856, he became a district attorney for Sullivan County, and at some point, had become the special county judge in Sullivan County. In 1860, Groo attended the national Republican convention that nominated Abraham Lincoln.

At some point between 1860 and 1870, Groo moved from Thomson, Sullivan County, New York, to Middletown, Orange County, New York. He would spend most of remaining life living in Middletown (with the exception being some period of time around 1875, in which he lived in Wawayanda, Orange County, before returning to Middletown by 1880). In 1870, he served as vice president of the Orange County Bible Society. In 1872, Groo became a Special County Judge for Orange County. In 1873, Groo married his second wife, Mary Frances Groo, and they went on to have 7 children.

By the early 1870's Groo became active in temperance and prohibitionist activism. In June 1873, Groo chaired a meeting of temperance and prohibition activists from several different groups, in Albany. The meeting was in response to then Governor John Adams Dix's failure to pass a local prohibition law in the state of New York. Groo spoke in favor of prohibition and the need to elect principled temperance men.

In 1876, Groo ran as the Prohibition Party candidate for governor of New York. He received 34,12 (0.34%) votes and came in 3rd place. He was able to get 1% or more of the vote in Chenango, Dutchess, Herkimer, Livingston, Niagara, Oswego, Otsego, Schuyler, Suffolk, and Tompkins counties.

Groo continued with his temperance and prohibition activism. In 1877, Groo gave an address at a meeting of the American Temperance Union at the Cooper Institute, in New York City. He spoke of the social costs of the damages caused by alcohol; including the resources wasted on alcohol manufacturing, and the role of alcohol in contributing to crime. His speech included the following lines: "Forty million bushels of grain, or a bushel for every man, woman, and child in the country, was destroyed annually in this business. Every interest suffers from it. The rents of tenement houses are increased as a result from increased taxation to support prisons, lunatic asylums, and poor houses. The furniture dealer suffers,

so does the carpet manufacturer, the shoemaker, the tailor, the dry goods dealer, the grocer, for in each of these lines of trade the money spent for rum would be used in purchasing the necessities for families."

In 1878, at the national meeting of the Sons of Temperance, in Buffalo, New York, Groo gave a speech, calling for increased efforts to educate the public on the harms of alcohol.

In 1885, there was a debate held at Music Hall, in Brooklyn, New York, on the merits of prohibition vs. high license. Groo was one of the participants on the prohibitionist side. Groo's arguments included the following statement: "The license people propose to perpetuate this obnoxious traffic and simply to increase revenue from it. We propose to stamp it out completely and to unite prohibition in state and national constitutions. We have developed such a sentiment with regards to this traffic that it has become odious, and nobody pretends to apologize for it. We have the moral duty and the right to pass laws against murder and larceny. We also have the moral right and obligation to write upon the statute book a law against that which makes murder and larceny."

In 1886, Groo ran as the prohibition party candidate for Justice on the state Court of Appeals. He received 36,414 (3.76%) votes. In 1887, Groo spoke at various temperance meetings, promoting prohibitionism. In August of that year, Groo attended the annual Prohibition Party state convention in Syracuse.

In 1888, Groo acted as a lawyer in a civil case in which the WCTU and the state Liquor Dealer's Association clashed. A woman in Orange County, whose husband had been injured in a drunken accident, sued the hotel who sold her husband liquor, in order to receive compensation for the financial losses caused by his injury. The woman was supported by Orange County WCTU, who hired Groo, and the hotel owner was backed by the state Liquor Dealer's Association. The case was battled in court multiple times, with multiple hung juries, until it apparently ended with its final hung jury in June 1890.

As a lawyer, Groo was involved in a variety of cases in this period. For instance, in 1891, Groo acted as an attorney for the Washington Street Methodist Episcopal Church in its case to secure favorable compensation for its property (as the church was going to be demolished to make space a city infrastructure project). Groo also involved himself somewhat in business ventures. Around 1890, Groo served on the board of directors for the Morris County Railroad company.

In 1889, Groo chaired a meeting of prohibitionists in the city of Brooklyn. In 1891, he had attended a Prohibition Party state

convention in Albany, where he chaired the platform committee. The 1891 state platform included support establishing prohibition laws, support for having a public vote on an amendment to the state constitution establishing prohibition, opposition actions by the U.S. State Department which supported the international liquor traffic, support for having the U.S. Senate ratify the Brussels Treaty (which worked to oppose the expansion of the liquor traffic in Africa), support for women's suffrage and equal voting rights for all citizens regardless of race and sex, support for having national tariffs rates decided by a non-partisan commission (and based on standards of national revenue needs and protecting home manufacturing), support for having a central U.S. currency printed by the government and exchangeable for gold and silver, and support for strong enforcement of civil service laws.

In 1891, the city of Middletown had a close election for Excise commissioner. The election featured Prohibition Party candidate Jesse Woods and his opponent Lewis B. Scott. The initial results of the election showed Scott winning. Groo represented Woods and challenged the results. After a recount, in March 1892, the Board of Canvassers still ruled that Woods narrowly lost to Scott, 216 to 238. In 1892, Groo served as chairman for a committee of Prohibitionists in Orange, Rockland, and Sullivan Counties to select delegates for 1892 Prohibition Party national convention.

In 1893, the state held elections for delegates to the 1894 New York State Constitutional Convention. Groo ran as one of the Prohibition Party candidates for delegates to the state constitutional convention for the 16th state senate district.

On January 17th, 1911, William Groo died at his home in Middletown.

Source: https://615c4beb-b241-4f4a-a6b4-a074dc02ce34.filesusr.com/ugd/2cc7be_75a98cfb415349c585b2cfd3e2f22342.pdf



"The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave." Patrick Henry