



PAVAN V. PARIKH

Hamilton County Clerk of Courts

From: Jason Alexander-Manager-Central Services Division
Re: Case Research In Reference To 1869 Superior Court of Cincinnati Judge Alphonso Taft Whiskey Case
Date: July 6, 2022

Background

On or around May 2, 2022 I received a request from a reference librarian from the Ohio Supreme Court. Their inquiry was prompted by a request from a chemical engineering professor from UC Davis. This request was in reference to an alleged case that occurred in 1869 that was ruled on by Judge Alphonso Taft in our now defunct “Superior Court of Cincinnati.” The importance of this case as it was conveyed to us was that allegedly, this case that Judge Alphonso Taft presided over and ruled on while on the Superior Court of Cincinnati bench was thought to be the world’s first case on whiskey standards which resulted in a ruling for the plaintiff finding that the whiskey in this case was not “pure whiskey.”

It is worth both noting and mentioning in this early point of the memorandum that at the very onset, I was intrigued as “**Superior Court**” was mentioned by the requester and in a very early search that I conducted not long after receiving the initial request, “**Superior Court**” is cited and referenced by one of the writers in an article that we discuss later on in this memorandum. The source of intrigue in my mind comes from the inherent nature and history of Superior Courts in the state of Ohio and that the party citing it in his article is from another country. It is such an arcane court, that even most people employed within the Ohio judicial system have likely never heard of it. Therefore, to have a writer from Australia reference this in an article definitely piqued my interest. To shed more light on this oddity, I believe that a short history of Superior Courts is warranted. In March 1838, the Ohio state legislature made provision for a Superior Court in Cincinnati. Superior Courts had concurrent jurisdiction with the Courts of Common Pleas and upon written consent of the parties, one could request that their case be transferred from the Court of Common Pleas to the Superior Court. In 1851, by way of a constitutional provision, the court was abolished and operated until February, 1852 when all pending cases were transferred to the Court of Common Pleas. In 1854, the Superior Court of Cincinnati was then re-established and given somewhat different jurisdiction than previously. Ultimately, in an act that also included our now defunct Insolvency Court, Superior Courts were abolished by the legislature in 1921 and its powers, vested in the Court of Common Pleas. Superior Courts are not only interesting due to their history of being abolished and re-established, but also due to the fact that only a total of seven such courts existed within the entire state and where they were placed was based on population.

While not having much information outside of what the Ohio Supreme Court was initially able to provide, we initiated a search that lasted approximately six weeks. During this search, approximately 151 parties were contacted in an attempt to gain any additional information regarding this alleged case. A listing of the parties contacted will be attached as a supplement to this memorandum. This list of parties includes various domestic and foreign governmental agencies,

whiskey and beverage trade associations, whiskey distilleries, whiskey writers and historians, travel websites connected to the country of Japan, the three authors that make mention of the alleged 1869 case in our Superior Court, and even former Ohio Governor Robert Taft. Governor Taft is the great-great grandson of the late Judge Alphonso Taft who presided over the alleged case.

The biggest issue of contention and obstacle that constantly plagued this search from its inception was the fact that no viable party information was known. Not the requester nor the few authors that have talked about or cited this case had any definitive knowledge of who might have been the plaintiff nor who would have been named as the defendant in this case. It is very common for this agency and other agencies alike to deal with inquiries in which a case number is not known, however parties requesting information that do not have a case number are at least able to provide to us party information for us to commence their search. The potential premise for this case seemed to center around Japanese citizens consuming large amounts of whiskey and spirits from the United States. After a number of years of consumption of this product, many Japanese citizens were sickened, sometimes so much so that it proved to be fatal. One of the many things learned in this search is that at the time, it was a very common practice for United States whiskey producers to adulterate the so-called straight whiskey. Often times, this implied that it was just a diluted product, it literally was simply “watered” down. Other times, it was far more malicious in that toxic additives were sometimes added to the product. Part of the information that was received by this office during this search was that after many years of this, the Japanese government tired of this happening to its citizens. The then government of Japan tasked Japanese chemists with determining what ingredients were contained in the latest batch of whiskey received.

The information given to this office goes on to allege that this latest batch that was analyzed contained noxious additives and was determined to have been shipped from a whiskey wholesaler located here in Cincinnati. Assuming that this was the case, logic dictated to me that the possible plaintiff in the case could have been the country of Japan. This also posed a problem as what we know by the name Japan in current times is not what its official name was in the year 1869. This prompted me to commence a search of our name indexes catalogued on our microfilmed records. This will be addressed in greater detail in the “Finding” section of this memorandum and additionally, the names and sources searched will also be made as a supplement to this memorandum.

Finding

As stated previously, given the limited information that we had, the only viable options that this office had were to conduct a quick internet search for this alleged case involving Japan and Judge Alphonso Taft, start reaching out to governmental agencies that may know something, contacts within the whiskey industry, whiskey writers/historians and the very few people that we have information on that did write about this alleged case. Coupled with this, we also began searching some of our old microfilm records in which this case may have been recorded.

After conducting a search of our first resource, that being the internet in an attempt to procure more information, we were able to find the case that Judge Alphonso Taft was most well-known for during his time on the bench. What was located, was a case filed in 1872 that was titled **“John D. Minor et al. versus the Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati et al.”** In this case, Taft dissented in the decision made by his fellow judges regarding the reading of the Bible in public schools. He argued in his dissenting opinion that “the constitution of the State did not

recognize the Christian religion any more than it recognized the religions of any other citizens of the state” and that “the school board had an obligation as well as a right to keep religious partisanship out of the public schools.” His dissenting opinion in fact, helped sway the Ohio Supreme Court as they subsequently ruled in favor of the school board, overturning the majority opinion of the Superior Court of Cincinnati and the opinion of Judge Taft’s peers. Although this was an interesting find, this was not a good initial sign to only find this case mentioned, as you will read later on in this memorandum that the alleged whiskey case, as it had been represented to us was thought to be a case of extreme importance at the time and yet, an internet search yielded nothing but the above case and the writings that will be talked about next.

In this stage, one of the earliest direct inquiries made in this search was to an Australian gentleman by the name of Chris Middleton. According to the website “The Whiskey Wash,” Mr. Middleton has made an international career within the whiskey industry. He was also the global director for the world’s leading whiskey, founding director of STARWARD whisky and he investigates and writes about whiskey as well. In my mind, this was the most natural place to start being that out of the four parties involved that have written about this alleged case, he has written about it and cited it the most in his writings. In an excerpt from an undated online article titled **“Japanese Whisky Rules”** author Chris Middleton writing for “Whisky Magazine” writes **“Fifteen years after the Japanese first tasted whisky they filed a US Federal court case against a Cincinnati wholesaler for supplying them fake whisky, which they alleged was a blend of rectified grain spirit, not “pure rye whiskey.” Judge Alphonso Taft of the Superior Court of Cincinnati found in favour of the Japanese plaintiff making this the first ruling on whisky’s quality and product identity.”** This is where we begin to see the first of various possible conflicts in this voluminous search. The article states a “US Federal court case.” From my research and from brief email conversation with Alphonso Taft’s great-great grandson, former Ohio Governor Robert Taft, I have it on good authority that Alphonso never served on the federal judiciary. So, is one to conclude that there was a separate federal case filed by a “Japanese Plaintiff” prior to the alleged case in Superior Court? This is just pure conjecture as we have not been able to locate a federal case of this nature.

We also have the following from Chris Middleton. In an online article dated November 5th 2021 writing for the website “thewhiskeywash.com”, we have the article titled **“Whiskey Chronicles of Edmund Taylor, Jr Part 4-Bluegrass Distilling Empire.”** In this article, the following information is cited: **“When serving on the Ohio Circuit Court in Cincinnati, President Taft’s father, Judge Alphonso Taft presided over the world’s first case on whiskey standards brought by the Japanese Government in 1869. They alleged a Cincinnati wholesaler supplied “pure rye whiskey,” which Japanese chemists determined was adulterated with rectified grain spirits (high wines). Judge Taft found in favour of the plaintiff, making the judgment that the whiskey, in this case was not “pure rye whiskey.”** Again, another conflict occurs. It is stated that **“When serving on the Ohio Circuit Court in Cincinnati.”** As mentioned above, Judge Alphonso Taft never served on the federal bench, that would rule out him serving on the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. No other Circuit Court in name existed in Cincinnati at the time. Additionally, there is only evidence and information to confirm that Judge Alphonso Taft only served on the Superior Court of Cincinnati bench.

We then moved on to the two books that make reference to the alleged case. The first being **“Kentucky Bourbon Whiskey: An American Heritage”** by author Michael Veach. On page 73 of

the above-mentioned book, the following is mentioned: **“The first legal challenge to the rectifiers came not from American distillers but from the government of Japan, which in 1869 objected to the practice of imported rectified whiskey being advertised as straight whiskey. This case ultimately came before the Ohio Circuit Court, the presiding judge, Alphonso Taft (the father of William Howard Taft), ruling that a product containing neutral spirits could not be called *whiskey*. While the decision did nothing to change the U.S. law-the rectifiers continued to do business as usual-it did set a legal precedent that would influence the regulation of whiskey under the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act.”** We again have a reference and potential conflict of the term “Ohio Circuit Court” being cited. As brought to light above, Judge Alphonso Taft only served in his capacity as a judge on the Superior Court of Cincinnati bench. At this point in time, my conclusion about these potentially non-malicious albeit, erroneous claims is that the parties writing about this case do not have a judicial background but are whiskey writers and historians. Being that this book from 2013 has the earliest mention of the alleged case, multiple attempts have been made to contact author Michael Veach in an attempt to obtain possible sources and more insight as to how and why this was cited in his book. Although I never received a reply back from Michael Veach, the initial party that inquired about this alleged case to the Supreme Court of Ohio did make an inquiry to Mr. Veach and did receive a reply. Michael Veach replied to him that he felt that the information regarding the Superior Court case before Judge Alphonso Taft came from the “Taylor-Hay” papers from The Filson Historical Society located in Louisville, Kentucky. This is of great importance as Michael Veach was once employed by the society and I believe that his position there laid the groundwork for his above book. And to elaborate further, I and another party reached out to the Filson. Multiple staff members there attempted to locate additional information specific to our alleged case from the contents of the “Taylor-Hay” papers without any success.

This brings us to the second book in which this alleged case is mentioned. This provided portion was written in 2016 from author Fred Minnick’s book titled **“Bourbon The Rise, Fall, And Rebirth Of An American Whiskey.”** In 1869, the Japanese were tired of receiving rectified whiskey sold as “straight whiskey”—a common term that today means whiskey must be at least two years old. At that time, *straight* was supposed to mean “neat whiskey,” meaning that nothing was added to it and the whiskey wasn’t stolen. But rectifiers marketed their adulterated products as “straight,” which led to the Japanese government suing US companies over false advertising. Ohio Circuit Court judge Alphonso Taft, father of future President W. Howard Taft, ruled that a product containing neutral spirits could not be called straight whiskey. This ruling impacted only exports, but it was an important step against rectified whiskey.” Again, being that this was from a published book, I sent an inquiry to author Fred Minnick asking if he could provide any additional information as to specific party information or perhaps a case number so that we could perform a more adequate search. I did get a response from Mr. Minnick in which he stated that he did write about this in his book and seemed to be very proud of this fact. He went on to say that it may take a while, but he could dig through his files. As of this writing, I have had no subsequent emails from Fred Minnick.

Of the four parties listed above that have written about the alleged case, Chris Middleton has been by far and without question, the most cordial and willing to engage in conversation about this supposed case. Although he was not able to provide any actionable and concrete sources for his articles, he did collaborate with us and made a concerted effort to contact Mike Veach as well as other people that may have additional information or at least sourcing material for what has been written about.

As mentioned in the first part of this memorandum, I was able to make contact with former Ohio Governor Robert Taft. Being that he is the great-great grandson of Alphonso Taft, there was a thought that he may have some knowledge about this case. He stated that he has no knowledge or information about this case but has expressed a great interest in it if it existed and has wanted to stay informed of our search and our progress.

After attempting to get more definitive party information and being unsuccessful, despite multiple parties being contacted worldwide and namely, the above writers, no other tangible information was received by this office. That being said, my next step was to attempt a search of our court records on microfilm. We were still at an almost complete stalemate as we still had no case caption, i.e. no plaintiff and no defendant other than the few above writings indicating that this case was filed by the government of Japan. With nothing else to go on at this point, a few logical assumptions were made as to who might have been the plaintiff and how the plaintiff could have named themselves in the alleged case. With this, I commenced a search of our “Superior Court Mutilated Name Indexes.” Mutilated was the arbitrary term given by the microfilm division when these records were converted from their paper medium to their microfilm format as many of these books were destroyed and or damaged in the fire of 1884. These “mutilated” records were in such a state of “mutilation” that they had to be reconstructed. A modern way of looking at the “mutilated” records is to think of “mutilated” either as reconstructed records or records created prior to the fire of 1884. Being that this alleged case was before Judge Alphonso Taft in 1869, this could have been in the “mutilated” period of our records.

The name indexes for the Superior Court of Cincinnati mutilated records exist only on microfilm reel **SRB Index #1**. Again, from assumptions made, these are some of the names that were searched within the index: “Country”, “Empire”, “Government”, “Imperial”, “Japan”, “Meiji”, and “Nippon.” The name “Meiji” is of particular importance as our research revealed that in 1868, there was a political revolution in Japan that brought about the final demise of the “Tokugawa shogunate” (military government) and nominally returned control of the country to direct imperial rule under Mutsuhito (the Emperor Meiji). This is known as the “Meiji Restoration” and came to be identified as an era of major political, economic, and social change that brought about the modernization and Westernization of the country. This is very important and will play into a subsequent portion of this memorandum. The above name searches yielded no results. Being that we believe that all Superior Court of Cincinnati cases were filed and initiated in the Court of Common Pleas as it was only after written consent of all parties involved that it could be transferred and heard by the Superior Court, logic would indicate that there was a possibility that this case could possibly be found within our Common Pleas Court Mutilated records, my search then focused on these records. A search of the same above names was done on microfilm reel **MRB Index #1** as this contained name indexes for case records from the Common Pleas Mutilated period. Again, with no results, the only other avenue that could be thought of was to search seven microfilm reels that consisted of 20 books of not name indexes but the actual Superior Court Mutilated Record Books. These reels contain the actual records of what happened and when with these cases. This search focused primarily on the court term of 1869 being that this is the year that the alleged case was filed and decided. Although many of these images clearly contained a record that Judge Alphonso Taft was one of the presiding judges during this time period, the search again yielded no results. One possibility is that it wasn’t the country of Japan that commenced suit but rather an intermediary such as an importer. Again, not having definitive names increases the complexity of this search. As stated

prior, a complete listing of internal sources and names searched will be attached as a supplement to this memorandum.

Now focusing on a portion from one of the above articles with regard to the statement **“which Japanese chemists determined was adulterated with rectified grain spirits (high wines).”** This information was always provided in my initial request template to the approximately 151 contacts regarding this inquiry. On two separate occasions, I have it on good authority from whiskey insiders/industry experts and historians via email correspondence that the ability to determine this during this time period is highly unlikely as evidenced by the following statements: **“How a Japanese company could have analyzed spirits in the second year of the Meiji calendar (i.e. when they had just opened the country to the rest of the world) —whether they even had the skills to do something like that is bizarre.”** And also, **“Japanese “chemists analyzing”: not to disparage the state of Japan’s scientific culture, but in the 1860’s, “western” style education and introduction to western scientific precepts was either non-existent or in its early infancy.”** **“So, its highly unlikely that scientific methodology would have developed from zero in the short span of a decade or so, at least enough for the results of their analysis to have much credibility.”** Again, the “Meiji” reference here is very important as mentioned prior, this was a great period of change and transition for the country of Japan and additionally, it had just opened up their country to external influences.

In our effort to locate and extract any and all external sources or information, some of the parties contacted in this on the federal level were both the Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration, and on the local level, that of the Hamilton County Law Library and a contact at the Cincinnati & Hamilton County Public Library. All institutions were extremely helpful and diligent in their search as well as in their suggestions. After their search of various records including legal bulletins, articles, the Taft Papers, legal resources, etc. no results were found. This was of great consternation to us all, as if this case existed and was of the importance that has been conveyed to us, why was there no mention or citation of this case anywhere outside of Hamilton County, Ohio? The indicated importance of this still elusive case is conveyed in a portion of this correspondence from Chris Middleton when he states **“Why Alphonso Taft’s 1869 case? This is the first legal case for defining bona fide whiskey in any Court, but it also exposes other questions about whiskey consumption in Japan. It also raises the question of what Government department, presuming it was the Government of Japan and not a private importer who commenced this action.”** This is where another contrary issue is brought to light. In one of his earlier articles, it was indicated that the first legal action was brought by the “government of Japan.” Here, there is the clear implication that it could have been a private importer who commenced this action and not the government of Japan.

Throughout the course of this, we did find reference to an interesting event in 1900 that had a connection to whiskey and Japan. As reported in the August 25, 1900 edition of **“The Japan Weekly Mail:”** it was an incident known as **“The White Whiskey Case.”** As indicated in the cited publication, an American importer attempted to import a highly-rectified whiskey to Japan, known as **“White Whiskey.”** The first installment, which was the smaller portion of the shipment was treated as whiskey and assessed a 40% tariff. Later on, a larger shipment was sent to Yokohama, Japan and this shipment was classified as alcohol and assessed a tariff of 250%. A dispute arose as to the increased amount of the latter tariff and reached the desk of the Secretary of State. This was considered a very high-profile incident in 1900.

Still not finding any definitive reference to a judicial decision regarding any whiskey case by Judge Taft from the Superior Court bench, something else of interest was uncovered. In 1876, Alphonso Taft serving in his official capacity as United States Attorney General, issued an “Opinion” regarding whiskey or alcohol in response from a request of the then Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service.

This now brings us to the close of this section of the memorandum. While there was very little about the alleged case to be found online as stated previously, the results did allude to something else. In what has been coined the **“Taft Decision”** issued in 1909, it would be none other than, Alphonso Taft’s son, President William Howard Taft, in his official capacity as President, who defined by executive order the legal definition of what is “whiskey.” The executive order was the culmination of months of committee hearings with testimony taken from members of the government’s Pure Food Department and various distillers. One of the parties that has worked in collaboration with me is Carol Ottolenghi, Director of Research and Library Services for the Office of the Ohio Attorney General. She pointed out what is possibly the most striking and jarring revelation uncovered throughout the whole course of this investigation. If Alphonso Taft’s ruling was in fact the **“first legal case for defining bona fide whiskey in any Court”** as it has been conveyed, it would stand to reason that his son President William Howard Taft would have mentioned or cited it in his 1909 executive order. However, after reading the 1909 executive order, no mention is made.

Conclusion

The entire purpose of this memorandum has been to demonstrate the depths and the lengths that this agency went to in conducting what has been nothing short of an exhaustive, worldwide search in collaboration with many other parties. Thus, we believe, unless new evidence comes to light, that this case never existed. The summary of our reasoning is as follows:

Our first theory as to why this case never existed is the entire lack of any sourcing material other than the articles and book references that contained what almost can be viewed as footnotes. Absolutely nothing else has been located to corroborate anything that these writings talked about in reference to this case. In looking back, it appears that the first writing about the Alphonso Taft case appeared in 2013 in Michael Veach’s book **“Kentucky Bourbon Whiskey: An American Heritage”** which we wrote about in an earlier part of this memorandum. All subsequent writings pretty much tell the same story, there is very little new information learned or covered. Upon further contemplation and review, it appears that in all subsequent writings the words were simply reformatted to perhaps provide some form of uniqueness and personalization.

Secondly, being that the parties that wrote about this were not employed or connected to the judicial system in any way, we believe that it is entirely within the realm of possibility that this alleged case was confused with that of Attorney General Taft’s opinion issued in 1876 since it was connected to the definition of whiskey or alcohol. In consulting with a few of the parties that have assisted in this search, we are all of the same thought that a legal “opinion” could very well be confused and misconstrued with that of a legal “ruling” when these are not terms and definitions that one is accustomed to or well-versed in.

Additionally, a clipping was unearthed from a Louisville newspaper in the Taylor-Hay archive that reported on the testimony that informed President Taft’s 1909 whiskey decision. One

paragraph describes the 1900 Japanese case, and the following paragraph describes Attorney General Taft's 1876 opinion. It is conceivable that this clipping, or other reporting of that time, were simply misinterpreted to conflate Taft's opinion as applying to the Japanese case. Based on all of the research, when President Taft issued his 1909 decision, both Attorney General Alphonso Taft's 1876 opinion and **"The White Whiskey Case"** were still fresh in peoples' minds.

This brings us to our last theory of what potentially could have happened. However, it is a thought of consternation and ambivalence. If this case in fact existed and it occurred in 1869 as it has been portrayed, then it's possible that it was among the many records that were destroyed by the riots and fire of 1884. This possibility still leaves us with a most vexing question: If the records were destroyed but the case does exist, why can't a single piece of empirical evidence be located from an external source outside of what has been already talked about or from the archives of what exists from within the Hamilton County, Ohio courthouse?

In conclusion, and knowing full well that one cannot prove a negative, when taking into consideration a totality of what has been gleaned in this investigation and the facts that are presently known to us, it is our firm belief in almost unequivocal terms, that there is a high probability of this case never having existed. It is the opinion of this agency, that its only existence outside of this memorandum, exists in the aforementioned articles and books cited above.

List of parties contacted for 1869 Judge Alphonso Taft Superior Court whiskey case.

Updated 7/27/22

- US Ambassador to Japan's Office-Washington D.C.
- US Treasury Tax and Trade Bureau
- Japan External Trade Organization
- Chris Middleton, Whiskey Magazine
- Margie Lehrman, Executive Director, American Craft Spirits Association
- Jo Moak, Vice President and Chief Counsel, Wine & Spirits Wholesalers of America
- Fred Minnick, Author of seven books about whiskey
- Brian Haara, Attorney and author of "Bourbon Justice"
- Michael Veach, Curator, Author, and Bourbon Historian
- Bridget Allshouse, Director, Distilled Spirits Council of the United States
- Lauren Morrison, Director, Cincinnati Law Library
- Larry Richmond, Manager, Genealogy & Local History Dept. Public Library of Cincinnati
- Bernie Lubbers, Global Ambassador for Heaven Hill Distilleries
- Eric Smith, Founder, Central Ohio Whiskey Society
- Max Stoller, Former Writer, WhiskeyRaiders
- Lew Bryson, Author, The Daily Beast
- Pari Swift, Former Senior Records Manager, Ohio Attorney General, current University Records Manager, the Ohio State University.
- Connie Connor, Government Records Archivist, Ohio History Connection
- Amanda Rindler, Records Manager, Indiana University
- Dennis Whitehead, Author
- Toya Jackson, Diplomatic Coordinator, Political Section, Embassy of Japan-D.C.
- Japan Whisky Research Centre
- House of Suntory Whiskey
- FRUS-Foreign Relations of the United States-State Dept. Office of the Historian
- Law Library, Library of Congress
- Holly Prochaska, Interim Head, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati
- Carol Ottoglenghi, Law Library Director, Ohio Attorney General's Office
- Ohio Liquor Control
- The Filson Historical Society
- The Whiskey Bible
- Chilled Magazine
- Whiskey Advocate
- The New York Times
- Dekanta.com
- Visitlex.com
- Bourbonfool.com
- Reid Mitenbuler, Author- "Bourbon Empire: The Past and Future of America's Whiskey."
- Simon & Schuster- Carlo DeVito, author, "Big Whiskey"
- DistilleryTrail.com
- Harris Cooper, PHD, author, "American History Through A Glass."
- Dillon McLaughlin, author of online article "The Turbulent History of Rye Whiskey"
- State Library of Ohio
- Westerville Historical Society

- Franklin County Law Library
- Kevin Kosar, author of two books and resident fellow at AEI
- Rackhouse Whiskey Club
- Scotchwhiskeyexperience.co.uk
- Robert Simonson, author, "The Old-Fashioned."
- WhiskeyMasters.org
- Men's Journal, Reference article "The Holy History of Whiskey."
- Brad Smith, author, "Japanese Whisky History: Rising Dam" TheJapanesBar.com
- Thirtyonewhiskey.com
- Whiskeyflavour.com
- Whiskeygeeks.com
- WhiskyRichard, nomunication.com
- FoodToursJapan.com
- The House of Whiskey.com
- Christopher Pong, Japanese Whiskey Expert
- Craft Whiskey Club.com
- The Bottle Club.com
- Japan Quality w Society.com
- Rediscover Tours.com
- Remote Lands.com
- Whiskey Muse.com
- JRPass.com
- Adventures In Whiskey.com
- Tabitha and Craig Hochscheid
- Molly Wellman, Co-owner of Japp's and author
- Brian Ashcraft, author, "Japanese Whisky"
- Travel Distilled.com
- Japan Distilled.com
- David Broom, author and whiskey expert
- The Right Spirit.com
- The Alcohol Professor.com
- World Whiskey Day.com
- Chris Morris, Brown-Forman Master Distiller
- Chuck Cowdery, author and whiskey expert
- The Whiskey Exchange.com
- Wine Mag.com
- International Trade Administration
- World Trade Organization
- Office of the United States Trade Representative
- EU-Japan Centre for Industrial Cooperation
- DrinksInternational.com
- GreatDrams.com
- Distilled Sunshine.com
- The Whiskey Jug.com
- Seventy Fifty.com
- Michael Micallef, author and contributor regarding spirits
- Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
- Ministry of Finance Japan
- Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare Japan

- The Drink Business
- Whiskey Unplugged.com
- Ukita Yasuyuki, writer and wine journalist
- Spirits Hunters.com
- Elite Wine Whiskey.com
- The Japanese Bar.com
- Japan Wines, And Spirits Importers' Association.com
- James Dempsey, Volunteer Archivist
- Former Governor Robert Alphonso Taft III
- Distiller.com
- World Spirits Alliance.com
- Sandra DeVise, Cincinnati Museum Center
- Officers for the Legal History & Rare Books of the American Assoc. of Law Libraries
- Mary Jenkins, Secretary American Association of Law Libraries
- Mark Podvia, Associate Law Librarian and Archivist. Author of article "Bourbon and the Law: A Brief Overview."
- Liquor.com
- The Whiskey Reviewer.com
- Restaurant Association Metropolitan Washington
- Master of Malt.com
- The Whiskyphiles.com
- The Whiskey Shelf.com
- Whiskey Culture.com
- Ed Carey, Founder and Owner S.N. Pike's Magnolia Est. 1849
- Whiskey Bent.com
- Jack Sullivan, American whiskey historian and blogger
- The PotStill.com
- Nicks Wine Merchants.com
- Advanced Mixology.com
- Scotch Whisky.com
- The Whisky Exchange.com
- Veviski.com
- Aaron Gilbreath, author of online article "Forgotten Japanese Whiskies of the 1980s and 90s."
- Andre De Almeida-Inside the Cask.com
- Tim Huber, author-online article "The 12 Best Books For The Whiskey Connoisseur."
- American Whiskey Magazine.com
- HardieGrant-Publisher for John D. Lemond, author "Le Snob Guide To Whiskey."
- Wandpdesign.com/Dovetail Publishing, publisher for Aaron Goldfarb, author "Hacking Whiskey."
- Cider Mill Press-Publisher for Carlo DeVito, author "Big Whiskey."
- Robin Robinson, author, "The Complete Whiskey Course."
- WhiskeyMax.com
- Diageo.com-Producer of Beer and Spirits
- Dannwoellertthefoodetymologist.wordpress.com
- NorthernKentuckyTribune.com
- Flaviar.com
- Potomac Press.com, publisher for author John C. Tramazzo, author-"Bourbon and Bullets: True Stories of Whiskey, War, and Military Service."
- Justin Goldman, author Hemispheres Magazine article "A 'Lost in Translation' Guide to Japanese Whiskey."

- United States District Court, Southern District of Ohio
- United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
- Export-Import Bank of The United States
- Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives
- Miller Center
- Jack Osborn-Manofmany website, author of "11 Best Japanese Whisky Brands."
- Bourbon Banter.com
- The Modern Day Man.com
- United States Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel
- Corning & Company Distillers

SOURCES SEARCHED IN ATTEMPT TO LOCATE 1869 SUPERIOR COURT OF CINCINNATI WHISKEY CASE:

Search focused primarily on our microfilm labeled “mutilated” records as these records were pre-1884, the year of the fire and the term “mutilated” was the term given by the microfilming department in the 60’s for the books that were reconstructed after the 1884 fire to distinguish from the post-1884 court records that did not have to be reconstructed as they were not “mutilated.”

- **Superior Court of Cincinnati Mutilated Records**

- Film Reel SRB Index #1 Name Indexes for Superior Court Mutilated Record Books
 - Names Searched Within Indexes:
 - Country
 - Empire
 - Government
 - Imperial
 - Japan
 - Meiji
 - Nipon
 - S.N. Pike’s Magnolia Whiskey (Cincinnati Whiskey Wholesaler at the time)
 - Mills, Johnson, & Co. (Cincinnati Whiskey Wholesaler at the time)
 - Andrew Pfirrmann (Cincinnati Whiskey Wholesaler at the time)
 - A. Pfirrmann & Co. (Cincinnati Whiskey Wholesaler at the time)
 - Pfirrmann & Pfau (Cincinnati Whiskey Wholesaler at the time)
 - Export Whiskey (Cincinnati Whiskey Wholesaler at the time)
 - The American Export and Warehouse Company (Cincinnati Whiskey Wholesaler at the time).
- Film Reels MSB-1 thru MSB-7 Superior Court Mutilated Record Books
 - Above reels consisted of 20 books. Books broken into terms. Search focused on the 1869 court term primarily when Judge Alphonso Taft was presiding. Attempted to locate any type of party names within this term that could have matched the parties listed above being that no one has any definitive party information.

- **Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas Mutilated Records**

- Film Reel MRB Index #1 Name Indexes for Common Pleas Court Mutilated Record Books. Index Book 1 thru 2. Same parties searched in this record series.
- Although everything leads us to believe that this case was in Superior Court, my research has led me to believe that when it comes to civil actions, those said actions could not commence in Superior Court, they would have to be initiated in Common Pleas Court and the parties could request transfer at the time to the Superior Court of Cincinnati.

- **Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas Civil Records Pre-1928**

- Index to Pending Suits, Living Judgements & Executions
 - Film containing XPLE Books ½ thru 3 searched for above parties as these books are pertinent to the time period in question.

- **Other Resources**

- Library of Congress Digital Records
 - William H. Taft Papers: Series 12: Legal Papers of Alphonso Taft, 1784-1889.
- Digitized Newspapers from pertinent time period
- The Life of Alphonso Taft by Lewis Alexander Leonard-1920
- The Online Books Page-Ohio Superior Court (Cincinnati) Online Books Library UPENN