





HOLY BIBLE

~ COLLECTION OF ~
Historical Commission
NORTH CAROLINA
CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY CONVENTION

C.C.WARE

WILSON, N.C.

Archivist

Rapidly with care,
Sliding with the prayer;
It will be a miracle
and perhaps some day you

J. W. H.



J. L. Thompson,
Bishop

June 10, 1854

P. R. DUNGAN'S WORKS.

<i>ON THE ROCK,</i>	\$1.50
<i>MODERN PHASES OF SKEPTICISM,</i>	1.50
<i>RUM—RUIN AND THE REMEDY,</i>	1.00
<i>MODERN REVIVALISM (paper),</i>	.15
<i>OUR PLEA AND MISSION (paper),</i>	.10
<i>WHAT SHALL WE DO? (paper),</i>	.10
<i>MISTAKES OF INGERSOLL ABOUT MOSES (paper),</i>	.10

CENTRAL BOOK CONCERN, Publishers.

RUM AND RUIN:

THE REMEDY FOUND.

D. R. DUNGAN.



CENTRAL BOOK CONCERN:

OSKALOOSA, IOWA.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

1877.

DISCIPLIANA LIBRARY
ATLANTIC CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
WILSON, N. C.

Copyright by
D. R. DUNGAN.
1879.

STEREOTYPED BY CAMPBELL & CO.
174 Elm Street, CINCINNATI, O.

INTRODUCTION.

My thanks are due the public for having kindly appreciated my former work, entitled "*Prohibition vs. License*," four published sermons and two series of articles on the subject of temperance. If this work shall be as well received as my former one, I shall have no cause of complaint. For fifteen years I have been preaching, lecturing, debating and writing on this question.

The work before you contains my best views of the issues of the hour. I have read Arthur's work, Richardson's lectures, Carpenter's prize essay, Pitman's *Alcohol and the State*, Dr. Lee's work, etc., etc., and have, no doubt, presented many thoughts that I have received from them. I have culled from many sources the testimony that I furnish, and hereby acknowledge my indebtedness for the patient research of others by which I have been aided in preparing the present volume.

THE AUTHOR.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

CONTENTS.

A

	PAGE.
Aaron's Calf,	149
Addison, Judge,	55
<i>Advance</i> , Chicago,	159
Agitation the Handmaid of Truth,	94
Alcoholism,	30
Alcohol in Many Liquors,	12
Alcohol May be Used as a Medicine,	18
Alcohol Prevents Digestion,	16
Alcohol Should not be Used as a Beverage,	22
Alcohol neither Food nor Drink Suitable for Man,	24
Alcohol, none but Physicians Should Prescribe It,	25
Alcohol a Leech,	51
Alcohol Convicted of Crime, etc.,	206
Argument for License,	138
Argument against Local Option,	139-145
Aughey's Liquor Analysis,	43, 44
Ames, Oliver and Sons,	178
Arcourt, Associate Justice,	180
Andrews, Alfred, of New Britain, Connecticut,	181

B

Bacon, Rev. Dr.,	193
Beale, Dr. Lionel S., on Alcohol,	26
Beer—Its Manufacture, Qualities and Results,	46-49
Beer Men,	193
Brewers' Opposition to Prohibition,	156
Brewers' Congress,	194, 195
Bower, Dr.,	16
Boston Under Prohibition,	170, 171
Black Art,	109, 110
Blackstone on Prohibition,	135
Browne, Dr. W. A. T., Report of,	35
Brown, B. Gratz, on Prohibition,	118-120
Bush, Rev., of Norwich,	181
Butler, General B. F.,	177
British Troops in India,	13

	PAGE.
C	
Carpenter's (Dr.) Prize Essay,	17
Carpenter (Dr.) - His Conclusions,	18-21
Carpenter's (Dr.) Results of Alcohol on Offspring,	35
Cartwright, Dr.,	25
Cantor Lectures,	24
Chambers' (Dr.) Clinical Lectures,	26
Chambers (Dr.), Alcohol not a Food,	27
Census Report,	161-163
Champagne,	50
Charities, Board of,	54
Christians Wish Prohibition,	57, 58
Civil Damage,	120
Coleridge, Lord Chief Justice,	55
Complete Law Necessary,	152, 153
Compromise is Ruinous,	206
Connecticut on Prohibition,	180, 181
Convers, Governor of Vermont,	179, 180
Cost of Alcohol,	82-84
Crime, Cause of,	52-56, 85
Crime not Regulated, but Prohibited,	96, 97
Crime Need Not Be Continued,	154
Curtis, T. T., Esq.,	174
Cuyler, Dr. John M.,	24

D

Dalton, Episcopal Rector of Portland,	161
Davis, Chief Justice,	55
Death Rate among Teetotalers,	40
Deaths by Alcohol,	42
Decalogue,	149
Decisions of Physicians,	22-24
Decision on Alcohol,	26-28
Difficulties Seen,	189
Divorce,	100
Do Evil that Good May Come,	100
Douro Valley,	50, 51
Dow, Hon. Neal,	200
Dunn, Dr. James B.,	167
Drugged Liquors,	50
Drunkenness Punished,	105
Dutton, Governor of Connecticut,	180

E

Eighty Gallons from One,	50, 51
Education First, then Law,	98, 150
Education Hindered by License,	116-120
Edwards County, Illinois, on Prohibition,	146

CONTENTS.

vii

F

PAGE.

False Arguments,	63, 90
Father Mathew's Work and Results,	155
Figg's (Dr.) Experiments with Alcohol,	13
Forbes, Dr. John,	17
Freezing Because of Alcohol,	37
Free-Thinking Americans,	193

G

Garney, Judge,	55
Germans and Prohibition,	148, 149
Good Templars,	89
Governor Seymour,	89
Goodrich, Hon. John B.,	177
Gough, John B., on Tremens,	28, 29
Guy, Dr.,	17

H

Habit,	30
Hale, Sir Matthew,	53
Hardin County, Iowa,	86
Hawley, Rev. David,	181
Harris, Elisha,	24
House of Correction,	173
Horace,	73
How, Dr., Report to Legislature of Massachusetts,	35
Howard's Reports,	133-135
How Maine Succeeded,	200, 201
How Secure the Law We Need,	184
How Petition the Legislature,	190
Hunter, Dr., Experiments of,	14
Hutcheson, Dr., Report of the Glasgow Lunatic Asylum,	30-33

I

Iowa on Prohibition,	197
Impleading the Traffic,	45
International Medical Congress,	24, 25
Infamy Harder to Control than Drunkenness,	152
Irish Republic,	53, 54

J

Justin the Martyr,	77
Jones, Rev. W. G., of Hartford, Connecticut,	180

K

Kent on Prohibition,	136
--------------------------------	-----

	PAGE.
L	
Lamb, Charles, Confession of,	29
Law an Educator,	150
Lawrence, Massachusetts,	172
Legalized Wrong,	96
Liebig, Prof., Discovery of,	15
License the Stay of Crime,	95-97
License, Murder, Law,	98
License Not All We Can Get,	99
License Alone Powerless for Good,	101
License and Prohibition Compared,	170, 171
License Can Not Be Enforced,	112-116
License a Monopoly,	103, 104
License, Twelve Reasons Against,	121-123
Local Option Can Not Fully Meet the Demand,	137-145
Life Insurance,	38, 39
Logical or Argumentative Nonsense,	102
Lowell, Massachusetts, under Prohibition,	173
M	
McNish, Dr., Anatomy of Drunkenness,	14
Monroe, Dr., Alcohol an Acrid Poison,	27
Markham, Dr., Alcohol not Food,	27
Man's Right With His Own Limited,	125
Maine Law in Maine,	157
Maine Law a Crucial Test,	158-164
Maine Law in Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, etc.,	157, 158
Massachusetts on Prohibition,	166-169
Medical Association in the United States,	23
Mental Debility from Use of Alcohol,	34
Methodist Conference,	58
Miller, Samuel, D. D.,	14
Miller, Governor of Connecticut,	180
Moral Suasion,	88, 89
Murphy Movement,	92
Modes of Action,	203, 204
Must not be Bound by Party Ties in any Way Interfering with Prohibition,	205
Must Vote With Our Interests,	192
My Temperance Creed,	200
N	
Nature to Accumulate is Higher than Nature to Eat and Drink,	127
New Haven,	181
Nose Paint,	110
Noble Saloon Keeper,	93
North Eaton,	178
Newman, Dr. J. P.,	56

CONTENTS.

ix

O

	PAGE.
Oporto,	51
Only a Moral Question,	89
Organization Needed,	184, 185
Our Party in Danger,	196

P

Party Record,	198
Parker, Willard,	24
Patterson, Judge,	55
Paddy's Pillow,	147
Peck, Chief Judge, of Vermont,	179
Peaslee, Prof. E. R.,	24
Periera, Dr., Materia Medica,	26
Pliny,	73, 74
Plutarch,	73
Poisoned Liquors,	43, 44, 51
Poetry on License,	59, 61
Political Cowardice,	145
Police Report,	177
Political Manipulators,	188, 197
Prize Fighters,	15
Prison Reports,	52, 56
Paul's Prescription to Timothy,	77, 78
Prohibition Right,	124
Prohibition by Railroad Companies,	132
Prohibition in Iowa,	197
Prohibition the Arm,	199
Prohibition in Connecticut,	182, 183
Present Political Parties,	187
Professional Evasion,	186
Punish the Drunkard and the Drunkard Maker,	124
Public Sentiment,	205

Q

Quarantine,	129-131
-----------------------	---------

R

Ray, John W., Reports of,	59
Religious Influence,	92
Report of Congress Committee,	163
Return from Prohibition to License,	165
Republican Party in Maine,	200, 202
Revenue from Drink,	79, 80
Revenue Report,	162, 164
Richardson, Dr Benjamin W.,	24
Ribbon Movements,	89
Rights Restricted,	125, 126

	PAGE.
Roupell, Dr.,	17
Rumsellers Guilty of Murder,	106, 109

S

Scottish League,	17
Saloon Men Oppose Prohibition,	156, 157
Smaller Crimes Prohibited,	111, 112
Sumptuary Laws,	124
Sunday Laws,	193
Supper, the Lord's,	74, 75, 77

T

Talbot's Veto Message,	176, 177
Temperance Becoming Popular,	206
Temperance Convention Manipulated,	198
Tirosh,	65
Thompson on Moderate Drinking,	40, 41
Total Abstinence Removes Crime,	155
Third Party,	199, 204

V

Vermont on Prohibition,	179, 180
Vineland,	174, 175
Victory is Sure,	207
Vivian, Prof.,	39
Von Moleschott, Prof.,	26

W

Wall, Joseph P., Sentenced,	57
Wastes,	81
Washburn, Governor of Massachusetts, in Message,	175
Walker, Rev. Dr., Testimony of,	182
Wealth Involved,	86, 87
We Must Answer Our Own Prayers,	94
Wilson, Rev. Geo. P.,	172
Wine of the Bible,	63
Wine, Meaning of,	62
Wine a Mockery,	64
Wine a Curse,	65, 66
Wine, When Commended,	67
Wine in New Testament,	68-73
What We Have Gained,	205
Wood, Rev. Horatio,	173

Y

Yellow Fever,	25
Youmans, Prof., Alcohol a Poison,	28

Alcohol a Physical and Mental Evil.

CHAPTER I.

ALL the interests of humanity are endangered by the use of alcohol. From this evil there is no certain release, except in total abstinence. To prove these statements, and to show some tangible means of escape, are my objects in writing. I begin these examinations with its results on man's body.

That alcohol is an enemy to man's body is clearly seen in the bloated forms and blistered faces, and the hot, poisoned breath of those who drink. Physical blemishes and premature deaths sufficiently attest that it is a blighting curse on the physical power of those who use it. And yet, scarcely a score of years ago, physicians were prescribing alcohol for many purposes. It was good in almost any disease, and indispensable as a tonic. A failing appetite or feebleness had to be remedied with whisky or brandy or wine, according to the tastes of the physician and the patient. Whether the one or the other of these was

recommended, alcohol was that which was sought after.

We insert here a table showing the percentage of alcohol in certain liquors, taken from a work by the celebrated French chemist, Thenard :

Scotch whisky.....	54.32	per cent.
Rum.....	53.68	“
Brandy..	53.33	“
Gin.....	51.60	“
Madeira.....	22.27	“
Sherry.....	19.17	“
Claret.....	15.10	“
Burgundy.....	14.57	“
Sauterne.....	14.22	“
Champagne.....	12.61	“
Hock.....	12.08	“
Cider, the strongest.....	9.87	“
Burton ale.....	8.88	“
Brown stout.....	6.80	“
Cider, the weakest.....	5.21	“
London porter.....	4.20	“
London bitter beer.....	1.28	“
Lager beer.....	6.70	“

It would be easy to follow out the list of American drinks, and give the per cent. of alcohol in each, but for the fact that there is no regularity in American manufacture. Scotch whisky is given at 54.32 per cent. But American manufacture, in its best showing, will not rise above 44 per cent.

These drinks were valued as tonics and helps in proportion to the alcohol they were supposed to contain. The physiologist and the chemist have

been at work to discover the facts. This work they have performed with a patience and energy that remove their decision from the plane of mere guess-work. Such experiments as the following lead the way. Dr. Figg relates the following experiment:

“To each of two bulldogs, six months old, five ounces of cold roast mutton, cut into squares, were given, the meat being pressed into the œsophagus without contact with the teeth. An elastic catheter was then passed into the stomach of one of them, and one ounce and a quarter of proof spirit injected. After some hours had elapsed, both animals were killed. In the case where the meat had been administered by itself, it had disappeared; in the other, the pieces were as angular as when swallowed.”

Again he says:

“If a pound of raw beef, cut square, be immersed for twelve hours in a pint of proof spirit, it will be found, when weighed again, to have lost four ounces three drachms. If the surface be examined with a microscope, it will be found covered with pointed tufts of a coffee-brown color, and the whole structure considerably condensed. This loss of substance, and this condensation of tissue, are attributable to the removal of water, and the brown deposit to the caustic influence of the alcohol on the albuminous element of the beef.”

In a given time the British troops in India have furnished a test. They were arranged in three classes: Abstinent, temperate, and intemperate. Their mortalities were as follows: Abstinent, eleven deaths for every one thousand; temperate, or moderate drinkers, twenty-three to the

thousand; intemperate, or those who would get drunk, forty-four to the thousand.

The next witness will be nearer home—the late Samuel Miller, D. D., of Princeton, New Jersey. For sixteen years he had followed the advice of his physicians, in drinking one or two glasses of sour wine daily. “During all this time,” he says, “my health was delicate. More than six years ago, when approaching my sixtieth year, I broke off at once. The experiment had not proceeded more than a month before I became satisfied that my abstinence was very strikingly beneficial. My appetite was more uniform, my digestion improved, my strength increased, my sleep more comfortable, and all my mental exercises more clear, pleasant, and successful.”

Dr. Macnish, in his *Anatomy of Drunkenness*, relates the following experiment made by Dr. Hunter upon two of his children of about the same age, both of them having been previously unaccustomed to wine. To one he gave every day a full glass of sherry; to the other he gave an orange. In the course of a week a very marked difference was perceptible in the pulse, urine and evacuations from the bowels of the two children. The pulse of the first child was raised, the urine high colored, and the evacuations destitute of their usual quantity of bile. In the other child no change whatever was produced. He then reversed the experiment, giving to the first the orange, and to

the second the wine, and the results corresponded; the child who had the orange continued well, and the system of the other got straightway into disorder, as in the first experiment.

Prize fighters themselves, however intemperate some of them may habitually be, when they prepare for a match and go into training, practice total abstinence. A gentleman once said to Tom Sayers, the champion of England, "Well, Tom, of course in training you must take a great deal of nourishment, such as beefsteak, Barclay's stout, or pale ale?" "I'll tell you what it is, sir," answered Sayers, "I'm no teetotaler, and in my time have drunk a great deal more than is good for me; but when I've any *business* to do, there's *nothing like water* and the dumb-bells."

Such facts as these, being observed everywhere, have led to the most untiring research after truth respecting the result of alcohol on the human system.

Professor Liebig was the first to discover the power of alcohol to displace the natural and healthy water-constituent of all animal tissues. When these are dipped into alcohol, more than one-half of the water is displaced. In the bladder, for one volume of alcohol retained by it, three volumes of water have been displaced.

It is an error to suppose that, after a good dinner, a glass of spirits or beer assists digestion, or that any liquor containing alcohol, or even bitter

beer, can in any way assist digestion. Mix some bread and meat with gastric juice, place them in a phial, and keep the phial in a sand-bath at the slow heat of 98 degrees—which is the heat of the stomach—occasionally shaking briskly the contents to imitate the motion of the stomach; you will find after six or eight hours the whole contents blended in a mass as for a poultice. If to another phial of food and gastric juice, treated in the same way, you add a glass of pale ale or a quantity of alcohol, at the end of seven or eight hours, or even some days, the food is scarcely acted upon at all. The explanation of this is, that alcohol has the peculiar power of chemically affecting or decomposing the gastric juice by precipitating one of its principal constituents, pepsine, rendering its solvent properties much less efficacious. Hence, alcohol can not be considered either as a food or a solvent for food, for it refuses to act with the gastric juice.

It is a remarkable fact, says Dr. Dundas Thompson, that alcohol, when added to the digestive fluid, produces a white precipitate, so that the fluid is no longer capable of digesting animal or vegetable matter. The use of alcoholic stimulants, say Drs. Todd and Bowman, retards digestion by coagulating the pepsine, an essential element of the gastric juice, and thereby interfering with its action. Were it not that wine and spirits are rapidly absorbed, the introduction of these into

the stomach, in any quantity, would be a complete bar to the digestion of food, as the pepsine would be precipitated from the solution as quickly as it was formed by the stomach.

Some years ago, the Directors of the Scottish Temperance League, anxious to have a work of high authority on the *Medical View of the Temperance Question*, applied to Professor Miller, of the University of Edinburgh and Surgeon to the Queen, to prepare a treatise on the subject. The learned Professor cordially complied with their request, and presented his manuscript as a gift to the League, by which it was published. In 1873 the work had already gone through nineteen editions in Scotland.

Some time before, a prize of one hundred guineas (about \$500) had been awarded to Professor Carpenter of the University of London, for his work on the *Use and Abuse of Alcoholic Liquors*, as the best out of fifteen competing works on the same subject. The award was made by a committee of three of the most eminent physicians of the day—they were Dr. Roupell, Physician to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, London; Dr. Guy, Professor of Forensic Medicine, King's College, London; and Dr. John Forbes, himself the author of a valuable little medical treatise on intemperance, and Physician to the Queen's Household, to Prince Albert, and the Duke of Cambridge.

In reading the work of Dr. W. B. Carpenter, it

should be remembered that he completed his work in 1849, now about thirty years ago, and although the Professor was then far in advance of public practice respecting the use of alcohol, yet his decisions are not as clear as those of Drs. Richardson and Condie, and the great majority of our more recent authors. Dr. Carpenter recommended the use of alcohol as a medicine when properly guarded, while most others discourage it; and many excellent physiologists and chemists have declared that it is never received into the stomach either of a sick man, or a well man, but with injurious results. It should be borne in mind, too, that when Dr. Carpenter wrote his essay the poisoned liquors of to-day were unknown. Therefore, when I quote the Doctor, I feel that I am quoting from an authority to which no liquor man can object.

In the author's preface he tells us to what conclusions his investigations led him :

“In the first place—That from a scientific examination of the *modus operandi* of alcohol upon the human body, when taken in a *poisonous* dose, or to such an extent as to produce intoxication, we may fairly draw inferences with regard to the specific effects which it is likely to produce, when repeatedly taken in excess, but not to an immediately-fatal amount.

“Secondly—That the consequences of the *excessive* use of alcoholic liquors, as proved by the experience of the medical profession, and universally admitted by medical writers, being precisely such as the study of its effects in poisonous and immediately-fatal doses would

lead us to anticipate, we are further justified in expecting that the habitual use of smaller quantities of these liquors, if sufficiently prolonged, will ultimately be attended, in a large proportion of cases, with consequences prejudicial to the human system—the morbid actions thus engendered being likely rather to be chronic, than acute, in their character.

“Thirdly—That as such morbid actions are actually found to be among the most common disorders of persons advanced in life, who have been in the habit of taking ‘*a moderate*’ allowance of alcoholic liquors, there is very strong ground for regarding them as in a great degree dependent upon the asserted cause; although the long postponement of their effects may render it impossible to *demonstrate* the existence of such a connection.

“Fourthly—That the preceding conclusion is fully borne out by the proved results of the ‘*moderate*’ use of alcoholic liquors, in producing a marked liability to the acute forms of similar diseases in hot climates, where their action is accelerated by other conditions; and also by the analogous facts now universally admitted in regard to the remotely-injurious effects of slight excess in diet, imperfect aeration of blood, insufficient repose, and other like violations of the laws of health when habitually practiced through a long period of time.

Fifthly—That the capacity of the healthy human system to sustain as much bodily or mental labor as it can be legitimately called upon to perform, and its power of resisting the extremes of heat and cold, as well as other depressing agencies, are not augmented by the use of alcoholic liquors; but that on the other hand, their use, under such circumstances, tends positively to the impairment of that capacity.

“Sixthly—That where there is a deficiency of power on the part of the system to carry on its normal actions with the energy and regularity, which constitute health, such power can rarely be imparted by the habitual use of alcoholic liquors; its deficiency being generally con-

sequent upon some habitual departure from the laws of health, for which the use of alcoholic liquors can not compensate; and the employment of such liquors, although with the temporary effect of palliating the disorder, having not merely a remotely-injurious effect *per se*, but also tending to mask the action of other morbid causes, by rendering the system more tolerant of them.

“Seventhly—That, consequently, it is the duty of the medical practitioner to discourage, as much as possible, the *habitual* use of alcoholic liquors in however ‘*moderate*’ a quantity, by all persons in ordinary health, and to seek to remedy those slight departures from health, which result from the ‘*wear and tear*’ of active life, by the means which shall most directly remove or antagonize their causes, instead of by such as simply palliate their effects.

“Eighthly—That whilst the habitual use of alcoholic liquors, even in the most ‘*moderate*’ amount, is likely (except in a few rare instances) to be rather injurious than beneficial, great benefit may be derived in the treatment of disease from the *medicinal* use of alcohol in appropriate cases; but that the same care should be employed in the discriminating selection of those cases as would be taken by the conscientious practitioner in regard to the administration of any other powerful remedy which is poisonous in large doses.”

Now, if I understand the Professor’s conclusions, they are—1. Because alcohol will produce intoxication when taken in large doses, its effects on the system will be injurious if taken repeatedly to excess. 2. The habitual, or beverage use of alcohol, though in smaller quantities, will be prejudicial to the system. 3. That the *unhealthy* conditions of persons having been in the habit of using alcohol as a beverage, may be legitimately

charged up to such habit. 4. The habitual use of alcohol will produce a marked liability to acute forms of diseases. 5. That the power to endure fatigue, perform mental labor, or resist heat or cold, is not augmented, but impaired, by the use of alcohol as a beverage. 6. In cases of debility, or want of strength, alcohol can not be used with any lasting results for good. 7. Consequently, it is the duty of the medical practitioner to discourage the habitual use of alcohol even in small quantities. 8. Alcohol may be used as a medicine, but should be prescribed by a competent and conscientious physician.

It is very certain, from all this, that in the mind of Dr. Carpenter, alcohol is not a food, and can not be used as a beverage, except in very rare cases, without evil results; and, while it may be used as a medicine, it must be managed with great skill and caution.

Certain it is, if alcohol is a medicine, it is not a food. And it is just as certain that no man ought ever to take so powerful a medicine except upon the prescription of a physician, (1) who knows the exact condition of the patient; (2) who knows just what medicine the patient needs; (3) how much; (4) how often; (5) under what treatment the patient should be during the action of such remedy; (6) and who is thoroughly conscientious, so that he would not make a prescription just to please the patient.

It is clear, then, that no man should use alcohol as a beverage, nor should he ever prescribe it for himself, nor for any one else, unless he is a practicing physician. It should be remembered, too, that the scientific decisions that prove it to be unwise and unsafe to use alcohol as a food or a beverage not only rule out the brandies, whiskies, and gin, but wine, ale, porter, beer, sherry, champagne, cider, etc.; for these are mainly sought for the alcohol which they contain.

In the conclusion of his preface, Dr. Carpenter shows that the scientific hosts were adopting his views; that “upward of *two thousand* of whom, in all grades and degrees—from the court physicians and leading metropolitan surgeons, who are conversant with the wants of the upper ranks of society to the humble country practitioner, who is familiar with the requirements of the artisan in his workshop and the laborer in the field—have signed the following certificate:

“We, the undersigned, are of the opinion—

“1. That a very large proportion of human misery, including poverty, disease, and crime, is induced by the use of alcoholic or fermented liquors as beverages.

“2. That the most perfect health is compatible with total abstinence from all such intoxicating beverages, whether in the form of ardent spirits, or as wine, beer, ale, porter, cider, etc., etc.

“3. That persons accustomed to such drinks may, with perfect safety, discontinue them entirely, either at once, or gradually, after a short time.

“4. That total and universal abstinence from alco

holic beverages of all sorts would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality, and the happiness of the human race."

Ninety-six physicians of Montreal, Canada, twenty-four of whom were professors and demonstrators in medical schools, in February, 1873, signed the following paper:

"Total abstinence from intoxicating liquors, whether fermented or distilled, is consistent with, and conducive to, the highest degree of physical and mental health and vigor."

The National Medical Association of the United States, at their Convention in Detroit, June, 1874, which was attended by more than four hundred physicians, resolved:

"That in view of the alarming prevalence and ill-effects of intemperance, with which none are so familiar as members of the medical profession, and which have called forth from English physicians the voice of warning to the people of Great Britain concerning the use of alcoholic beverages, we, as members of the medical profession of the United States, unite in the declaration that we believe that *alcohol should be classed with other powerful drugs*; that when prescribed medicinally, it should be done with conscientious caution, and a sense of great responsibility.

"That we would welcome any change in public sentiment that would confine the use of intoxicating liquors to the uses of *science, art, and medicine*."

The substance of this has been adopted by one hundred and twenty-four physicians in New York city and vicinity. Among them are such men as

Dr. Willard Parker, Alonzo Clark, Prof. E. R. Peaslee, Prof. Alford C. Post, Dr. Edward Delafield; John M. Cuyler, Medical Director in the United States Army; Stephen Smith, President, and Elisha Harris, Secretary of the American Health Association.

Dr. Benjamin W. Richardson, in his "Cantor Lectures," says of alcohol that it "is neither food nor drink suitable for his (man's) natural demands." Its application as an agent that shall enter the living organization is properly limited by the learning and skill possessed by the physician—a learning that in itself admits of being recast and revised in many important details, and, perhaps, in principles.

In a still more recent work, "The Diseases of Modern Life," he says of the physician that he "can find no place for alcohol as a necessity of life. . . . In whatever direction he turns his attention to determine the value of alcohol to man beyond the sphere of its value as a drug, which he at times may prescribe, he sees nothing but a void; in whatever way he turns his attention to determine the persistent effects of alcohol, he *sees nothing but disease and death; mental disease, mental death; physical disease, physical death.*" Pp. 209, 210.

From the report of the International Medical Congress, held in Philadelphia, September, 1876, on the paper read by Dr. Hunt, on "Alcohol in

its *therapeutic* relations as a food and a medicine," I quote the following:

"First—Alcohol is not shown to have a definite food-value by any of the usual methods of chemical analysis or physiological investigation.

"Second—Its use as a medicine is chiefly as a cardiac stimulant, and often admits of substitution.

"Third—As a medicine it is not well fitted for self-prescription by the laity, and the medical profession is not accountable for such administration or for the enormous evils resulting therefrom.

"Fourth—The purity of alcoholic liquors is, in general, not as well assured as that of articles used for medicine should be. The various mixtures, when used as a medicine, should have a definite and known composition, and should not be interchanged promiscuously."

Dr. Cartwright, of New Orleans, in 1853, thus writes to the *Boston Medical Journal*:

x "The yellow fever came down like a storm upon this devoted city, with 1,127 dram-shops, in *one* of the *four* parts into which it has been divided. It is not the citizen proper, but the foreigners, with mistaken notions about the climate and country, who are the chief supporters of these haunts of intemperance. *About five thousand of them died before the epidemic touched a single citizen or a sober man, so far as I can get at the facts.*"

Thus it is evident that when a man uses alcohol as a beverage he does so in the face of the scientific world. And even in its use as a medicine it probably kills ten to where it ever cures one. In the yellow fever of 1878 it was employed as a medicine (so far as reported) to the loss of *every case*. Let the laity then, at least, keep their hands from this accursed poison.

Those who would have it appear that alcohol is a profitable stimulant make a free use of the name of Dr. Periera, and yet he stated, in answer to a question addressed to him concerning this very point, that "in my *Materia Medica* I have characterized alcohol as a *powerful, subtle, and corrosive poison*. If I had to point out," he adds, "the injurious qualities of alcohol, I could soon prove that, though it evolves heat in burning, it is an *obnoxious and most expensive fuel*."

Dr. Lionel S. Beale, M. D., F. R. S., Physician to King's College Hospital, says: "Alcohol does *not* act as food, does *not* nourish tissue; nay, more," he adds, "it cuts short the life of rapidly growing cells, or causes them to live more slowly."

Dr. Markham, in the *British Medical Journal*, 1864, summed up the question as follows: "The chemical theories upon which the extensive use of alcohol has been based, in disease and health, have at length been found *untenable*. Alcohol is *not* a supporter of combustion. It does *not* prevent the wear and tear of tissues. Part and probably the whole of it escapes from the body, and none of it, so far as we know, is assimilated or serves for the purpose of nutrition. *It is, therefore, not a food in the eye of science*."

Even Prof. Von Moleschott says: "Alcohol does not effect and direct restitution. *It does not deserve the name of an alimentary principle*."

Dr. T. K. Chambers, in his "Clinical Lectures,"

says: "It is clear that we must cease to regard alcohol *as in any sense an aliment*, inasmuch as it goes out as it went in, and does not, as far as we *know*, leave any of its substance behind it."

The eminent French chemists, Lallemand, Perrin and Duroy, in October, 1860, declared that "*facts establish, from a physiological point of view, a line of demarkation between alcohol and food.*"

Dr. Monroe, in a treatise upon the "Physiological effects of Alcohol," says: "Every writer upon toxicology has classified alcohol as a narcotic or a narcotico-acrid poison. For proof, I refer you to the works of Prof. Orfila, Dr. Pereira, Prof. Christison, Dr. Taylor, and other eminent authorities. "Alcohol," he goes on to say, "is a *powerful narcotic poison*, and if a large dose be taken *no antidote is known to its effect.*" He then goes on to prove that by its action upon the saliva, the gastric juice, the chyme, the albumen, the pepsin, and the blood, alcohol is always a "*rank and deadly poison.*" Dr. T. K. Chambers, physician to the Prince of Wales, says: "It is clear that we must cease to regard alcohol *as in any sense a food.*"

Dr. Markham says, in summing up certain lengthy and able discussions in the British medical journals upon the question, "Is alcohol food or physic?" "we are bound in conscience to boldly declare the *logical and inevitable* conclusion that alcohol is *not* food; that if its imbibition be of service, it is so only to man in an *abnormal*

condition, and that ordinary social indulgence in alcoholic drinks is, medically speaking, very *unphysiological* and *prejudicial*."

Prof. E. L. Youmans, in his essay entitled "Alcohol and the Constitution of Man," says: "There is but one word in our language which describes the relation of alcohol to the human system, and that word is *poison*." And near the close of his article he declares that "there is no escape from the conclusion that alcohol, in whatever form or *quantity*, is a poison in all the common cases of its employment."

Nearly all our modern physiologists tell us that alcohol can not assist in the digestion of food, neither can it be digested. Hence, at least as a food or a beverage, it must always be not only useless but injurious. To show its power over the body and mind of man, I will make one quotation from John B. Gough:

"For three days I endured more agony than pen could describe, even were it guided by the hand of a Dante. Who can tell the horrors of that horrible malady, aggravated as it is by the almost ever-abiding consciousness that it is self-sought? Hideous faces appeared on the walls and on the floors; foul things crept along the bed-clothes, and glaring eyes peered into mine. I was at one time surrounded by millions of monstrous spiders, which crawled slowly over every limb; whilst beaded drops of perspiration would start to my brow, and my limbs would shiver until the bed rattled again. Strange lights would dance before my eyes, and then suddenly the very blackness of darkness would appall me by its dense gloom. All at once, whilst gazing

at a frightful creation of my distempered mind, I seemed struck with sudden blindness. I knew a candle was burning in the room, but I could not see it. All was so pitchy dark. I lost the sense of feeling, too, for I endeavored to grasp my arm in one hand, but consciousness was gone. I put my hand to my side, my head, but felt nothing, and still I knew my limbs and frame *were* there. And then the scene would change. I was falling—falling swiftly as an arrow far down into some terrible abyss; and so like reality was it, that as I fell I could see the rocky sides of the horrible shaft, where mocking, gibing, mowing, fiend-like forms were perched; and I could feel the air rushing past me, making my hair stream out by the force of the unwholesome blast. Then the paroxysm sometimes ceased for a few moments, and I would sink back on my pallet drenched by perspiration, utterly exhausted, and feeling a dreadful certainty of the renewal of my torments.”

It is very common for the defenders of alcohol to say that all this is the abuse rather than the use of alcohol. Be it so; but what can not be used by such a man as Gough without the abuse is not a thing to recommend for men in general, nor is it safe to be used by them. Many a young man is heard to boast of his self control and consequent safety from the possibilities of drunkenness. He says: “*I can take a drink or I can let it alone.*”

Charles Lamb, in his “Confessions of a Drunkard,” says: “Is there no middle way betwixt total abstinence and the excess which kills you? For your sake, gentle reader, and that you may never attain to my experience, with pain I must utter the dreadful truth that there is none—none that I can find.”

There may be a time in life when this can be done. But if any one continues to drink intoxicants regularly, that time will pass away. There are two reasons why this is so.

1. *The power of habit.* This is greater than most persons seem to realize. Let any practice be continued for a number of years, if it amounts to no more than the silly habit of chewing gum, and strong resolution will be necessary to break away from it. The mind as readily falls into ruts as the wheels of the carriage; and will as certainly remain in them unless lifted out by some extraordinary means; and even then there will be a strong tendency to slue back into former manners. The young man who says he can drink or refuse to drink, at pleasure, has not considered the power of habit, by which a man may be controlled during his whole life for good or evil.

2. *Alcoholism.* Many do not know, nor care to know, any thing of this dreadful disease. It is not the result alone of intoxication, but even the *moderate* use of alcohol will gradually bring about that condition of the system.

Dr. Hutcheson, in the "Report of the Glasgow Lunatic Asylum," for 1844, writes from close observation respecting *oinomania* or *wine mania*, or an uncontrollable thirst for intoxicating drinks. (See pp. 39-44 of the Report.) He says, "The disease appears in three forms—the acute, the periodic, and the chronic." Of the periodic form he says:

“In some cases it occurs whenever the individual partakes of stimulants. In these, total abstinence is the only remedy. Like the form about to be mentioned, it is frequently hereditary, derived from a parent disposed to insanity or addicted to intemperance. In such cases the probability of cure is very small. The individual thus affected abstains for weeks or months from all stimulants, and frequently loathes them for the same period. But by degrees he becomes uneasy, listless and depressed, feels incapable of application or restless, and at last begins to drink till he is intoxicated. He awakes from a restless sleep, seeks again a repetition of the intoxicating dose, and continues the same course for a week or longer.”

Under the third form of this disease our author says :

“Of all the forms of *oinomania* the most common is the *chronic*. The causes of this are injuries of the head, diseases of the heart, hereditary predisposition, and intemperance. This is by far the most incurable form of the malady. The patient is incessantly under the most overwhelming desire for stimulants. He will disregard every impediment, sacrifice comfort and reputation, withstand the claims of affection, consign his family to misery and disgrace, and deny himself the common necessaries of life to gratify his insane propensity. In the morning morose and fretful, disgusted with himself, and dissatisfied with all around him, weak and tremulous, incapable of any exertion either of mind or body, his first feeling is a desire for stimulants, with every fresh dose of which he recovers a certain degree of vigor, both of body and mind, till he feels comparatively comfortable. . . . And, unless absolutely secluded from all means of gratifying his propensity, the patient continues the same course till he dies, or becomes an imbecile.”

As alcohol is not digestible, it acts immedi-

ately upon the blood, and through it influences the entire system, until the lungs, liver, kidneys, nerves, brain, stomach, etc., etc., are diseased by this acrid poison. He is an unwise person who will tamper with it. A man may thus become diseased very gradually, and hardly realize his condition till all hope of his salvation is gone. But few men ever come to know themselves as confirmed drunkards. Every one else will know it first. He thinks that he has been a little unsteady at times, and very sick at others, while the people have said: "He gets as drunk as a brute at least once a week, and frequently has touches of *delirium tremens*."

If there is any such thing as the use of alcohol as a beverage without its abuse, it is safe to say that very few men ever attain to it. Of all the men who have used it even "*moderately*," ninety-nine out of every one hundred have been injured by it. Hence there remains no reason why it should be tolerated, seeing that it is an evil and not a blessing. Or, if there are benefits to be derived by its use, its evils counterbalance them a hundred times. It is idle to talk of the "*use and not the abuse*," when it is clear that the wisest and most determined men are unable to so control themselves while using it. We can not judge of it by some imaginary use which we suppose might be made of it, but in the light of the real facts in its history it is to be condemned.

THE USE OF ALCOHOL INDUCES INSANITY.

Dr. Hutcheson makes the following tabular report of the Asylum in Glasgow :

YEAR.	Total No. of Patients.	Cases where the Disease was Hereditary, etc.	Cases where the Cause was Unknown.	Cases where Intemperance was the Cause.	Proportion per cent. of Intemperance to other Causes.
1840	149	3	34	20	13.4
1841	157	20	44	30	19.1
1842	199	54	20	46	23.1
1843	327	116	38	31	9.42
1844	390	77	41	53	18.2
1845	360	47	38	90	24.7
1846	414	49	62	105	25.3
Total.	1900	366	277	375	19.73

In 1843 a large number of patients were introduced from Arran of whom no report was made respecting the origin of their lunacy. These were either put into the list of those coming from hereditary descent or the unknown. No doubt many of these were from intemperance. Also those all the time marked *unknown* contain a large per cent. who have lost the balance of mind because of the use of alcohol. I think, therefore, that it is not unreasonable to suppose that one-third of the inmates of that institution had been thus lost to the world and themselves either be-

cause of their own intemperance or that of their parents.

An accurate report from our American Asylums would exhibit the work of rum in a frightfully large number of cases.

Not only insanity, but mental debility and idiocy, are the result of the influence of alcohol. Dr. Carpenter, in his work on "Alcoholic Liquors," pp. 48, 49, thus writes of "Mental Debility in the Offspring:"

"It is scarcely necessary to accumulate further proof in support of the assertion, that of all the single cases of insanity, habitual intemperance is the most potent, and that it aggravates the operation of other causes. We have now to show that it has a special tendency to produce idiocy, insanity, or mental debility, *in the offspring*. Looking to the decided tendency to hereditary predisposition in the ordinary forms of insanity; looking also to the fact that perverted or imperfect conditions of the nutritive functions established in the parent are also liable to manifest themselves in the offspring (as shown in the transmission of the gouty and tubercular diatheses), we should expect to find that the offspring of habitual drunkards would share with those of lunatics in the predisposition to insanity, and that they would, moreover, be especially prone to intemperate habits. That such is the case is within the knowledge of all who have enjoyed extensive opportunities of observation; and the fact has come down to us sanctioned by the experience of antiquity. Thus Plutarch says: 'One drunkard begets another;' and Aristotle remarks that, 'Drunken women bring forth children like unto themselves.'"

Dr. W. A. F. Browne, the resident physician of

the Crichton Lunatic Asylum, at Dumfries, makes the following statements :

“The drunkard not only injures and enfeebles his own nervous system, but entails mental disease upon his family. His daughters are nervous and hysterical; his sons are weak, wayward, eccentric, and sink insane under the pressure of excitement, of some unforeseen exigency, or of the ordinary calls of duty. At present I have two patients who appear to inherit a tendency to unhealthy action of the brain from mothers addicted to drinking; and another, an idiot, whose father was a drunkard.”

The author has learned from Dr. Hutcheson that the results of his observations are precisely in accordance with the foregoing.

On this point, however, the most striking fact that the writer has met with is contained in the “Report on Idiocy,” lately made by Dr. Howe to the Legislature of Massachusetts:

“The habits of the parents of three hundred of the idiots were learned; and one hundred and forty-five, or nearly *one-half*, are reported as ‘known to be habitual drunkards.’ Such parents, it is affirmed, give a weak and lax constitution to their children; who are, consequently, deficient in bodily and vital energy, and predisposed, by their very organization, to have cravings for alcoholic stimulants. Many of these children are feeble and live irregularly. Having a lower vitality, they feel the want of some stimulation. If they pursue the course of their fathers, which they have more temptation to follow, and less power to avoid, than the children of the temperate, they add to their hereditary weakness, and increase the tendency to idiocy in their

constitution; and this they leave to their children after them. The parents of case No. 62 were drunkards, and had seven idiotic children."

See, also, *American Journal of Medical Sciences*, April, 1849, page 437.

The Physical, Mental and Moral Evil.

CHAPTER II.

As seen in the preceding chapter, alcohol, taken in any way, does not impart vitality to the system, but really depletes it. Men can not endure as much fatigue, neither can they resist the heat or the cold as well, if they use alcohol, as they can if they do not use it. A very common error is that alcohol will assist in withstanding extreme cold. The Russian army furnishes positive proof to the contrary.

Also, it has been shown that the use of alcohol paves the way for any contagion to take hold and perform its work of death. Cholera, yellow fever, or any infectious disease whatever, marks the whisky and beer drinkers as a particular prey. They are the first attacked, and are most easily slain. Of the great number who have frozen to death on our frontiers, three-fourths, if not more, have been partially under the influence of alcohol. I speak of this from personal observation, having been on the frontier for twenty-six years. They

are more easily bewildered, less competent to endure fatigue, less able to resist the cold, and on many other accounts are their dangers increased by the use of intoxicating drinks. It has been noticed, too, that the cases of sun-stroke follow the line of beer-drinkers very closely. But few men who are really temperate are ever seriously injured in this way.

Life insurance has sufficiently proven that the use of alcohol as a beverage shortens life and greatly increases the death-rate among men. I will again quote from Dr. Carpenter's work on "Alcohol" (pp. 71, 72), on the "General Effect of the Excessive Use of Alcoholic Liquors on the Duration of Life:"

"69. We shall close this part of the inquiry by examining into the general tendency of the excessive use of alcoholic liquors to shorten life; either by themselves giving rise to the diseases above enumerated, or by increasing the susceptibility of the system to other morbid causes. That such a tendency exists can not for a moment be questioned. No life insurance office will accept an insurance on an individual whose habits are known to be intemperate; and if it be discovered after his death that he has been accustomed to the excessive use of alcoholic liquors, contrary to his statement in his proposal for insurance, the policy is declared void. And it is doubtless owing in part to the superior sobriety of the great bulk of insurers over that of the average of the population, that a lower rate of mortality presents itself among them than that which might be expected according to the calculations founded on the entire mortality of the country, to the great profit of the office. Thus,

at the age of 40 years, the annual rate of mortality among the whole population of England is about 13 per 1,000; whilst among the lives insured in the Life Offices it is about 11 per 1,000; and in those insured in the Friendly Societies it is about 10 per 1,000. Now, the average mortality for all ages, between 15 and 70 years, is about 20 per 1,000; whereas in the Temperance Provident Institution, after an experience of eight years, and with several lives above 70 years of age, the average mortality has been only 6 per 1,000 up to the present season, in which it has undergone a slight increase from the cholera epidemic. It is worthy of remark, however, that although many of the insurers in this office are of the poorer class, whose condition and employment expose them much more than the middling classes generally to the epidemic causes of cholera, no more than 8 have died of this disease out of the total of about 3,500 insurers. As a means of further comparison the following table may be subjoined, in which the mortality of the insurers in the Temperance Provident Institution for the first five years is compared with that of the insurers in other offices during the corresponding period of their existence :

	Life Policies.	Deaths.						
A	issued 944 and had	14,	being equal to	15	per one thousand.			
B	“ 1,901 “ “	27,	“ “	14	“ “ “			
C	“ 838 “ “	11,	“ “	13	“ “ “			
D	“ 2,470 “ “	65,	“ “	26	“ “ “			
T. P. I.	“ 1,596 “ “	12,	“ “	7½	“ “ “			

Here it is seen that the total abstainers in the T. P. I. (Temperance Provident Institution) suffered less than half the mortality of the other companies—permitting what they denominated a moderate use of alcoholic liquors.

E. Vivian, M. A., read a paper before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at its

annual meeting in 1875, from which I get the following facts respecting the mortality of total abstainers as compared with the death-rate of the people generally:

“RATE OF MORTALITY DURING THE LAST NINE YEARS,
ENDING 30TH DECEMBER, 1874.

In the Total Abstinence section:

Expected deaths	549
Actual deaths.....	411

Difference.....	138
-----------------	-----

Or 25 per cent. below the average.”

But some one will be ready to urge that we are only comparing total abstinence with drunkenness, or the excessive use of alcohol. It should be remembered, however, that this is not true, for we have given the difference between total abstinence and what the insurance companies permit, and they do not allow it used to “*excess*,” or to drunkenness.

Sir H. Thompson, a practitioner of very wide reputation, writes thus to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

“I have long had the conviction that there is no greater cause of evil, moral or physical, in the country, than the use of alcoholic beverages. I do not mean by this that extreme indulgence which produces drunkenness. The habitual use of fermented liquors to an extent far short of what is necessary to produce that condition, and such as is quite common in all ranks of society, injures the body and diminishes the mental strength to an extent which, I think, few people are aware of. Such, at all events, is the result of observation during more than twenty years of professional life,

devoted to hospital practice and to private practice in every rank above it. Thus I have no hesitation in attributing a large proportion of some of the most painful and dangerous maladies which come under my notice, as well as those which every medical man has to treat, to the ordinary and daily use of fermented drink taken in the quantity which is conventionally deemed moderate."

We could quote at any length from the best scientific and medical authorities in Europe and America, to show that alcohol, taken in any quantity, is an enemy to the human system; that only in a few extreme cases of disease can it be profitably used as a medicine; that even then there is danger of laying the foundation of a worse malady than is likely to be cured by the remedy; that in most cases it can be supplanted by other remedies that are not attended with its evils, and that while it may possibly save a few lives, it is certain that it destroys a thousand for every one it even temporarily heals.

We have seen, too, that one of the legitimate results of the habitual use of alcoholic liquors is the mental derangement, not only of the drinker, but the children, to the third and fourth generation. Much of the insanity and idiocy of our land are from this parent of evils. That it shortens the lives of those who use it admits of no doubt. That even its *moderate* use increases the death-rate is proven beyond dispute. Our life-lease is worth very much more without it than with it.

But look again at the host of those who are killed outright by the use of intoxicating drinks. Many also die from disease, or predisposition to sickness so remotely traceable to the use of alcoholic liquors that it would be difficult to prove that such habit caused their death, and yet very certainly attributable to that cause. The fighting, stabbing, shooting, by which not only the drinkers, but many sober and useful men are killed, are largely owing to the use of intoxicating drinks. Take a Chicago daily and cut out all the deaths, murders, etc., justly chargeable to rum, and you will find your paper badly injured. Then remember that the work is being prosecuted in all our large towns and in most of our villages throughout nearly the whole country, and you will begin to form some idea of the work of death wrought by the rum fiend in this beautiful land of ours. Deaths by murders, deaths by disease, deaths by accidents, etc., etc., occasioned by intoxicating liquors, in the United States of America, have been variously estimated at from 60,000 to 120,000 annually. I presume to say that we are safe in adopting the first figures. A true account would be more likely to overrun than fall short of that number.

In view of these incontestable facts, we are surprised at the indifference of the American people on this subject.

But I am told that the great mortality occa-

sioned by the use of these liquors in this country is largely due to the fact that they are poisoned. Perhaps it is true that, at the present time,

ALL LIQUORS ARE POISONED.

But it should be remembered that the medical decisions that we have quoted have been made respecting *alcohol*, and the supposition has been that these liquors were what they claimed to be. Hence these liquors are poisonous to the physical system. But now that they are universally drugged, they are doubly so. Some five years ago, in Lincoln, Nebraska, the temperance men obtained twelve samples of liquors in that city and submitted them to Prof. Aughey, of the State University, for an analysis. Here is his report:

“LINCOLN, NEB., *April 25, 1874.*

“REPORT TO THE LINCOLN CITY TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

“In accordance with your request, I have made a careful analysis of the liquors brought me two weeks ago. The following is the result:

[I omit the analysis of these liquors. There was not one of the samples that did not contain the most virulent poison, of various kinds, and in large quantities.]

“This analysis is not exhaustive, as I did not separate the sugar which some of the liquors contained in the form of caramel, or the cayenne pepper which all the whiskies contained, more or less. The poisonous substances, however, I carefully separated. The absolute amount of sugar of lead, strychnine and strontia,

was remarkably large. The poisonous qualities of these substances are so well known that nothing here needs to be said about them.

“In many of these liquors there is strychnine enough in a quart to kill a man if it were taken separate from any other mixture and at one dose; the same is true of the sugar of lead.

“In good whisky, the amount of alcohol should be from 40 to 50 per cent. But in these liquors, it ranged only from 15 to 25 per cent., the larger percentages belonging to the brandies and gin.

“As good liquors as some of these whiskies could be profitably manufactured for thirty cents a gallon; and *none* of these liquors are what they purport to be.

“If any one doubts that these poisons are found in common liquors, if such doubter will come to the University laboratory in the afternoon I will separate and precipitate lead, strontia, etc., in his presence.

“Respectfully submitted,

“SAM'L AUGHEY,

“Prof. of Chemistry in University of Nebraska.”

When this report was published there was “no small stir” in the city. Some saloon-keepers declared that they did not know that they had been dealing out such poisons. But the wholesale dealers, and some of the druggists were involved. Some of the most interested denied the correctness of the analysis, but they did not dare to put it to the proof.

We implead the rum trade in the name of our “wasted resources,” of two billions burned; in the name of a drunken Congress and an injured people; and we charge it with rape, theft, prostitution; with the crushing of every diamond vir-

tue, and the cultivation of every vice. Let bleary-eyed, blackened, bloated, and blistered humanity, testify as to the causes of their ruin; let the drunken dead arise and state the temptations, the snares, and the slippery ground from which they fell into the vortex of eternal ruin. Bring forward the three millions of children, now withheld from our common schools because of rum and the poverty, stupidity and disgrace that result from its use, who run the streets in rags, who live from filthy gleanings and theft, many of whom have been cursed into being by drunken brutes in human form, and permit them to tell the story of woe-begone, and describe the scenes of incipient hell, so familiar to their eyes. Awake, O Potter's Field, and tell of the slaughtered innocents thou hast kindly hidden in thy bosom, that were murdered outright by the red hand of the rum power. Thou gentle zephyrs, who sigh so plaintively, tell us of the burden of sorrow with which thou art freighted from all lands because of the vice and wretchedness that have been occasioned by the sale of rum. Let all intelligences, who know the sad results of intemperance, tell the story, and the sum of evils in the world because of the rum trade, and all will acknowledge that murder is a minor evil compared with the work of drunkard making, which is the parent of nine-tenths of all crime, murder included.

I have no doubt of the average integrity of the

Lincoln rum-sellers. The poisons found in those liquors are to be found in them all over the country; and he who presumes to drink them must assume the responsibility of taking the rankest poison in the dark.

BEER IS SUPPOSED TO BE A WHOLESOME DRINK.

It is thought to have been first manufactured by the ancient Egyptians, several centuries before Christ; but from some cause its manufacture was discontinued and forgotten, till it was introduced from France during the French invasion. The Grecian poet Archilochus, 700 B. C., and the tragedians Æschylus and Sophocles, 400 B. C., speak of *the wine of barley*. The ancient Germans were quite noted for beer, which was called *cerevisia*—from *Ceres*, the goddess of grain, and *vis*, power. Whether the beer of those times was like that which is now in use we have but little means of knowing. I suppose, however, it then, as now, contained the power to intoxicate, and, because of that quality, that it was sought after by the people.

It is argued that *beer and ale*, as now used, are healthful drinks; and multitudes of men, and even women, drink it regularly, supposing it to be nutritious and wholesome.

I DIFFER FROM THIS OPINION AND WILL TELL YOU WHY.

1. In the barley from which it is made there is nutritive aliment, but with every change in the

process of beer-making we lose those God-given qualities of the grain that make it valuable to the consumer; and when the work is completed there is but little left that can be beneficial to the human system.

2. There is a per cent. of alcohol in beer varying from 2 to 9, which, taken as a beverage, is always injurious. Whatever else we shall find in any kind of beer the two facts named are sufficient to cause me to reject it as being inefficient for any particular good, but competent to do much harm.

THE PROCESSES IN BREWING PROVE MY POSITION TO BE CORRECT.

1. *The steeping or sprouting.* The grain is covered in water. In this condition it remains for about two days. In this time the grain is supposed to germinate. The grain now exhibits *starch sugar* qualities, but in the soaking it has lost much of its original power—the same as our grain that sprouts in the stack or germinates before being ground.

2. It is now taken out and thrown into a heap, and left to heat and further complete the process of germination. Here it has to be changed from the inside out several times that the growth may be evenly continued. In this *acrosfire* it is continued for about fourteen days. By this time the germ is supposed to reach the end or point of the grain and the sweetening process is done. But in

these two weeks of heating, stirring and cooling, much of the original strength and power of the grain is exhumed.

3. The growth is now suddenly stopped by spreading the whole mass upon a kiln, or a perforated floor, with a fire beneath. Here the life of the grain is thoroughly destroyed. Again by the dampness and growing condition and now the heating and drying process, the original qualities of the grain are still further evaporated and made to disappear.

4. The barley is next to be crushed between rollers, and then mixed up with hot water. Thus the *starch sugar* is dissolved, and we have as the result a sweet liquor, called wort. We yet have the mucilage, starch, and sugar of the grain—not all, but most of it. Hence, to prevent a putrefactive fermentation, it is boiled. Here it passes another evaporating process. The mucilage is coagulated and gotten rid of. A portion of hops is added, which is thought to add wholesome qualities, because the beer is made bitter. It is disagreeable until the taste has become depraved.

5. After the *worts* are sufficiently boiled, they are poured out into coolers, in which the mucilage is deposited. Here again is another departure of properties of barley.

6. The next, and last change that I notice, is the fermentation in vats, and the addition of yeast. In this change the alcohol is produced, and the

remaining properties of the barley are now almost entirely dissipated.

What have we, then, in all this malting, sweetening, sprouting, germinating, heating, sweating, spreading, cooling, cooking, drying, evaporating, crushing, watering, mixing, dissolving, boiling, fermenting, hopping, yeasting, that is competent to furnish anything that is fit for the stomach of a man?

Prof. Liebig declares it to be demonstrable that there is no more nutriment in eight quarts of beer than there is in the amount of good wheat flour that can be had to lie on the point of a table-knife.

Besides, lager beer not only contains nothing really advantageous to man, but it is poisoned, just the same as all other liquors. There are three gallons of beer sold to where the maltsters have received barley enough to make one.

A farmer adds a little sand to his timothy seed. He injures no one's health, nor does he destroy any one's life; he only cheats a dealer out of four or five dollars. For it, however, the State employs him at hard labor for ten years. What, then, shall be done with the creatures that poison our sons? In 1866, four houses in New York city palmed off two millions of these deadly compounds. They buy the meanest whisky or spoiled cider, and "drug" it into the rarest wines in a few hours. It not infrequently happens that a country seller drives in a few barrels of his poorest drinks, sells it

to a manufacturer, does his shopping, and in a few hours drives back with a part of the same stuff "drugged" into wine or brandy, for which he paid an advance of four or five gallons. A Frenchman, pointing to a barrel, said: "Tell me what kind of wine or brandy you want, and give me three hours, and I will draw it out of that barrel."

The more costly the liquor the more certain the fraud. The whole champagne district is only twenty thousand acres, and produces only about 800,000 baskets per annum. Of this Russia consumes 160,000 baskets, France 162,000, England 220,000, Germany 146,000; leaving for America and the rest of the world only 112,000. Yet Yankees consume more than 1,000,000 baskets yearly. How dull it is in England and Germany, and France and Russia, to imagine that they get any champagne when they consume twenty-five per cent. more than is produced.

Only 30,000 barrels of wine are produced on the Island of Madeira. America buys 50,000 barrels, and the rest of the world has a full share.

Port wine is manufactured in Douro Valley, in Portugal. The valley is narrow, and only sixty miles long. Yet all the world drinks from these vineyards. London alone drinks more than twice as much port wine as is produced, both good and bad. There is consumed annually more than one hundred times as much as is produced. Follow a gallon of pure juice from the press on the banks

of the Douro. In the warehouse in Oporto, by the aid of beet whisky, elder-berry juice and water, it is made into five gallons. In the London Dock warehouse, by the aid of potato whisky, red saunders, and the like, it swells up into twenty gallons. In New York it takes a dose of strychnine, belladonna, and spoiled cider, and puffs up into thirty gallons. In the wholesale house in Chicago, bad whisky, stramonium, and drugs, enlarge it to forty gallons. In the retailer's back room it gets another dose, and comes out eighty gallons. We receive one drop in eighty, and that is twenty-five per cent. better than the average.

With these facts before us, it would seem that nothing but the most uncompromising perverseness, or the most uncontrollable ignorance, can account for the stupidity necessary to continue the use of these drinks.

Already we have seen the depletion of the human stock because of the poisons received through alcoholic liquors. The body is weakened, the blood is poisoned, the children are depraved—liable to insanity, idiocy, and vice of every description. Alcohol is the leech that draws away the virtuous blood of our nation, corrupts the fountains of family and social life, blights our public morals, and leaves us, to the extent of its influence, a community of plunderers and criminals. It causes

FOUR-FIFTHS OF THE CRIME OF THE NATION.

The Annual Report of the Board of Inspectors of the Massachusetts State Prison to the Legislature (of 1868) is equally explicit against license. The Inspectors say, pp. 7, 8:

“Intemperance, as a most fruitful cause of crime, has been frequently referred to in past reports of the warden and inspectors, and the general fact is undeniable that a very large proportion of offenses against law which bring men to prison for punishment are committed through the agency of intoxicating liquors, and that their increased public sale adds to the number of crimes committed and the number of persons convicted. We are not called upon to discuss this matter separate from our observation as supervisors of the prison, and therefore simply call attention to the fact of the increased number of commitments made during eight months of the present year, when the sale of spiritous liquors has been almost wholly unrestrained, over those of the same time in the preceding year, when the public sale was prohibited, and, to a great extent, stopped.”

Warden Haynes speaks as follows, in his “Pictures from Prison Life,” p. 272:

“Since I have been connected with the prison, we have had twenty-one here for killing their wives, two for killing their fathers, and one for killing his mother. Of these twenty-four, *all but one were not only habitual drunkards, but actually drunk when they committed the crime.* Not one of this number was born a drunkard; not one but was once a temperate drinker; not one but what at some period in his life would have been indignant had it been intimated that he might become a drunkard, much less a murderer; not one but was as secure against becoming a drunkard as any other man who is in the habit of drinking occasionally. . . . I repeat, these

were not bad men, except when under the influence of liquor."

Even in 1670, Sir Matthew Hale, Chief Justice of England, said:

"The places of judicature I have long held in this kingdom have given me an opportunity to observe the original cause of most of the enormities that have been committed for the space of nearly twenty years; and, by due observation, I have found that if the murders and manslaughters, the burglaries and robberies, the riots and tumults, the adulteries, fornications, rapes, and other enormities that have happened in that time, were divided into *five* parts, *four* of them have been the issues and product of excessive drinking—of tavern or ale-house drinking."

The *Irish Republic*, a Roman Catholic journal of New York, recognizes this fact, and accounts for the same precisely as do the official reports which we have introduced. It says:

"The curse of intemperance has been the great cause of all our misfortunes as a people. To it can be traced the loss of our independence at home, and the cause of all our miseries abroad. It is the basis of all crime, and the man or men who make our people temperate, will obliterate Irish crime. We assert and defy contradiction, that a sober Irishman scarcely ever commits a crime. There may be exceptions, but they are of no consequence. It is whisky, then, that brings shame into the Irish household, that whets the knife of the infuriated madman, that abuses the wife and sends the children adrift on the world. It fills the prisons and poor-houses, and gives the enemies of our race a whip to lash us. It is the duty, then, of all men to take measures to destroy this monster that has destroyed our people.

“We have received the Annual Report of the New York Board of Police for the year ending October 31st, 1868, and turning to the column of arrests, we find that during the year 78,451 persons were arrested. Of this number, 25,957 were Americans; 8,281 were Germans; 37,014 were Irish.

“It is useless to attempt to shut out these figures; they have gone before the world, and we must acknowledge that they are disgraceful to us as a people. Every man of our race, no matter what his standing may be in society, the name of our country and every principle in which our nation takes pride, is pressed down to the level of the gutters by the strong arm of that demon which has dragged thirty-seven thousand of our people to the watch-houses of New York, and pilloried the degraded wretches before the public gaze.

“We are sure that out of the 37,000 Irish arrested for the year, 35,000 were for ‘drunk and disorderly.’ It matters not, as far as public scandal is concerned, whether they were arrested for drunkenness or for heavier crimes. The public does not look behind the figures on the Police Board, and those figures convict us of supplying almost *one-half of the entire crime of New York!*”

On page 175, the Board of Charities for Massachusetts, 1868, we read:

“The prison registers indicate that more than two-thirds of the criminals in the State are the victims of intemperance; but the proportion of crime traceable to this great vice must be set down, as heretofore, *at not less than four-fifths*. Its effects are unusually apparent in almost every grade of crime. A noticeable illustration appears in the number of commitments to the State Prison, which, during eight months of the present year, in which the sale of intoxicating liquors has been almost wholly unrestrained, was 136, against 65 during the corresponding months of the preceding year. *Sim-*

ilar results appear in nearly all the prisons of the Commonwealth."

Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, of England, says: "That his experience as a jurist has shown that crimes of violence almost without exception were traceable to drunkenness."

Judge Patterson says: "If it were not for drink, you and I would have nothing to do."

Judge Addison says: "If all men could be persuaded from the use of intoxicating drinks, the office of judge would be a sinecure."

Chief Justice Davis, of New York, says: "The saloons and grogeries have had full swing, and filled the city with a huge amount of misery and crime. . . . More than seven-eighths of the crimes committed in this country, which involve personal violence, are traceable to the use of intoxicating liquors."

Judge Garney says: "Almost every crime has its origin more or less in drinking."

Judge Wrightman says: "Three-fourths of the cases of crime have their origin in public houses and beer houses."

Judge Coleridge says: "But for the offenses brought on by the excessive use of intoxicating liquors, the courts of justice might nearly be shut up."

J. P. Newman, in a sermon recently preached in New York, very correctly points out the true course of vagrancy and crime. He says:

“Let us demand of the Legislature such a law as will strike at the fruitful cause of more than two-thirds of all the vagrancy, pauperism and crime in our city—that is, the license system. I hold that system responsible for the following facts: Of the 9,000 adult paupers in this State who are permanently dependent upon public charity, 6,000 are intemperate; 93,000 arrests in this city in 1877—62,000 were for intoxication and disorderly conduct; and much of the insanity and idiocy came from the same cause. There are seventeen miles of rum-shops in New York. Our city receives annually \$300,000 for license fees, and expends annually \$8,000,000—chargeable directly or indirectly to the liquor traffic. We have a right to demand a legal deliverance from supporting the poor whose poverty comes from intemperance.”

In a very interesting sketch of the Albany Penitentiary and of the labors in connection therewith of Superintendent Pillsbury, and of his father, the late General Pillsbury, by Wilbur Arliston Worlock, Esq., it is stated that during the period of ten years ending with 1876, there have been incarcerated in that prison 13,413 prisoners. “Of that number,” it is added, “10,214 have *admitted* that they were of intemperate habits, while 3,199 *claimed* to be temperate.” Mr. Worlock thinks it “would prove a hard task indeed to furnish a more damning evidence of the curse of intemperance that so prodigally thrives within our midst,” and that these significant figures “furnish the true key with which to unlock and reveal the scourge from which so large a portion of crime emanates.” We fully concur in his view, and also that it is a “disgrace to humanity, to a Christian people,

that public sentiment has become so blunted as to license crime in this direction"—a guilt shared by the national, state, municipal, and local governments, and by the voters of the country who create and perpetuate them.

Judge Davis, of New York, in sentencing Joseph P. Wall to fifteen years' imprisonment for kicking his wife to death, said that the prisoner must have been intoxicated when he bought the whisky which encouraged the crime, and says the children thus doubly orphaned could bring suit against the liquor dealers for damages sufficient to support them, and advised Wall to take the proper steps for such action. In closing, Judge Davis said:

"I should rejoice to see such an example made, for, in my judgment, and I believe in the eye of God as well as humanity, the consequences which fall so terribly on you, and vastly more on your children, are traceable to the misconduct of men who, for the paltry gain of a few glasses of liquor, deal it to men whom they must know it will make still more drunk, and expose to terrible consequences."

In our efforts to remove this enemy of morals we now have the sympathy of the purest and best and most thoughtful men and women of our nation. Here are some resolutions from a body of Congregationalists:

"*Resolved*, That we believe entire abstinence from the use of all intoxicating beverages to be a Christian duty, alike necessary to a pious life and a consistent example, and therefore binding upon all disciples of Jesus.

Resolved, That we heartily approve all appropriate moral agencies to advance the temperance cause, such as temperance sermons and lectures, the introduction of the pledge into the Sabbath and public schools, as well as among adults, the circulation of temperance literature, the organization of temperance societies, both for the young and old, and all other instrumentalities necessary to advance the cause of total abstinence.

Resolved, That since the traffic in intoxicating beverages of all kinds is antagonistic both to the moral agencies used to promote the temperance reform and to the means of grace employed by the Church to save men, we hereby record our uncompromising hostility to said traffic, and pledge our support to its legal prohibition."

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at a Methodist Conference in Massachusetts:

Resolved, That we recommend the employment of the pulpit and the press, and all other means coming under the head of moral suasion, for the promotion of the cause of temperance.

Resolved, That inasmuch as the prohibitory law of 1867 is a most efficient instrument of moral suasion, destructive alike to the opportunity of indulgence and the temptation to it, we will do all we can to secure its re-enactment and enforcement.

Resolved, That the magnitude of the financial, moral and religious interests imperiled by the beverage use and sale of intoxicating drinks, properly introduces the whole question into the sphere of politics; and it becomes our duty, as Christian citizens, to demand of each political party that it shall incorporate in its platform the principle of prohibition."

These speak for themselves, and show the con-

clusions to which God-fearing and thinking people are coming.

Mr. John W. Ray's reports of Indiana a little more than two years ago, furnish a lesson for every one:

Co.'s.	Pop. Voters.	No. Saloons.	Convicts.
18	34,361	1,179	475
65	154,342	968	238
9	22,366	000	31

It will be seen that in the eighteen counties where saloons prevailed they had one pet in the penitentiary for every $72\frac{1}{2}$ voters; in the nine counties where there was no saloon they sent only one to this assembly of criminals for every $721\frac{1}{2}$ votes. So the criminal docket of the saloon counties was ten times that of the prohibitory counties, in proportion to the whole number of voters in each. Now, if you want drinking and gambling, debauchery and crime of every shade and hue, license this thing. Both facts and reason show that these things are to be had in that way. But if you prefer sobriety, prosperity, and civilization, then prohibit this traffic:

“Licensed to make the strong man weak,
 Licensed to lay the strong man low;
 Licensed the wife's fond heart to break,
 And make the children's tears to flow.

“Licensed to do thy neighbor harm,
 Licensed to kindle hate and strife;
 Licensed to nerve the robber's arm,
 Licensed to whet the murderer's knife.

“ Licensed thy neighbor's purse to drain,
And rob him of his very last ;
Licensed to heat his feverish brain,
Till madness crown thy work at last.

“ Licensed, like spider for a fly,
To spread thy nets for man, thy prey ;
To mock his struggles, suck him dry,
Then cast the shattered hulk away.

“ Licensed, where peace and quiet dwell,
To bring disease, and want, and woe ;
Licensed to make this world a hell,
And fit man for a hell below.”

This is what the saloon-keeper is licensed to do. Nay, it is what you licensed him to do when you voted for those whom you knew would license him. Nay, more : this work of death and ruin, desolation and shame, is your work, if you support the license system, or the men who will support it. What a man does by the hand of another, he does as really as if he operated without the intervening agency. And I appeal to the peace-loving, and especially the God-fearing, to stand clear of the blood of this martyred host, sent to an untimely death by the rum power.

Does the Bible Sanction the Use of Alcohol?

CHAPTER III.

THERE are many men now pleading the Bible as authority for the use of alcohol as a beverage. It is strange that any man who believes that God is the author of that book would use it to establish a habit which the science and medical skill of the age agree in condemning. To me it seems the last extremity for the rum-drinker or the rum-seller when he flies to the Bible for support. Before the courts of medicine, history, and popular opinion, he has lost his cause; and now, as a *dernier resort*, he betakes himself to the Bible, in the vain hope of finding something, under cover of which he may disappear from public condemnation.

The argument is made upon the word wine, which, it is claimed, contained alcohol. The word wine means "*fermented juice of the grape*," which always contains alcohol. The Bible sanctions the use of it, and gives it a place along with corn and

(61)

oil among national blessings. Inspired men of old spoke of it as making the heart glad, and referred to the time of its increase as an occasion of great joy. God required a sacrifice of wine, a libation, which, if it had been wrong for men to use, he would not have done, any more than he would have directed the sprinkling of swine's broth. These gentlemen rejoice at the wedding in *Cana of Galilee*, and imagine themselves hilarious from the wine made by the Savior. Paul's prescription to *use a little wine* is suited to their "*often infirmities*," and agreeable to their stomachs. And they are certain that the Savior sanctioned the use of alcoholic wine by the institution of the Supper.

Their argument, in logical form, stands thus: 1. Wine is sanctioned by the Bible. 2. Wine means the fermented juice of grapes, which always contains alcohol. 3. Therefore alcohol is sanctioned by the Bible.

Now it is safe to say that if the word wine, in those passages in which it has the divine sanction, contains alcohol, then there is good support for the use of alcohol as a beverage.

But I must now protest against the argument as a whole. They argue that because wine was sanctioned, therefore we are at liberty to use, without stint, all the miserable drinks now sold in the market. Now, it ought to be known that wine, at the worst, was only supposed to contain a per cent. of alcohol; but that it was entirely free from

those poisons that now go to make up the staple of other liquors. Alcohol is now being condemned by the entire medical profession as a beverage, and very many of the most learned of the present time deny that it can ever be used as medicine without injury. But whatever may be said of the result of alcohol in the stomach, it ought to be known that the whiskies, brandies, etc., etc., now imported and sold in the market, contain a very small per cent. of alcohol. In its place, however, they have a large per cent. of sugar of lead, strychnine, strontia, potash, soda carbonates, benzine, Brazil wood, logwood, etc., etc. These poisons are much more destructive, both to reason and to life, than alcohol. Hence we now have but very few old men, who are in the habit of getting drunk, from the simple fact that in the use of these modern liquors a man will not live to be old.

Hence, if we were to admit all they claim for the word wine in the Bible, it would not justify the traffic which they seek to protect. Their conclusions are not contained in their premises. Hence the manifest unfairness of their whole plan of argument.

But I now call in question the meaning which they attach to the word wine. I do not deny that sometimes the word has the meaning they give to it; that many times in the Bible it means the fermented juice of grapes. I will quote a few passages in which the word contains this meaning.

For it ought to be known that the word wine in the Old Testament is a translation of twelve different Hebrew words, only two of which mean wine in its common acceptation. But here are the readings promised :

“And Noah awoke from his wine.” Gen. ix. 24.

The son of the Nazarite: “He shall separate himself from wine and strong drink.” Num. vi. 3.

Eli said to Hannah: “How long wilt thou be drunken? Put away thy wine from thee.” 1 Sam. i. 14.

“Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise.” Prov. xx. 1.

“Who hath woe? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine. Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder.” Prov. xxiii. 29-32.

“Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that continue until night, till wine inflame them! And the harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe, and wine, are in their feasts: but they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of his hands.” Isa. v. 11, 12.

“Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine!” Isa. xxviii.

1. Again, in the seventh verse, God continues to condemn Ephraim: “But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way; the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment.”

In this sense Solomon uses the word in connection with the drinker: “Be not among wine-bibbers; among riotous eaters of flesh: for the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty; and drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags.” Prov. xxiii. 20, 21.

There are many other occurrences of the word in the same sense, but not in a single instance does the divine approbation certainly rest upon it.

When wine is required as an offering, or spoken of as a blessing, the word is *tirosh*, which contained no intoxicating quality. There are instances in which the word wine occurs in the common version when it should have been raisins, figs or dates. Hence those who have an acquaintance with the original can but smile at the parade of texts from the Old Testament in favor of the use of intoxicating wine.

The drink from grapes approved in the Old

Testament, or even tolerated, does not necessarily mean *fermented* juice of grapes. And when we listen to its ringing denunciations of that which could intoxicate, we are in no mood to believe that it also recommends the same things which it condemns.

The use of intoxicating wine was attended, then, with evil results, on account of which it was condemned.

“Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart.” Hos. iv. 11.

“Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken also.” Hab. ii. 15.

“And they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious; he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton, and a *drunkard*. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones, that he die: so shalt thou put evil away from among you; and all Israel shall hear, and fear.” Deut. xxi. 20, 21.

“Awake, ye drunkards, and weep; and howl, all ye drinkers of wine, because of the new wine; for it is cut off from your mouth.” Joel i. 5.

They “that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments; but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph. Therefore now shall they go captive with the first that go captive, and the banquet of them that stretched themselves shall be removed.” Amos vi. 6, 7.

Let us turn from this condemnation to the sanction of wine. In doing so, however, we come to other words. Concerning most of them we know that alcohol was not meant. I have space here only to quote a few of these passages:

“And Pharaoh’s cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes and pressed them into Pharaoh’s cup, and I gave the cup into Pharaoh’s hand. And Joseph said unto him, this is the interpretation of it: The three branches are three days; yet within three days shall Pharaoh lift up thine head, and restore thee unto thy place, and thou shalt deliver Pharaoh’s cup into his hand, after the former manner when thou wast his butler.” Gen. xl. 11-13.

“The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass’s colt unto the choice vine, he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes.” Gen. xlix. 10, 11.

“Butter of kine, and milk of sheep, with fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan, and goats, with the fat of kidneys of wheat; and thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape.” Deut. xxxii. 14.

It will be seen at a glance here that the newly expressed juice of the grape is spoken of. So it was in the sacrifices of wine that the Lord de-

manded of his people. When wine is spoken of that had power to intoxicate, its use was condemned. The Nazarites and Rechabites were blessed because of their purity, arising from total abstinence. The drinks used by the Israelites, containing the power to intoxicate, were employed as the symbols of scourge, and blight, and ruin.

From these facts it would seem unreasonable for any man to attempt to find any authority for the use of intoxicating wine in the Old Testament. Indeed, the strongest condemnation of the use of such drinks that can be found any where are found there. Hence the Old Testament is clear, in not supporting alcoholic beverages.

These men, who are just now establishing their cause by the word of God, have recently become profoundly learned in the original of the New Testament. They tell us that the *oinos* of the Greek meant fermented grape juice. And, therefore, the Savior made intoxicating wine at the wedding in Cana of Galilee.

My opinion is that *oinos* does mean the fermented juice of the grape, but it also means the unfermented juice, either the newly expressed, or the must, which had been preserved from the atmosphere, and therefore had not fermented.

Here are a few passages in which alcoholic wine is referred to in the New Testament:

“And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit.” Eph. v. 18.

‘And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.’ Rev. xiv. 8. Again, in tenth verse: “The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God.”

“And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell: and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.” Rev. xvi. 19.

“With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.” Rev. xvii. 2.

There are two other texts in which intoxicating wine is probably meant: 1 Tim. iii. 8, and Titus ii. 3. A bishop, or presbyter should not be “given to much wine.”

There are some occurrences of the word in which it is quite as clear that fermented liquor is not intended. In Matt. ix. 17, it occurs three times; in Luke v. 37, 38, the same statement is made, in which the word in question also is read three times. In Mark ii. 22, the substance of the same is found again, only *oinos* occurs four times instead of three, as in the other places. “And no man putteth new *wine* in old bottles, else the *new* wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred; but new wine must be put into new bottles.”

The bottles referred to were the skins of animals. If they put new wine into an old one, that had stretched all it could, and was brittle and hard with age, the wine not yet having fermented, would be exposed to the atmosphere in this old skin, and would pass through that condition, but in doing so there would be an increased demand for space, which would result in the destruction of the bottle, and the loss of the wine. This is, beyond doubt, the simple teaching of these passages on the word wine. Hence we have ten occurrences in which unfermented grape juice is intended, and six in which intoxicating wine is meant, and two in which alcoholic wine is probably referred to. Wine-bibber is found twice, in which it is quite evident that they meant to accuse the Savior of drunkenness, as well as gluttony. See Matt. xi. 19. Luke vii. 34.

Besides these, the word *oinos* occurs fifteen times, in which the meaning of the word is more or less in dispute. Then we have once (1 Pet. iv. 3), *oinophlugia* rendered *excess of wine*, by which drunkenness is indicated.

Hence when men tell us that *oinos* in the New Testament always means alcoholic wine, we know that they are not themselves informed in the matter, or are intentionally trying to deceive us. When, therefore, the word wine occurs in the New Testament, we are sure that the blood of the grape is meant; that whether in a fermented or

unfermented state, must be determined by the context, not by the meaning of the word itself.

On the day of Pentecost some men scoffingly said: "These men are full of new wine." Acts ii. 13. The word which they used is *gleukous*, abbreviated *gleukus*, sweet, and *oinos*, wine. It should be translated *sweet wine*. Yet this word was commonly used to mean the new juice of grapes, or the *must*, or wine that had been kept from fermentation. Their being full of sweet wine would not indicate that they were drunken, as they supposed—verse 15. Hence, they said one thing, while they thought it would be understood as meaning more than that. It is, however, by Peter's reference to the matter, rather than by the word itself, that we know just what they wished to be understood as affirming.

Since the word wine, then, in the New Testament, may mean either the fermented, or the unfermented juice of the grape, by what rule shall we be able to determine which meaning to attach to it, in those passages yet in dispute?

In the Old Testament the words in the original helped us to the meaning of the word wine. And we find in passing over that ground again, that when a word is used that indicates the presence of alcohol, the curse of the Almighty rests upon it. We find that when God requires a libation, or an offering of the fruit of the vine, the newly expressed juice is indicated, that a word is employed

that excludes the thought of alcohol. This is also true in those passages in which wine is spoken of as a national blessing.

If this rule in the Old Testament shall guide us in the interpretation of the New, then where we shall find wine spoken of favorably, we are to know that *must*, or the new juice, is to be understood. This is a reasonable rule. Indeed, we can not suppose for a moment that God would thunder his anathemas, as he does, against intoxicating wine, and then in the perfect law permit, and even encourage its use.

There are only three passages in the New Testament in which wine-bibbers of the present day seek refuge: the wine made at the wedding; the wine used in the Lord's Supper, and Paul's recommendation to Timothy. We will give each of these a passing notice.

We will first consider the wine produced miraculously at the feast. To do this, as we ought, we will read the account :

“And there were set there six water-pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece. Jesus saith unto them, Fill the water-pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bare it. When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was (but

the servants which drew the water knew), the governor of the feast called the bridegroom, and saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good wine until now." John ii. 6-10.

Usually there is a play made here on the word drunk, and it is forced to indicate that the guests on that occasion were stupid from the free use of wine. But this thought is in no way presented by the passage. The governor of the feast makes no allusion to the condition of those then in attendance, but to that which was customary on such occasions.

Nor does the phrase "well drunk," indicate that it was customary for the guests to become drunken on such occasions. The language simply means—when they have drunk enough to satisfy them, so that they do not care for more wine. But whether or not they would be intoxicated would depend on the character of the wine, and the amount that would be necessary to satisfy them.

It is claimed that the wine made by the Savior was strong, or intoxicating, because the governor pronounced it the *good wine*. This raises the question, "What did they regard as good, or the best wine?" According to Pliny, Plutarch, Horace, Theophrastus, and many others, they denominated the wine that would not intoxicate, "*the best wine*,"

the "*wholesome,*" "*the innocent,*" "*the moral wine,*" etc. Pliny expressly says that "*good wine was destitute of spirit.*" Lib. iv. 13. Judging the wine, therefore, by this rule, it was not intoxicating.

4. But a last effort is made to find complicity on the part of Jesus with intoxication, in the quantity of wine that he made. So that if it was not alcoholic when made, yet the condition in which it was left would secure to it the intoxicating quality, with the age that it attained before it would be used. But here it will be noticed that our opponents take for granted just what needs to be proved, that Jesus made all the water in those water-pots into wine. A second thought will convince us that he made no more wine than was necessary for the occasion, and that it was only that which was drawn out and borne to the governor that was turned into wine. This would be a double miracle, and would better manifest his glory. Hence there can be found no evidence in this account that Jesus produced that upon which men could become intoxicated, or that he in any way recognized the right or propriety of such drinks.

The "Lord's Supper" is appealed to with confidence in favor of the use of intoxicating wine, even in an ordinance of the most sacred character. And while I speak a word upon this point, I am oppressed with the indifference of the religious world on this subject. This question has been

raised in religious assemblies, and resolutions relating to it have been tabled, as if it were a matter of no concern. I regret this exceedingly, and yet I need not tell you what others have done in this matter, for perhaps we are no more alive on this question than those to whom we have referred.

Did the Savior, then, leave an ordinance to be observed by his people, in which alcohol was to be used? Both science and history have declared it to be the greatest scourge to any people using it. In our own America it numbers its victims at 60,000 per annum; it fills the land with corruption and crime, with desolation and want; it is full of rape, and theft, and murder; it stupefies, bloats, blackens, and blisters. It is now withholding millions of children from the common schools; it is filling the land with broken-hearted widows and helpless orphans. Like a withering blight, it blasts all it touches. Do you say that I am prejudicing the question? I deny it. I have only stated a few facts of history. Did the Lord ask his disciples to drink of the cup that has slain more than have ever fallen in battle? Does that narcotic poison, that works only death to body and soul, represent that blood by which we are to be saved from all sin? Did the Lord from heaven give his disciples alcoholic wine, saying: "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins?"

Some have been alarmed at the word wine, sup-

posing that both our English word, and that *oinos* in the Greek, indicate the presence of alcohol. But we have seen from New Testament usage that it is not true; that *oinos* does occur in a number of instances, in which such a meaning is absolutely impossible. Hence there can be no need of supposing that alcoholic wine was used on that occasion.

The word wine does not occur in the New Testament in connection with the Lord's Supper. On this account some have maintained that the Lord did not use wine on this occasion. This appears to me to be unsafe; for while it may not be absolutely certain that wine was used on that occasion, yet we can not deny that all the probabilities are on that side of the question. The Lord said: "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine until that day that I shall drink it new in the kingdom of God." Mark xiv. 25. Indeed, the word cup, used under those circumstances, indicated wine as the contents. Paul says: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" 1 Cor. x. 16. This seems a clear reference to the Passover, in which they partook of wine four times. The third time the cup was passed it was called the "*cup of blessing.*" But it should be remembered that if the Savior took that wine which was on the table at that time to introduce this new ordinance, then he did not have intoxicating wine; for the wine used at the Passover

was must, or the juice of grapes that had not been permitted to ferment, mixed with an equal quantity of warm water. Believing this to have been the contents of the cup used by the Savior, the early Christians so observed the Lord's Supper till the time of Justin the Martyr. See his "Apolo-
gy for Christianity." Vol. I. page 65.

But Paul said to Timothy: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." 1 Tim. v. 23. The original would indicate not that Paul would have Timothy to drink no more water, but use wine in its place; not that, but that he should put wine with the water which he used. The paraphrase of Dr. James Macknight sets forth the thought of the passage in great clearness. He says:

"Thy health being of great importance to the Church, no longer drink pure water, but mix a little wine with it, on account of the disorder of thy stomach, and thy many other bodily infirmities."

Let us note a few facts on the very surface of this passage:

1. Timothy was of delicate constitution, was a physical sufferer, and needed medicine.

2. So far he had practiced total abstinence, in that he drank nothing but water.

3. Paul makes a medical prescription for his benefit.

4. He was so radical in his convictions on this subject that it required apostolic authority to

induce him to use any quantity of any kind of wine.

5. Paul does not reprove Timothy for his total abstinence convictions and habits.

6. Paul recommends only the use of a little wine, which would be a fearful comment if it had been addressed to a great many ministers who have lived since then.

7. Paul would have that little mixed with water.

8. As it is not necessary to suppose that Paul meant alcoholic wine, and as Timothy from his abstinence stand-point would certainly refuse fermented wine, as Paul knows this, and as we know *now* that alcoholic wine would have been injurious, it is quite evident that must, or the unfermented wine, was intended.

We find, then, that the word of God everywhere condemns drunkenness, or the use of that which is capable of intoxicating. The Lord will not only at last consign the drunkard to eternal banishment from his presence, but those who keep his company, that eat and drink with the drunken, shall have a portion with the hypocrites. And the word of the Lord pronounces a woe against every man who giveth his neighbor drink, who putteth the bottle to him and maketh him drunken also.

The Cost of Alcohol.

CHAPTER IV.

THE revenue derived from the liquor traffic is a strong argument in its favor in the minds of many persons. There are those who claim that it really increases business, and that it is, therefore, a financial benefit to the country. The license fees will help defray the expenses of the city schools; it will assist in the construction of sidewalks, and pay for other public improvements.

If all they claim in the respect of finances were granted, still the objections to the licensing of saloons for the sale of intoxicating liquors would remain insuperable. He who so far forgets the real needs and interests of humanity as to put every physical, mental and moral question out of sight, and base his calculation alone upon financial issues, is incompetent to give the subject that investigation which its importance demands.

Some have said that we must license this traffic or we will lose business and impoverish the city; the men that we now have will go elsewhere, and the thrift and energy of the place will be impaired

And, further, we now derive the handsome revenue of \$600, \$200 from each beer saloon in the place.

This wisdom is wholly financial. It does not stop at the thought of building our sidewalks in the blood of our brothers and sons; of educating our children from the tears and wails of the broken-hearted! Let this mighty car of prosperity rush on. What care these engineers if a thousand lifeless forms bestrew the track behind them! Peace may be taken from the earth, a thousand pale-faced, care-worn, poverty-stricken women may pray them with uplifted hands to stop ere they crush to powder all their hearts hold dear; the children may cry, "*Father is on the track! father is on the track!*" but it is nothing to them. Give them money and they are satisfied!

But how is it possible that making, selling and drinking alcoholic liquors can be of any financial advantage. The corn and rye and barley, etc., that contain food are sprouted, malted, rotted, destroyed. What is furnished in the place of it is incompetent to do any good. It is not food, and it is even doubtful if it is medicine. How, then, can such employment be useful?

Nor can I see wherein is the financial gain of keeping saloons. Is it because that every fifth man is induced to squander a portion of his means in drink that can not do him any good, and to neglect his business? Is it the charm that produces midnight orgies, houses of prostitution,

fight, brawls, stabbing, knocking down with billiard cues, that brings a hundred homes to squalid poverty, and a thousand men and women to grief; that which causes corruption and crime to fester and ripen until the very atmosphere is putrid, and is more loathsome than a den of lepers? Is this the secret of its greatness and its favor, that imparts the tone of prosperity and makes it smack of financial success? It must be! Now it requires a deep insight into the social economy of the times to discover any advantage to the people from the rum trade.

It is evident to every person of observation that whatever corrupts the morals of the people and depletes public and private virtue, must be a financial curse to the country. A sober man cares for his family, and plans and works for their honor and happiness. But he who is induced to waste his money and time in drink ceases to be careful for the welfare of any one. Hence his work is discontinued, and his life is rendered worthless.

All accounts agree in representing great business depression and destitution in England. Bank suspensions, failures, strikes and lock-outs are of daily occurrence. One thing that will retard business revival is the vast drain made by liquor upon the nation. The working people of England, from long custom, regard beer as one of the essentials of life, and without it they imagine they can neither work nor live. A careful estimate made last year

puts, in round numbers, the cost of intoxicating drinks annually drunk by the English people at \$700,000,000. This amounts to twenty dollars to every man, woman and child, and is a gloomy basis upon which to found a returning prosperity. No nation under such bondage, with such a drain of not only money in vast amounts, but, what is far better, life and moral energy, can hope to hold the wheel that directs the world's commerce.

The Glasgow City Bank lost \$25,000,000 for its stockholders when it suspended. Many of them are ruined. An appeal has been made to the people of Scotland for a relief fund, raised by subscription, and a Scotch official calls attention to the fact that the whole \$25,000,000 is only half the annual liquor bill of the Scotch people.

Not only do the people suffer a direct loss of more than \$50,000,000, but the time spent in drinking, and damages done because of intoxication, accidents and neglect of personal and public interest, caused by the stupefying power of rum, which will equal double the sum of the drink-bill.

It is almost impossible to be entirely correct respecting the cost of liquors. If we base our calculations upon manufactures and importations we will be far from the amount of liquors sold and drank; for very much, perhaps two-thirds, of wines, ales, gins, brandies, beers, etc., never knew a grape, or grain of corn or barley.

The following statistics have been carefully compiled from the best authorities, and are as nearly correct as they can be made:

Liquors consumed in the United States:

Spirituos Liquors.....	69,572,062	gallons annually.
Beer	279,746,044	“ “
Imported Wines.....	10,700,009	“ “

Liquors consumed in Great Britain:

Spirituos Liquors.....	33,090,377	gallons annually.
Beer and Ale.....	906,340,399	“ “
Foreign and British Wines.....	17,144,539	“ “

Liquors consumed in Germany:

Beer	146,000,000	gallons annually.
Wine.....	121,000,000	“ “

Liquors consumed in France:

Spirituos Liquors.....	27,000,000	gallons annually.
Beer	51,800,000	“ “
Wine	600,000,000	“ “

We estimate that the world consumes twice as much as these four nations:

Spirituos Liquors.....	314,031,882	gallons annually.
Beer	2,797,291,632	“ “
Wine.....	1,482,239,914	“ “

Cost of liquors in the world in ten years, \$64, - 405,042,231, or twice the value of the United States of America. Allowing the average value of the world, per square mile, to equal the United States, and every one hundred and twenty years the actual cash value of the world is consumed in these drinks.

The materials used in the manufacture are annually as follows:

	Bushels of Grain.	Bushels of Grapes.	Value.
United States.....	39,349,520	2,364,312	\$42,895,984
Gr't Britain & Ireland	63,929,550	3,784,246	69,605,920
Germany.....	9,125,000	34,714,285	61,196,428
France.....	9,237,500	171,428,571	366,380,357
The World.....	242,971,145	42,634,261	891,922,536

The cost in France and Germany would be modified by the cost of grapes, which are much cheaper there.

Cost of the land, buildings, machinery, labor, etc., invested in the traffic is about as follows:

	Acres.	Buildings & Machinery.	Labor.
United States.....	903,414	\$74,041,044	\$9,405,104
G. Britain & Ireland	1,629,733	92,116,883	15,271,432
Germany.....	517,410	46,120,535	6,304,892
France.....	1,576,017	190,967,633	27,929,283
The World.....	9,253,228	746,488,070	117,821,020

	Value of Land.	Total Investment.
United States.....	\$45,170,500	\$128,616,848
Great Britain and Ireland.....	81,488,650	188,876,965
Germany.....	25,870,000	78,395,427
France.....	78,800,850	297,697,766
The World.....	462,660,400	1,326,969,492

Cost of alcoholic drinks in the United States annually:

Direct outlay for drink.....	\$725,407,028
Seven per cent. on the \$10,000,000,000 which the nation should possess, but has been destroyed by the traffic.....	700,000,000
Direct loss of wages.....	7,903,844
Ten per cent. on capital employed in the manufacture.....	25,848,081
Ten per cent. on capital employed in saloons.....	36,254,700
Charity bestowed on the poor.....	14,000,000
Loss by sea and by land.....	50,000,000
Court, police, hospital expenses, charity, litigation, insurance.....	207,266,550
Total.....	\$1,866,642,203

This nation receives in return for this traffic:

500 murders, 500 suicides, 100,000 criminals, 200,000 paupers, 60,000 deaths from drunkenness, 600,000 besotted drunkards, 600,000 moderate drinkers, who will be sots ten years hence, 500,000 homes destroyed, 1,000,000 children worse than orphaned.

And if the country should be searched, from center to circumference, it would be impossible to find *any* good resulting from this traffic, or a single reason why it should exist longer.

A competent committee, a short time ago, examined the reports from the counties of Iowa, from which they furnish us the following:

Criminal costs from 86 counties, reported for 1877	\$344,319 47
Rate for the other fourteen counties not reported	56,051 94
<hr/>	
Total criminal expense.....	\$400,371 41
Nine-tenths of this occasioned by liquor.....	360,334 26
Cost of maintaining Insane Asylum	236,260 76
Fifty-five per cent. of this due to liquor traffic.....	129,943 41
Cost of the penitentiary.....	95,206 87
Nine-tenths due to liquor.....	85,686 18
Pauperism caused by liquor, 1875—latest dates....	175,179 00
Cost of feeble-minded orphans.....	120,000 00
Expenses of the two reform schools.	18,826 48
Cost of the running expenses of the State for one year	1,046,000 00
This to be paid by direct taxes of the people.	
Take from this our liquor, criminal and pauper expenses. In short, the incidental expenses of the liquor traffic, and they are reduced to.....	68,201 99
During 1877 there were convictions for crime.....	1,672
Of these, the number of saloon-keepers.....	874
Of other criminals by reason of liquor.....	718

This report was as accurate as the committee could make it, and shows that about 95 per cent.

of the crime in our State was caused by the rum trade. The whole drink bill, according to their report for 1877, lacked only a little of \$38,000,000.

In Hardin County, alone, there were twenty-four criminal convictions; fourteen of those convicted were saloon-keepers. Several others came to their evil deeds from the influence of liquor.

The wholesale drink bill was	\$74,880 00
Cost of criminal prosecutions.....	1,491 61
Fines uncollected, and therefore lost.....	2,605 23
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$78,976 84
Our equalized value of lands and town lots reaches	\$3,011,443 00

Now, when we count our jail expenses, and all that result from the liquor traffic in this county, we find ourselves paying three per cent. of our landed worth for the inestimable privilege of rum.

In absolute indifference to this leakage of money and morals, we gravely discuss finance, complain of hard times, write long articles on political economy, the remontization of silver, and the circulating of greenbacks. But if any man shall uncap this sink-hole and show where our money, as well as our honor and morality is disappearing, it will be in order to stand off and sneer learnedly at temperance fanaticism.

BUT WE ARE ASKED TO CONSIDER THE IMMENSE WEALTH IN THE COUNTRY THAT WOULD BE DESTROYED BY ABOLISHING THIS TRADE.

The United States has 903,414 acres of land employed for the whisky, beer and wine trade. This

land, at \$50 per acre, is worth \$45,170,700. That money, at ten per cent., would be \$4,517,070 as the annual outlay in lands. In buildings and machinery there is invested \$74,041,044, which, at ten per cent., would yield \$7,404,104.40 annually. In the manufactory of alcohol, we perform \$9,405,104 worth of work per year. This is a heavy investment, I grant. But the land is capable of producing wheat, oats, corn and potatoes. Hence, there is no capital in that which will be lost by prohibition. The men who work at this business could easily find other and useful employment. Nay, more, the tramps that have threatened to overrun the country are largely the outgrowth of the whisky and beer business. But for alcohol and its concomitants, tramps in this country had never been heard of. The buildings can be used for some profitable purpose. In machinery, and in liquors on hand, there would be a few millions loss. And yet, if all these buildings would burn up to-night, and the lands be converted into rattlesnake dens, and the men become paupers to-morrow, the country would be incalculably wealthier by the change.

The total costs of alcohol in this country, counting all per cents., wastes, loss of time, criminal expenses, give us an outlay for 1877 of \$1,866,642,203. Who would refuse the meager sacrifice necessary to save the country from this financial ruin that weighs us to the very earth?

How Shall We Remove the Evil?

CHAPTER V.

THIS is the most difficult of all questions relating to the evils of intemperance. Many answers are given by those who wish the world to be saved from the demon. We have also many suggestions from the enemy himself. Not unfrequently he attends our councils and tenders his advice. Sometimes we have been decoyed into covenant making with him, and have found always, when too late, that we had lost our virtue and power by our unrighteous obeisance to him whose work it is to ruin our cause. Daily and hourly are the workers in the cause of humanity enlightening each other respecting the best methods of dealing with the monster of intemperance. Of course we will suspect each other's loyalty to the cause, or exercise an unpleasant amount of charity for those who differ from us. This is because we are severally right on the subject, and those who differ from us are either in favor of saloons or their temperance education has been sadly neglected. When we are less infallible we will understand one another better.

Moral suasion is always a legitimate power to employ against money. Hence it is evident that in every effort to pledge men against the use of that which can intoxicate, every speech that is made in favor of total abstinence, every article written and printed, every tract circulated in favor of the truth, every organization by which this work may be carried forward, by which men may be induced to return from drinking habits and others kept from falling into the snares of the tempter, is in the right direction. All honor to all the Ribbon Movements, to Good Templars, Sons of Temperance and Temple of Honor workers. Let them work on; let the Father Mathew Societies be kept up; let the Bands of Hope and Juvenile Templars bring up the rear of this great army. They are co-workers in the mighty army. But some have thought that this is

“ONLY A MORAL QUESTION.”

He who holds this view says that no law can remove the appetite for drink, and therefore this work must be accomplished by moral means. This was the profound folly of ex-Governor Seymour, of New York, to say nothing of still wiser men.

Let me utter my logic as a match for this: “No suasion can remove the appetite for drink; therefore, men must be saved by prohibition, which will put the drink, and the temptation to drink, out of the way.”

In the attempt at logic made by my brother one premise is assumed which is not true. It is that, in order to remove drunkenness from the land, the appetite for drink must be destroyed. It is also assumed, in an attempt at a second syllogism in the same combination, that moral suasion will remove the appetite for drink. This again is untrue. While my logic was not put into logical form, it will bear the pressure. 1. To reform men, temptation to drink must be taken from them. 2. Prohibition will remove the temptation. 3. Therefore drunkenness can be removed by prohibition. Hence my position is logically true, while that of my friend is logically untrue. There is only one fault with the syllogism which I offered. My first premise seems to deny that any man can be reformed in the presence of temptation. I am willing to grant that some have been reformed and saved in the presence of temptation. But the number is very small, and with the moral suasion appliances only, more than forty men are going down to one that is coming back.

Hence when a man begins to talk to me of there being no other way to redeem the world from drunkenness except by moral suasion, I am impressed with the feeling that he takes me for a simpleton.

There can be no doubt that, so far as the drinker is concerned, moral suasion can be employed legitimately, and sometimes with good results. Many have been turned back again from incipient drunk-

eness by the power of moral suasion. But when we look on and see that for every one of our men we disentangle from the meshes of this abomination, Satan inveigles forty-three more, we despair of saving the world by moral suasion alone.

Every question has its moral phase if it in any way relates to right and wrong. All the crimes in the catalogue are to be dealt with by moral means—theft, murder, fraud, infamy, are all moral questions and are to be dealt with by moral suasion. And there is as much reason to refuse prohibition respecting one of these as another. Suppose I should say that no law can remove the propensity of the thief; therefore law is not to be employed in the case. Suppose, then, that having perpetrated this immense nonsense, I should make it the foundation of another position and say, “Therefore, the only means by which theft is to be removed is the use of moral suasion!” I know this would be foolishness; and yet it is exactly parallel with the moral suasion-alone-argument on the liquor question.

A man who believes in moral suasion alone usually persists in misunderstanding prohibitionists, and denies that they believe in any moral suasion at all in order to save men from drunkenness. Yet I never saw a prohibitionist that did not believe in the use of all the suasion that can be made effectual in removing the curse from the earth. Their position is moral suasion for the

drinker, and legal suasion for the rum seller. It is my opinion that legal suasion will have to be applied to the drinker. It is so employed after a kind now. Indeed, the license form of this question is legal suasion for the drinker and moral suasion for the rum-seller.

Moral means, as a rule, are ineffectual with the saloon-keeper. What he wants is the money. Give him that and you may have all the morals. And while some who have gotten into drinking habits may be persuaded to return to a temperate life, many of them seem to have gone beyond the reach of hope; and the only suasion that will reach the case is that of the law. It is probable, therefore, that both drinking and selling that which can intoxicate will have to be punished by law. And while many drinkers will have to be withheld from the crime of drunkenness by the authority of law, there may be a few saloon-keepers who can be influenced to quit their nefarious business by moral suasion. I would, therefore, try the soft words and the handfuls of turf, and, if successful in that way, all right; but, if not, I would use stones without any compunction whatever.

Just now there is a religious feature to the question that is both promising and sad. In this new idea men persuade themselves that

IT IS THE WORK OF GOD TO REMOVE INTEMPERANCE.

Those who hold this view usually disparage the use of law. Mr. Murphy has nothing but good

will and kind words for saloon-keepers; and they hold him in very high esteem. The great revival that he held in Pittsburg carried every thing before it; but its noise had hardly died out on the air when there were seventy-two more saloons in the city than at the beginning of his great revival. A few places, even in civilized Iowa, have suffered from this same religious gush. Men have been taught that with sound conversion the Holy Ghost would destroy all appetite for drink, extract the poison from their systems, and heal up their ulcerated stomachs. In the midst of the whirl and excitement, men have loudly professed this physical sanctification. But when the fervor of the occasion has subsided, the sow returns to the mire; and, after a few months of sobriety and industry, they have returned, to spend the money they have made with the "noble saloon-keeper." I do not wish to call such performances a farce. Many who engage in them are honest, severely honest. But it is only the part of candor to confess that but little, if any good, has been accomplished that has not been counter-balanced by the religious untruths that have been taught, and the shilly-shally softness with which the whole question has been treated.

It is not enough to say to men who take God at his word that there is no promise in the Bible that God will heal up a drunkard's stomach any more than he will put on the hand that he has cut

off in some drunken fit. Hence the frenzy that has come from this false teaching can not be otherwise than injurious. As well might we expect men to fill and fatten on the east wind as to receive any lasting benefit from such religious froth and pious nonsense.

We should use religious suasion; we should bring every man to Christ that we can; and we can assure them that God will help them if they continue to help themselves. But any effort that leaves men so nearly unconverted as to be satisfied with the existence of saloons, can have but very little of promise in it. In so far as this movement has called public attention to the subject of temperance, good has been the result. Agitation is the handmaid of truth. But to the extent that men have been reconciled to the existence of saloons, unmitigated evil is the result.

I will help no man nor movement that helps the saloons; and to have a revival of the kind I have described in the town where I live would be a real calamity. I would pray for temperance; I would work for temperance; I would live for temperance; I would vote for temperance. When I pray I must pray in faith; but to pray in faith I must ask for what God has promised to give; also, I must comply with the conditions upon which the blessing is to be enjoyed. Hence I can not pray to God to remove the curse of intemperance by doing what he has never promised to do; and

I must, to the utmost of my ability, answer my own prayers.

There are many yet who say that the only law that can be of any benefit is a

LICENSE.

Every law should be judged, at least in part, by its object. And we are to suppose some worthy object to have been before the minds of men when the idea of licensing the sale of liquor was begotten. The end proposed was to remove the disgrace, and curtail the injuries of the traffic.

I notice a fallacy in this system to begin with. It is that the sale of liquors is not a crime in itself; hence, only the abuse needs to be prevented. This idea has been duly prominent in all the license laws that have been made till within the last ten or fifteen years. Men have been enlightened on the subject, of late, till it is now regarded as an evil under any circumstances. And under the direction of this advanced idea, those who have favored the license system have done so on the ground that the evil could not be suppressed, and that all we could do with it would be to hinder it from working the fearful ravages in human society that it is likely to work unless controlled by law.

This last view is inconsistent with Christianity. If a thing is wrong, we do not dare to legalize it, or give to it the sanction of law. To do so would be to throw around a crime the protection and

respectability of our government; and, to the extent of our protection, we become partakers of other men's sins. If a thing is right, then we have no more right to tax it in this way than we have to impose a stamp act, and compel all commodities to pay duty, or, at least, all luxuries to do so. Hence, logically, we have no right to license the liquor traffic, whether right or wrong.

Now, if crime is to be regulated by law, especially that of the sale of alcohol, I can not see why a man should not be required to take out a license to drink it. This, too, might go to increase the school fund! And a man would then have purchased the right to any kind of a debauch that might happen to suit his peculiar taste. It would then be his right to squander his means with the "gentlemen of good moral character and standing" who have been employed by the people to corrupt their sons, impoverish the community, and ruin the country. Having purchased this liberty with a great sum of money, he would then be free, not only to drink whisky, but to commit whatever crimes it might prompt. And whatever of infamy, of theft, of lust unbridled, of brutality, beastiality and loathsomeness that would naturally follow his inebriety, would have all been arranged and provided for by the prepaid indulgence! No man could then call in question his right to beat his wife for not having dinner ready for her lord, when there was nothing to make it of, and no fuel

to cook it with; for this would be one of the consequential privileges that he would have purchased in obtaining his license! This would surely make it all right! No one could object to a *gentleman* like that having the privilege of wrecking his manhood, impoverishing his family, and losing his own soul; especially if he would first pay a sum of money into our school fund for such a pleasure and privilege! Besides, it would not at all inconvenience him. He could as easily prove a good character before the law as the saloon-keeper. Let the license law, then, be made consistent with itself, or let it be repealed.

I think I hear a murmuring objection, that this is not a fair statement of the question; that the evils are upon us, and that they simply make choice between them; that they only prefer the evils that will occur under a license system to the greater evils that would occur in the absence of such a law; that this is the only available means by which they can ever lessen the terrible results of the existence and use of alcohol.

The fallacy of this may be made to appear by striking out "liquor traffic," and inserting "murder." Let me claim to believe that, since the time that Cain murdered Abel, this crime has been repeated annually, and almost hourly, under whatever laws have been enacted against it. Therefore, as law can not remove the evil from the world, we must license it! I am, therefore, justi-

fiable in helping to sustain a "license-murder-law," as the best thing that may be done under the circumstances. Would I be regarded as favoring the protection of the people? But I very distinctly tell you that I am in favor of suppressing murder; but, until the people are better educated than we find them at present, any effort to prohibit this crime by law will be a failure, and that such attempts to control the people, without the ability to succeed, will have the effect to render all law nugatory. Hence, I will license murder, and make it legitimate and respectable, and thus educate the world to abhor it to such an extent that we will be enabled to pass and execute a law prohibiting it! To take such a position would demand a vast amount of dignity and bustling pretension, to make me respectable in the minds of Christian men, who are given to that mental movement called thought. My brethren, west of the Mississippi especially, would not possess the mental acuteness to distinguish between my course and aiding and abetting the murderer.

Do you say that the cases are not parallel? I know it. The murderer kills but a few men, while the rum trade kills sixty thousand annually. Not only so, but the murderer leaves their good name and their souls untouched, while the liquor traffic robs them, kills them, and damns them; fills the land with heart-broken wives, mothers, sisters, brothers, fathers, with orphaned children, desolate

homes, squalid poverty, and sows the land with seeds of shameless, nameless criminality, that send their pestiferous roots downward till they have sapped the foundation of every virtue, and raised their branches aloft, the very shade of which is spiritual death and moral putridity.

This argument is sometimes made for a protection at this point:

1. It is my duty to lessen the crime of drunkenness and drunkard-making all I can.

2. The circumstances are such that I can get and operate no law except a stringent license, which will at least do some good toward protection.

3. Therefore, it is my duty to employ the only law at my command by which I can accomplish any good for the people.

This, however, is special pleading. It assumes the point in debate, that the license law is all that he can get and operate; which, if all temperance men were united, would not be true in a single State in the Union. Again, this pleading is presented in justification of the efforts made in favor of the license system. If it could be proven to be our duty to quietly accept a license under some peculiar circumstances, it would say nothing in favor of contending for a license, when it is confessedly not the law that is wanted, when the law we do want may possibly be obtained. The idea of voting and working for a law, which, in the nature of things, is wrong, in order to accept

something called the lesser evil, is the doctrine condemned by Paul in the Roman letter: "*Let us do evil that good may come!*"

But, again, some philosopher objects that we assume knowledge of the right and wrong in matters of law which is not granted. The right and wrong of law must be determined by the condition of the people to whom such law is given. Hence, we must judge of a law by its competency to prevent the wrong and assist the right; to the extent of success in these things is the law valuable. Moses gave Israel a permit of divorcement, not because the law was the best in itself, but because it was the best for the times. The hardness of the hearts of the people made him give them this law; it being the best that could then be enforced.

Observation will convince any thoughtful person, however, that the cases are not at all similar.

If you will read, and critically examine Deut. xxiv. 1, 2, you will find that the divorcement referred to by the Savior in Matt. xix. contained strong prohibitory features. It was less in keeping with the original purpose of marriage than the teaching of the Master. But when we have gone to the utmost limit of the words employed, we have, by Moses, a prohibitory law, not a license law, to regulate, or, rather, to remove a social evil. This law, however, was less complete in the prohibitory features than the one afterward given by

the Savior. Here, then, is the logic. Because of the hardness of the hearts of that people Moses gave us a law less strict in its prohibitory features than the one Jesus gave, therefore, in this enlightened day, when a majority of the people want a prohibitory law, we are justified in licensing men to spread a snare for the feet of the unsuspecting and unwary, to give their neighbor drink, to put the bottle to him and make him drunken also! See Hab. ii. 15. It seems to me that when Deut. xxiv. 1, 2, is cited in favor of the right, under any circumstances, to license the liquor trade, there has been wanting an exegesis of the passage, or a willingness to have perfect justice done the subject. Let no one hold me accountable for this impression of mine. It is only my impression.

It might be pertinent here to ask, what benefits can be derived from a license law of any kind? The thing can be done, no matter whatever it may be, as well without a license as with it. In fact, just the same. So far as it is really a license law, it has but one power, and that is to defend the thing licensed. This defense by law of a crime renders it still more difficult to be met, since now the law of the land is made to protect it, and give to it the tone of respectability.

The only ability in any license system to prevent vice and crime is to be found in its prohibitory features; such as, thou shalt not sell to minors, men that are in a state of intoxication,

to men who are in the habit of becoming intoxicated, to any one on Sunday or on days of election; or, if the man commits nuisance or permits gambling, or violates any of the conditions of his license, his authority to sell may be taken away altogether, and in this case be a total prohibition—where the people are sufficiently educated. Hence, if a law was wholly license, it could not do any good, since it could not impart any right to do that which would be beneficial, for that right exists independent of any license; while it might have the power to fasten upon even an unwilling people untold and unending evils. I repeat it, then, with emphasis, that, in the nature of things, merely a license law has but one power, and that is to perpetuate the wrong. But I must notice the policy argument.

It is claimed that a license law is more acceptable to the masses of people, that it is more easily enforced than a prohibitory law, and yet that it contains features of prohibition that will go far toward removing the evils of intemperance; indeed, much further than more ultra prohibitory measures.

Here I am impressed with the evidence of a contradiction. It is tacitly acknowledged in their argument that, (1) the rum trade is an evil; (2) the only way to remove the evil is to prohibit the trade; (3) therefore we must permit the trade or license it! Such is the logical nonsense of this argument.

But some one says we prefer to put it in this form: (1.) A mild form of prohibition is the best way to remove the evil. (2.) A judicious license law furnishes that form of prohibition. (3.) Therefore a license law is best calculated to remove the evil.

But I ask, Why license the sale of rum in any way? Whether its sale is right or wrong, the traffic can be carried on just as well without the license as with it; and if the law contains prohibitory features, for which alone it is valuable, why not incorporate those features into a law by themselves, and leave the rest out? Will our licensing a man to sell to one class of men enable us the better to prohibit him from selling to another? Now, I am just impressed with the idea that no man in his senses will say yes.

There remains, then, no reason why a law relating to this question should contain any license features.

I hate a monopoly in anything, for it can only lead to tyranny—at least such is its history. But why a monopoly should be allowed in rum-selling more than in anything else, I do not know. As to its preventing bad men from selling, it is the merest nonsense in existence. Scarcely will any other man seek for or obtain a license; for no man who has the cause of humanity at heart will, understandingly, engage in such a nefarious business. Hence it makes money the standard of character

necessary to engage in this traffic. Now, I think that any poor wretch who may want to deal out poison by the ten cents' worth, ought to have the same right to take the life of his fellow-man for money that the rich man has. As this is a free country, let him exercise his gift. The whisky that he would sell would only make loafers, loungers, vagabonds; brutalize, debauch, ruin, blunt all the finer sensibilities of the soul; cause poverty, destroy the peace in the family and in society, dethrone the reason and wreck the manhood; sow the seeds of degradation and death; bloat and blacken and blister and blight the body; fill the country with helpless orphans and broken-hearted widows, and cover the land with shame and disgrace, just the same as that which is sold by that more fortunate gentleman who is able to sport "a good moral character!" And hence the injustice of our law must be apparent, as it refuses one of the inalienable (?) rights to a poor, worthless creature, for no other reason than his want of money to buy license to kill men and be happy and respectable!

But there is sometimes a plea made for the license law like this: We must license the sale of ruin, so that it may come legitimately under the control and regulation of law. Such a plea, however, is utterly void of any common sense. We would here pay it no attention but for our respect for those who offer it. There are many crimes of

minor importance that our law deals with by prohibiting them. If any man would argue that we must license theft, or larceny, or fraud, in order to bring it under the control of law, it would only excite contempt for the author. The argument itself is really based upon the idea that selling whisky is not wrong in itself; but it is only when abused by being conducted in an improper manner. This, however, we have already considered, and have decided that the traffic in intoxicants is the most withering, blighting curse than has ever befallen our country. Still further, it is evident that when the saloon is raised in the scale of its degradation looking toward decency, its power for evil is increased; that it then becomes capable of deceiving many who would never be decoyed into one of those lower haunts of vice. Hence, the saloon business is a crime against humanity, and, like any other crime, can not be regulated. That is not what law proposes to do with crime. Suppose that we talk sentimentally about regulating murder by law? Our logic would then only equal that of those who argue that we must regulate the rum traffic by a license law!

1. All these laws, so far as known to the writer, have undertaken to legislate against the drunkard. If a man is found in a state of intoxication, he may be arrested by the city marshal, put into the cooler till morning, then fined by the mayor five or ten dollars, and sent home to his family, penni-

less, friendless, and hopeless. The money that might have furnished starving children with food has been taken to satisfy the demands of law and political conscience; but he by whose machinations, inducements and temptations this man has been made a drunkard walks abroad without censure. It was a silly fly to be caught by the spider; but for that folly punishment has been meted out. The fly is a simpleton, I grant, but the spider is the cold-blooded criminal. If the old fly has fallen a prey to the tempter, should there be a law among insects that would punish all the young at home? thus increasing the suffering consequent upon parental vanity or folly, and at the same time license Mr. Spider to continue his depredations without let or stint?

The man has made a fool of himself in getting drunk, and the license law visits his folly upon the heads of the wife and innocent and helpless children, while the man who, more than all others is to blame in the matter, is petted and pampered, and protected by the law that talks of justice!

2. A man may be dangerous to society while drunk—murder may be the probable result of a single drink—but in the midst of temptation the drinker does not realize his condition. The drink is sold, the brain is maddened, the murder is committed, and the insane actor is punished with death or imprisonment for life, while the real murderer walks in company with the respectable, and

is to be honored as a worthy citizen! True, the saloon-keeper may have had no quarrel with the deceased. What he did was only for the money he got for the drink; and yet, but for that drink the murder had not been committed. He may have been wholly indifferent as to the results of that drink; and yet the two facts that fasten crime are found in his history: 1. He knew its probable results; and, 2. He sold the liquor in full view of such probabilities. Here, then, is the injustice of all license law. It sentences one man, who was impelled by the maddening power of drink, while the man who is more to blame than any other goes free!

3. If one man should kill 60,000 men he would be the most notorious murderer of this age. No matter how he might accomplish this destruction of life—whether he poisoned the air or the water—the deed would be the same. Nor would it be any amelioration to find that he had no personal ill-will against any of his victims. And though we find that for this horrible deed he received one billion in gold, even this temptation would not be accepted as an apology. But the rum-trade kills that many annually, and yet we license it to continue. When I say rum-trade, I put the business in the place of the saloonists who prosecute it. Hence these men are as guilty of murder as one man would be who would poison the water or the atmosphere, or by some device decoy the unsus-

pecting multitudes into a snare by which the same results would be reached. They can not be released from this charge on the plea that the work has been divided among 160,000 men. Neither law nor justice can permit them to escape in that way. Does some one say that it is not known in any one case that death has been the result of the individual work of any one man? This statement, however, is not true. It is known in hundreds of cases just where the liquor was obtained by which the death was caused. And yet, if it could not be clearly and certainly shown who shot the man last, they are all guilty of shooting to the extent of their opportunities and ammunition. Does another say that these men have not severally known the result of the liquor, beforehand, and therefore have not been guilty of murder? I answer that they do know the probable consequences of the whole trade; and hence, in the light of the facts, they drive their business in the face of the murder that results therefrom. Let me illustrate: Five men ask a license to shoot among a thousand. The license is granted. They shoot without taking aim. Two men are killed. These were the probable results before shooting, and are found to have been the consequence of the sport of these gamblers. We may prove that neither one of these men could know that he killed a man; but when all the facts are reported, these men would be convicted of murder by any law except a license

law. Such a law might clear them, for it is *particeps criminis*. Hence, we say it boldly, that the average saloon-keeper knows that he is destroying human life, but for the sake of the money gotten from the trade he continues to kill, and is in every proper sense of the word a murderer!

Therefore we emphasize the injustice of the law in that it discriminates between criminals, and that it defeats the ends of justice thereby.

Sometimes it is argued that the saloon-keeper is not responsible for this drunkenness; that he does not ask men to get drunk and butcher each other in this fearful way: he does not sell without the consent of the men themselves. Suppose this were all true, what then? Will the fact that men have been willing to be duped into this loss of property, manhood, honor, and even life, lessen the crime upon the part of these tempters and seducers? But for their work this slaughter would never occur. They know this, and are therefore guilty in the full meaning of the term.

Suppose that a man who is skilled in the black art should come into your town exhibiting his attainments. He invites young men to come up and sit with him on the platform, assuring them that he can pass his hand over their eyes and dement them so that they will never know anything more. But a hundred young men, full of confidence in themselves, deny his ability to injure them in that way. Then follows the test. It is

seen by the audience that the work has been done. See the frantic mothers rushing upon the platform, each one calling to her son, to bring back his mental powers. But all to no purpose. Reason has fled; and now they are a set of idiots who stare at those who speak to them; but they know not anything. The mothers rush upon the conjurer in the wildness of despair—"Bring my son to his right mind again." Watch that sneer on the countenance of that hardened trickster, as he says: "Ladies, I have done with your boys all that I proposed to do, and I can not bring them back again. I did not force them into this experiment; they undertook the matter of their own accord. Hence, as I gave them fair warning, I am in no way responsible for the results." Would your city fathers license him to continue his efforts to dement the youth of your city? Will the fact that it was by their choice that the trial was had, make his experiments any less injurious? Will the people excuse him on that plea? He was more honorable than the rum-seller; he told just what he would do. The saloon-keeper hides the results of his experiments. He says to young men: "Come in and have a good time." They walk in, and he ruins them. Is he now excusable on the ground of their willingness to take the risk? Suppose that he advertised his goods as one man does in this State (Iowa): "NOSE PAINT;" "THE ROAD TO HELL;" would even a correct advertisement

make his work any less awful? There would be a little infernal boldness in such performances; but nothing that could wipe out the evil done, or make him less than a murderer when he kills men. No matter if he should say on his sign: "I will take your money, waste your time, make fools of you, rob you of your fortune, your honor and your manhood; I will bloat your body and remove your reason; I will corrupt your morals and disgrace you in the eyes of all intelligent people; I will madden your brain, and send you home to kill your wife and children or your neighbor; I will take your life by inches, and damn you forever." This would of course be but a partial advertisement; and yet it is true as far as it goes. But would that correct advertisement make him anything less than a murderer? Though he acknowledges that it is his legitimate business to empty the community of all its morals, waste its energies and resources, and take the lives of its best men; and though, after that fair warning, the people invite him to engage in his work in their midst, he is still guilty, and should be punished according to the magnitude of his crimes.

4. Our law prohibits incest, infamy, bigamy, theft, robbery, fraud, manslaughter, murder, etc., and then licenses that which is the parent of all these crimes. Nine-tenths of all the criminality in our land is caused by the sale and use of intoxicating drinks. If we must license crime, let us

license the smaller evils and prohibit the greater ones. Let us license thieving, infamy, murder, but not that which lies at the root of all the evils known to men and demons.

If only our people could be made to realize their responsibility, that what we do by the hands of another we do as really as if we acted independently of such an agent; that when we make a law that permits crime to run riot at noonday, and that when men are killed as the result of such a law, that we are guilty of the blood of a brother, we might be still more aroused on the question than what we are. Having witnessed the utter incompetency of the license system to bring us any relief from the evils of intemperance; finding that it has failed, as it must, of any practical good to those States that have tried it; seeing that it is wrong, in the nature of things, to license that which is evil, and that the sale of whisky is the greatest evil of the present time, we ask, Are we not ready now to deal sensibly with this question? While men are ready to exercise common sense in reference to all other crimes, we wonder how long it will be before the crime of rum-selling may be dealt with in justice.

I will now state my objections to the license system numerically:

I. A LICENSE LAW CAN NOT BE ENFORCED IN ANY RESPECT IN WHICH THE PEOPLE SHALL BE BENEFITED.

If this proposition is too sweeping, it may be

modified by *easily*, or *not well*. What I want to affirm is, that a license law necessarily stands in opposition to all effort to prevent the sale of rum. If the law contains prohibitory features, then, in so far, it is prohibition and not license, and all its license features are in antagonism to them. By the very fact that the law will license a certain traffic that traffic is defended from all forcible opposition. In throwing around the business such a safeguard, the law has plainly said that it is legal and right, and therefore not to be hindered.

Take into account the many opportunities of avoiding the law under a license system, and they render the chances for the enforcement of its regulations very small indeed.

To begin with, the man that is thus permitted and indorsed to drive his trade is a villain, and cares nothing for the law. I do not say that all saloon-keepers are murderers and thieves, for some of them may be ignorant of the results of their work. But most of them know what they are doing, and thus engage in cold-blooded murder. This they do for money, knowing that their money will make them respectable. It would be unreasonable to expect such men to observe any law that would stand in the way of their business.

The chances to sell directly or indirectly to minors, or men who are intoxicated, or those who are in the habit of getting drunk, are only limited by the wish and the means of his victims. If we

were to enter all the saloons in the United States at one time, say at 9 o'clock at night, we would unearth as many minors, or nearly as many, as those who were of the age prescribed by the law, and we would get the proof that saloon men care nothing for the law. Do you say, then, they are liable to heavy punishment? How are you going to prove them guilty? They have corrupted the community, until no law in that place can be enforced against them. In every way they are assisted in evading the law. They do every thing in the darkness and under the cover which the law provides.

The law may license the sale of wine, ale and beer, and prohibit the stronger drinks. But how are we to know what he sells? A man who will go there, and get the one of these, will get any other drink there just as well. And, respecting poisoned liquors, he has every chance to drug them that would please his depravity; and, without a constabulary, or some system that a license law never provides, there can be found no means of knowing what he sells. All the chances for the evasion of any law restricting his wishes in the matter are granted that he could wish. It is no matter of wonder, then, that every saloon-keeper in the country favors license and opposes prohibition.

2. There is no way to protect ourselves against the vilest men on the earth under a license law.

•

Do you say that they must have twelve men to go on their bonds, certifying that they are men of good moral character and *standing*? But who are these bondholders? Any men who may be freeholders. But a man who is low enough in his morals to encourage a saloon does not care a fig whether the man has any character or not. He knows, if he has common sense, that men of good morals would not engage in the traffic. But that does not matter. He wishes the saloon, and will go on any bond, and for any man, in order that the thing may succeed. Here, then, is another feature in the license system that is deceptive.

3. The low tone of morals begotten by saloons will render any law regulating or prohibiting intemperance nugatory.

4. If the license law succeeded in making saloons decent and respectable then it would ruin all the more. A young man does not begin to drink in those low, dirty dens of debauchery. He prefers to be a respectable gentleman, who *can take a glass or let it alone*; he wishes to move in respectable society, and will not, therefore, go to one of those *low-order-saloons*: But those houses where no drunkenness is permitted, and where honorable men go to pass a social hour, are the places competent to decoy him from the path of rectitude. Hence, if the license system could be made to accomplish its purpose, of making saloons respectable, and removing from them the drunk-

eness, revelry and murder that occur in them, it would only enable them the more certainly to deceive the unsuspecting, and then lead them into those habits that will certainly ruin them.

5. The principle of license is wrong. And if it could be found that prohibition will not prohibit, still, as we have seen, there is no power in a license to prevent intemperance. When we give any man a legal permit to sell rum for a sum of money we discriminate between the rich and the poor.

6. A few men being enabled to monopolize the rum-trade does not lessen the drinking and drunkenness, as they can all be supplied from a few saloons as well as from a larger number.

7. To license the rum traffic is to participate in its results. The saloon-keeper is responsible for the murders committed under the influence of the liquors he sells. The law is also responsible, which has licensed his business. And every man who voted for the law, or for men who would vote for the law, is responsible. No man, therefore, who fears God, can vote for a license law or for any man who will vote for it, seeing that by so doing he becomes a participant in the evils thus encouraged.

8. LICENSE HINDERS THE EDUCATION WHICH IS NECESSARY TO REMOVE THE CRIME OF DRUNKENNESS.

Men have said, we must have education before legislation. In a sense this is true. And yet it

is true that we never can have the needed education under a license system. There are many persons—I dare say the majority—who judge of the right and wrong of this question by the light in which the law exhibits it. The masses think *second-hand*, and will not be easily persuaded that the law-makers would have licensed this evil if it were such an unmitigated nuisance as we affirm it to be.

Again: the familiarity of this abomination paralyzes all opposition against it—

“Vice is a monster of such hideous mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with its face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.”

A season of cholera sends the country into a tremor of excitement. A few thousands have been carried away in defiance of all medical skill. But the rum-trade may kill sixty thousand per annum, and we pay but little attention to it, because we are accustomed to it. Hence the licensing of this traffic binds upon us a custom that has an educating influence in the United States equal to one hundred and sixty thousand schools kept in favor of those vices, out of which we expect a few hundred men to bring the people by goodish lectures on the evils of drunkenness. While we are trying to educate the people, on one hand, to total abstinence and prohibition, on the other, we are employing a billion every year to teach them just the opposite. The cost of all temperance

effort in the United States for 1877, including the work done by clergymen, was not more than ten millions, while the wholesale cost of rum was nearly seven hundred and fifty millions; or, for every dollar we expended to teach the people that intemperance was wrong, we paid seventy-five to teach that the use of these drinks, as a beverage, is right and legal. And yet, men of thought on other matters, will continue to talk of education before legislation! To me it is inconsistent, not to say hypocritical, for a man to preach that the use of alcohol as a beverage is wrong, and then to vote that it is right and lawful. It is like praying that all who profess faith in Christ may be one, and then laboring to keep the divisions that now exist, or like confessing the Lord in words and then denying him in works. If, then, we do really favor education, we must employ the object lessons of the law.

On this subject, B. Gratz Brown, in one of his speeches, presents my view so well that I can do no better than copy it. He says :

“Of twenty-three murders in one year, in Philadelphia, twenty came of drink. Of 75,692 arrests in New York City, 34,696 were for drunkenness and disorder.

“In fact, all the annals of penitentiaries, houses of correction and jails, but confirm what you see so patent in daily police reports, that intoxication and crime go hand in hand down the slippery paths to perdition. And this moral leprosy is contagious, constantly spread-

ing, making its conscription younger every generation. But the blunted moral sense which breeds dishonesties among individuals, when brought into contact with the State, turns its employ into rings of plunder and combinations for spoils. Those who have witnessed the growth, in late years, of the sentiment that robbery of the State is no robbery unless discovered, will not need to be told that it finds its culmination in that organized association known as the lobby, whose trade is corruption; whose appliance is human weakness, and whose Bible is the bottle.

“The effect, however, of this open traffic in intoxicating drinks is visible in the morals of public thought long before it takes on any violent types of depravity. What the State licenses the community will persist in regarding as right. Thus all reverence for law is undermined in those who still believe it wrong, and all faith in morals is shaken with such as stickle for the law; so that obedience to authority, which constitutes good citizenship, finds itself embarrassed either in accepting or repudiating legalized intoxication. Indeed, it goes much further; for we have thus the State as a teacher of morals, inculcating, by way of a first lesson, that the beginnings, whether of virtue or vice, are, in its estimation, matters of indifference. How early the seeds of disobedience are sown by such teaching may be well shown from reports of the Boston public schools, where, by careful inquiry, it has been shown that ‘among the causes for truancy, that which so far transcends all others as to be considered the cause of causes, is the early use of intoxicating drinks.’ Such is the attestation of Mr. Philbrick, for so many years superintendent. If to this be added the educating influence of the dram shops, for they are the rendezvous of riper profligates ambitious to encourage the young to emulate their courses, some idea may be formed of the antagonism thus interposed to any higher moral and physical development. Even if the great object of government, then, was merely the suppression of crime, without other

or nobler purposes, does it not sap the very foundations of its strength and permanence by sanctioning the license system? Is it not equally fatal, as a policy of State, to the governing and the governed?

“And here I might properly rest this analysis, were it not that there is one great element of society which revolves in a sphere of its own, and is scarcely to be classified under either of these aspects. I mean the families of the people—the centers of domestic rather than public life. The dram-shops law is not merely a menace; it is a crime against the marriage ties.

“The State first licenses the sale of intoxicating liquors, and then declares habitual intoxication cause for divorce. This is separation made easy; and ninety-nine cases out of every hundred which occur in our courts rest on that ground. It is not the question here whether drunkenness be sufficient cause; but if it is, how can the government excuse itself for upholding and legalizing the traffic which causes drunkenness? And where one family is thus dissolved by a legal edict, how many thousands upon thousands die out, or are virtually destroyed, which make no outward sign? It is in the heart of the mother and the terror of the child that this dread visitant first finds recognition. It is over ruined hopes, and broken promises, and lost respect, and wounded love, that drunkenness invades the family, and when once there, it is only a question of how long before every affection which binds that family together will be trampled out of being. And the future of citizenship is thus accursed before it is born into time.”

THE CIVIL DAMAGE CLAUSE

has some to advocate its claims. This law would license the sale of intoxicants, and then attempt to make the vender responsible for the damage that he shall do while in the use of these legal liberties.

On this idea we may license a man to steal, but make him responsible in those cases in which he is caught. It would be far better for mankind to license the horse-thief, for he is a far better man than the saloon-keeper, and does much less harm. He makes property to change hands without the owner's consent, but he does not waste the time of two millions of men, nor does he intoxicate or otherwise deprave the people. Of course we could catch him in his tricks occasionally, and then the former owner would only lose the time and work of his horse, and his own time in getting him.

The civil damage clause, with licensing the rum-trade, is inoperative. No one wishes to file the complaint at the time that the damage is being done. It is when a man is being initiated into the habit of drinking that the work of ruin takes place. At such a time, however, if a saloon-keeper should be sued at law for damages, he would have nothing to pay. The law protects him in his mischief till he has ruined his victim. Then, the wife, or sister, or mother, when driven to the verge of insanity and desperation, files the complaint. She has no means to prosecute her cause, and no influence in the court. If, however, she should be successful, only one or two thousand will be awarded. Is this the price of blood? Is this what will satisfy the heart-broken wife?

We have certainly reached these conclusions:

1. That merely a license law can not, in the

nature of things, have any power to remove the sin of intemperance.

2. To license the sale of rum protects the traffic.

3. If the law contains prohibitory features that might be of advantage, they are antagonized and neutralized by the license itself.

4. If the traffic is right and proper, then it is unjust to refuse this natural right to the poor man who has not the means necessary to pay the revenue expenses.

5. If the traffic is wrong, no license can make it right, and no government has a right to legalize and protect iniquity.

6. All are responsible for the injuries done under a license who aid, in any way, in obtaining it.

7. No license law can be enforced, in any way, that will hinder drunkenness, for all possible chances are extended to the saloon-keeper to evade the law.

8. A civil damage clause in a license law works no essential relief, but continues all the opportunities for drunkard making, and, at best, offers money in the place of fortunes wasted, men, and honor, and virtue, that have been stolen.

9. If a license law had the effect to make saloons respectable it would only increase their power for evil.

10. The license system has an educating influence that is very hard to overcome, and is all on the side of drunkenness.

11. Any temperance effort that does not aim at prohibition, ultimately at least, must be a failure.

12. Moral suasion and religious suasion should always be employed, when there is even a possibility of saving any one by their use; but neither has much power over the rum-seller. Hence, in order to remove temptation from the young and unsuspecting, saloons, with all that belong to them, must be abolished by law.

The Right to Prohibit.

CHAPTER VI.

IT is said that a man has a right to eat and drink what he pleases; that a prohibitory liquor law is a sumptuary law, and necessarily contravenes natural right.

Sumptuary is from the Latin *sumptus*, which means expense, cost. Webster says: "Relating to expense; regulating expense or expenditure. *Sumptuary laws or regulations*, such as restrain or limit the expense of citizens, in apparel, food, furniture, or the like."

Where, then, are the sumptuary features in a prohibitory liquor law? Does it make any attempt to regulate the expenditures in house-keeping? It does not even say *what* a man shall eat, *what* he shall wear, nor does it contain any features of sumptuary regulations. It simply refuses the privilege to men to sell that which will impoverish and poison, and, in almost every sense, ruin all who shall be deceived into its use.

They sometimes state their position as follows:

"A MAN HAS THE RIGHT TO DO WITH HIS OWN AS HE PLEASES."

This statement would be true with the following added: ONLY WHEN HE DOES NOT INJURE OTHERS THEREBY.

It is sometimes argued that a man has a right to do with his own as he pleases, and therefore men and laws have no right to interfere with his business. If he chooses to sell whisky, then it is his right to do so, since it is his property. But if that argument is good, then the license system is wrong, since it may debar some from this inalienable right, they not being able to pay the requisite amount.

But it is not true, in the absolute, that a man may do as he pleases with his own; since, such a privilege granted to the unprincipled, would work the insecurity of the person or property of another. By a wrong or vicious use of his own, a man might do violence to other men, which he has no natural, and should have no legal, right to do. Hence, a man may not burn down his own house, since, if he does not endanger the houses of other men, or destroy the life of some one within, yet he destroys the property of the commonwealth, and, by so much, injures the community as he burns up its capital. A man may not ignite the prairie grass on his own land, when, by so doing, he renders the property of another unsafe. The land being his own makes no difference in the eyes of law and justice. If a man should start a glue manufactory in the heart of our city, though his work would be a profitable one in many respects, yet its fumes

would create an unhealthy and offensive atmosphere. It would be dispensed with, and no claims of a right to do as he pleases with his own would protect him in the eyes of a refined and sensible community. To keep a hotel is right, to keep hogs is well enough, to give them the offal of the house is judicious and economical; but where swine and slops become offensive to the health and happiness of the people, neither the city fathers nor the citizens listen to any claims of individual rights, but demand that *the nuisance shall be abated*. A man might buy lots in this city and proceed to construct a powder magazine thereon, under the pretense of a right to do as he pleases with his own. But the people would be indignant at the idea. Nor would he be permitted to continue in his business. This plea, then, must be so circumscribed that when a man does as he pleases with his own, he will not please to do that which will injure other persons.

After all that has been said on the subject of a man's right to eat and drink what he pleases, the idea is not true, unless properly limited.

Man has some things in common with the animal creation; such as flesh, blood, bones, instinct, and intuition. He has also other mental qualities not possessed by animals in general. Those declare that he is an animal, while these affirm his superiority over all other earthly existences. When man gratifies his appetite, or his lust, he yields to the

demands of his inferior nature. The instinct of animals is their guard against the violation of law. But man has been left without such protection; for his superior powers of thought and reason must be his guide. The demands of his lower, or animal nature, must be held in abeyance to his superior intellectual endowment. His desire to accumulate property is a much higher aspiration than the desire to pamper and pet, and become the slave of his appetite; for it stands in the list of those qualities that belong to his higher nature. Can we not argue, then, as it is man's nature to accumulate property, that he can therefore do so in that way that seems good to him? But the law and the common sense of all men say, No! If a man shall undertake to enhance the value of his property to the injury of his neighbor, the whole civilized world stands ready with a veto. Our law is supposed to have its foundation in justice when it refuses one man the privilege of taking something for nothing. Indeed this principle of justice underlies all the enactments of our law with reference to theft and fraud.

This may be fixed upon, then, as an axiom: A man has the natural and legal right to increase his property in any way that he pleases, provided that he shall not interfere to the injury of the rights, person, or property of any one else. But if he may not accumulate property, regardless of the consequences to any one but himself, and his

desire to do so is a higher law than that of mere appetite, it is senseless to argue that he may appease his appetite in any way he pleases, without regard to the interests of other people.

The question, then, comes to this: Can the eating and drinking of what one pleases interfere with the natural rights of others? If we answer in the affirmative, then the boasted position of liquor-dealers is gone.

If a man eats or drinks that which destroys his life, health, or his usefulness, he thereby injures, to some extent, every other man. But especially is his immediate community poorer in proportion to the amount of capital thus withdrawn from its resources. But when we come to reckon the evils of whisky drinking, they are so numerous, and of such fearful magnitude, that it is an absolute strain upon our charity to regard any man as both sane and honest who will contend for a minute that any man has any natural right to make a brute of himself in that way. It is now commonly known that to the account of intoxicating drinks is charged nine-tenths of all the crimes brought into our courts. Can any man in his senses believe that it is the right of any man to drink that which will cause him to commit crime? Like all wrongs, these things come by degrees. The man first drinks occasionally with a friend, then by himself; then he neglects business to loaf around haunts of vice; his family is impoverished; he becomes

reckless, and, under the influence of the "*narcotico acrid poison*," he commits murder or theft! •Now, it may be difficult to determine the exact time of his responsibility, but none will fail to charge up the crime, along with his neglect of family and business, to the drink that has at last brought him to ruin. Hence a man has no more right to drink that which will cause him to commit a crime than to commit the crime itself. Again: it is certain that a man has neither the right to drink, nor the right to sell intoxicating beverages; for these are the acknowledged causes of nine-tenths of all the crime of the country to-day.

I clip the following article from the *National Prohibitionist* for its good sense and correct logic:

"QUARANTINE. — We are now having a very striking example of the power of law to protect the people.

"Persons who have committed no crime, have broken no law, have injured no one, are taken off railroad trains and steamboats, deprived of their liberty, and held in durance on a mere suspicion, only that they have been exposed to an infectious disease; and while few people die, as compared with other and worse evils, forty millions of people in this free country submit to this without protest, without murmur.

"Whole sections of the country are now cut off from intercourse with other sections — commerce is paralyzed, business is stopped, mails are not delivered, cities are patrolled, and, if a stranger is found, he is taken out and sent adrift. In fact, one of the agents of the firm of Clafin, Allen & Co., of St. Louis, reports that he was stopped near Cairo, Ill., held for a time, and then taken away from his route of travel, miles and miles,

and left on a lone, desolate shore, uninhabited, without food or protection.

“This gentleman was pursuing his legitimate business and calling in a legitimate way, molesting no one; but it was rumored that he might have been exposed to a contagious disease, and the law steps in and says: ‘To prevent suffering you must submit, not only to be stopped and turned back, and put off alone, but you must remain there for a certain length of time, for the good of the people.’ That is, no matter how pressing your business may be, how important that you reach your home; wife, children or friends may be sick, dying: all that is nothing to the protection of the people. And so ‘quarantine is enforced’ at Cairo, at New Orleans, at Jackson, Miss., at Grenada, Miss., at Memphis, and at various other points; and our merchants and manufacturers, and travelers, and business men of all classes, not only submit, but they send money—thousands of dollars to those who are afflicted in these cities.

“This action is, in all respects, worthy all praise. But the poison and infection of yellow fever—the death and destruction by this scourge—is not to be compared to the poison, and death, and destruction, resulting from the legalized liquor traffic!

“A person dying of yellow fever dies honorably, is mourned for, lamented, and his death can be spoken of with affectionate regard in all after time.

“Is it so with the drunkard?

“What shames, and crimes, and debauchery—what reproach and beastliness dog his steps, from his first loss of control and respect, on and on, down the long, shameful career, until the rotten hulk of a diseased body and a wrecked soul is covered deep with such an infamy as forbids even mention of the name or circumstance of death, except with shame and regret.

“We ‘quarantine,’ and submit to such restraints as would justify armed resistance to this lesser, and temporary, and local danger, while the horrid evils, the

crimes, and murders, and miseries, and poverty, and disease, and death, from the legalized liquor traffic, this greater evil, continuous and as wide-spread as the continent, grows apace, numbering its victims by tens and hundreds, where the yellow fever strikes one. If we have a right to quarantine for a 'fever,' we have an equal right to 'quarantine' to prevent the limitless crime, and curse, and poverty, and death, from drunkenness! Have we not?

"If you admit we have, then you are a Prohibitionist."

Our railroad managers are finding that they must prohibit the use of intoxicating liquors. In the last report of the Railroad Commissioner for Wisconsin, we find that this question was asked all of the railway companies operating roads in that State:

"Has your company any rules governing conductors, engineers, and trainmen, concerning the use of intoxicating liquors?"

The answer of the Chicago and Northwestern officials was as follows:

"The rules of this company absolutely prohibit the use of intoxicating liquors by the conductors, engineers, and trainmen; and they are strictly enforced."

The Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Company made this answer:

"It is a rule of the road not to employ or retain in service men who make an immoderate use of intoxicating liquors, and this rule is enforced."

"Perfect sobriety required, and no liquors allowed on the property," is the answer given by the Chippewa Falls and Western.

“Employees not allowed to use intoxicating liquors,” says the Green Bay and Minnesota Company.

Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western: “The use of intoxicating liquors on or about the premises of the company is strictly prohibited, and any employe appearing on duty in a state of intoxication is forthwith discharged. Those who totally abstain will receive the preference in promotion and employment. These rules are strictly enforced.”

Western Union: “Our rules provide for the discharge of any employe who uses liquor to excess.”

West Wisconsin, now Chicago, St. Paul and Minneapolis: “The use of intoxicating liquors involves instant dismissal.”

Wisconsin Central: “The use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage will be considered just cause for dismissal from the service of the company.”

Wisconsin Valley: “Total abstinence.”

Many more of our Western Roads have, and are adopting similar regulations. They find that they must do this or lose the patronage of the traveling public. This is prohibition enforced by companies; and yet no one doubts their right in the matter.

IS PROHIBITION CONSTITUTIONAL?

Some years ago it was commonly said, in opposition to prohibition, that it was unconstitutional. In so grave an assembly as the Nebraska Legislature, only a few years ago, it was regarded by lead-

ing men as unconstitutional ; and, though most people at the present time know better, yet it may not be wholly out of place, even in these chapters, to give a few decisions on this subject. For the benefit of such as may have an interest in such things, I will quote from the fifth volume of Howard's Reports of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Justice Carton said: "If the State has power of restraint by license to any extent, she may go to the length of prohibiting sales altogether." [Page 611.]

Hon. Justice Daniels said of imports, when cleared of all duty and subject to the owner: "They are like all other property of the citizens, and should be equally the subjects of domestic regulation and taxation, whether owned by an importer or vender." [Page 614.]

And in reply to the argument that the importer purchases the right to sell when he pays duties to the Government, the Judge says: "No such right as the one supposed is purchased by the importer. He has not purchased, and can not purchase from the Government, that which could not insure to him a sale, independent of the law and policy of the States." [Page 617.]

Hon. Justice Grier says:

"It is not necessary to array the appalling statistics of misery, pauperism, and crime, which have their origin in the use and abuse of ardent spirits. The policy power, which is exclusively in the State, is competent

to the correction of these great evils, and all measures of restraint or prohibition necessary to effect that purpose are within the scope of that authority; and if a loss of revenue should accrue to the United States from a diminished consumption of ardent spirits, she will be a gainer a thousand-fold in the health, wealth, and happiness of the people." [Page 632.]

Does some one say that the Hon. Justice was a little prejudiced in favor of the temperance cause? I have only to answer that it does not appear in the decision. He has only said what his sound judgment and thorough acquaintance with law demanded of him. Hon. Justice McLean has also rendered several decisions. Among the many good things that he has said, I quote the following:

"A license to sell is a matter of policy and revenue within the power of the State." [Page 589.]

"If the foreign article be injurious to the health and morals of the community, a State may prohibit the sale of it." [Page 565.] Again he says:

"No one can claim a license to retail spirits as a matter of right." [Page 597.]

Mr. Justice Woodbury said:

"After articles have come within the territorial limits of States, whether on land or water, the destruction itself of what constitutes disease and death, and the longer continuance of such articles within their limits, or the terms and conditions of their continuance, when conflicting with their legitimate police, or with their power over internal commerce, or with their right of taxation over all persons and property within their jurisdiction, seems one of the first principles of State sovereignty, and indispensable to public safety." [Page 630.]

Chief Justice Taney said:

“If any State deems the retail and internal traffic of ardent spirits injurious to its citizens, and calculated to produce idleness, vice, or debauchery, I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent it from regulating or restraining the traffic, or from *prohibiting it altogether*, if it thinks proper.” [Page 577.]

Let these suffice upon this subject. When any man shall say that a State has not the constitutional right to prohibit the sale of alcohol within the limits of its jurisdiction, he will array himself in opposition to the best legal mind *of the nation*.

Many have argued that a government license to sell whisky, etc., will override the prohibition of the State. But this is plainly untrue, according to the decisions which we have already quoted, and with which all the great interpreters of law have ever decided. “Let a man,” says Blackstone, “be ever so abandoned in his principles, or vicious in his practice, provided he keeps his wickedness to himself, and does not offend against the rules of public decency, he is out of reach of human laws. But if he makes his vices public, though they be such as seem principally to affect himself (as drunkenness or the like), they then become, by the bad example they set, of pernicious effect to society; and therefore it is then the business of human laws to correct them.”—I. 124.

On these principles, our own commentator on American law says:

“The Government may, by general regulations, interdict such uses of property as would create nuisances, and become dangerous to the lives, or health, or peace, or comfort of the citizens. Unwholesome trades, slaughter-houses, operations offensive to the senses, the deposit of powder, the building with combustible materials, and the burial of the dead, may be interdicted by law, in the midst of dense masses of population, on the general and rational principle that every person ought so to use his property as not to injure his neighbors, and that private interest must be made subservient to the general interest of the community.” 2 Kent, 340.

Now we have convicted the business of selling rum of being injurious to health, destructive of wealth, opposed to education, in antagonism to the religion of Christ, and being a moral nuisance. It is the direct cause of nine-tenths of all the crimes in the land, and the fruitful source of much of the misery and most of the degradation and depravity now known to the world. If there can be found a reason for prohibiting anything known to law, that reason will hold good in legislating against the sale of intoxicating beverages.

Local Option.

CHAPTER VII.

WE are told of the great need of the education of the people before undertaking to enact or enforce a prohibitory law; and it has been thought that a local option law would favor this work of public instruction, as it would cause the ground to be canvassed anew once every year.

The power of a right education can scarcely be overestimated; and by no man who loves the cause of temperance can it be overlooked. In a community that favors the rum-trade no law prohibiting such traffic is likely to be regarded. You may file your complaint, bring your witnesses, prove your charges, but that jury will have one man that will hang the case with the "*not guilty.*" The police judge and the marshal have been elected by the rum vote, and wish to be elected again; hence the empaneling of the jury, and the instructions are all in favor of the violator of law going free. If the enforcement of law is left to the community, the officers will do about as the party that elected them wishes them to do; or, rather, they will be obedient to the ring-masters.

If these men have the rum politics of the place where they live, and they are generally below the level on this question, they will present men of their own kind for office; and hence the law will not be well executed. In reason, then, we must say that an education is a necessity, in order to enforce the law.

Some have seen these things plainly, and because there are difficulties in the way of prohibition, they have thought that a license law would do better. But will a license law be any better observed than a prohibitory law? As we have already seen, in so far as it is merely a license law, it makes no difference whether it is obeyed or not, seeing that it simply extends to men the privilege of doing as they wish. Can it be, then, that the prohibitory measures of a license law will be regarded, by having a place in a legal system, which, in principle, stands against them?

Because there are difficulties in the way of one system of law is not proof that some other would work better. When any one wishes to argue in favor of a license law, let him not suppose that he has gained his point when he has found some hindrances to a prohibitory law. If he be a man of honor, and really given to logic, he will endeavor to show you wherein a license law may be enforced in a way that will protect the people from the evils of intemperance, in which a prohibitory law can not. Up to this time I have seen no such an at-

tempt. Hence, so far as I am competent to judge, those who talk of a "*judicious license system*," wholly fail to argue the real question. If we ask any one of them, or all of them, to tell us of a single power, belonging to a license law, to hinder drunkenness that does not attach to a prohibitory law, we will have our work for nothing. They seem to think that they have done enough when they have referred to some difficulties lying in the way of prohibition.

I do not understand local optionists to oppose prohibition, but to favor it, but think that this is the best way to obtain and enforce a prohibitory law.

In justice, however, we ought to know just what is meant by *local* OPTION. What things have we to choose from? Is free whisky to prevail where the county or city does not vote for prohibition? or does the nuisance stand prohibited until the community shall demand that saloons be licensed? or is some form of license to exist unless the people shall demand a severer treatment of the evil? A local option that puts the temperance cause on the offensive gives the advantage to the whisky party. If prohibition is to be the law till repealed by a majority vote in favor of whisky, the condition of things is vastly changed.

I do not believe, however, that a local option is what we want. I will state my reasons numerically:

1. Local option implies the right of free whisky

or a local license law. We have seen that neither one of these can be right. Hence this law would impose an evil upon the people.

2. It reduces a question of principle, a question of right and wrong, to the plane of policy; and in this way hinders the quickening of the public mind respecting the sin of the rum-trade.

3. If by this law saloons should be prohibited in one county and licensed in an adjoining one, the evil would only be partially removed. The opportunities to obtain intoxicants would not be as good as before; still the distance is not great enough to prevent the drinkers in the prohibitory county from getting drunk as often as their means would permit, and their poisoned systems and depraved appetites would require. And yet, when you have banished the tempter from your county or city, you have made the drink a little less convenient for the man who wishes to continue his beastly habit, and you have improved the chances for rescuing those who may wish to do better, by the removal of temptation a little further from them.

In the State of Iowa we have prohibition of all intoxicating liquors except ale, beer, and wine, manufactured in the State. Even these may be prohibited in towns that are incorporated. Yet when we drive them from our city limits, they can go two miles away and start up. Some have thought that an *option so local* can not be of any benefit. But this is not true. We can greatly discourage

the drunkard-making business in this way. And by actual experiment we know that the young men who would otherwise be induced to frequent saloons for company and mirth, and thus be led step by step into drinking habits, will not go off two or three miles to hunt them up. Also the fact that the people of the town have voted the traffic a nuisance, serves to elevate the sentiment of young men on the subject.

I am not ready to denounce local option as wholly worthless. It is better than no option. But its failure to remove the evil far enough prevents its success; hence it is faulty. It is not the law that we want, unless it shall first be apparent that it is the only one we can get.

4. An insuperable objection against local option is found in the fact that the question is never settled. With every change of law there is a weakness, and a failure in enforcement. (1.) Because men are unacquainted with it; that the people are to be educated to the observance of the new system. (2.) There is an overawing prejudice in favor of the old arrangements that has to be subdued before the new will be right loyally observed. This changing by one Legislature what was done by a previous one has been the bane of temperance legislation in nearly all the States where our authorities have attempted to deal with the subject. Here, then, is one of the great weaknesses of local option: The question is fixed only for a

year at a time. During this period the opponents busy themselves in making the law as offensive as possible. Lacking fixedness, it lacks authority and the respect of those it was intended to govern. In the minds of the people, the question of prohibition is not settled; hence vacillation and oscillation, weakness and general frailty, is the certain result of this system.

5. LOCAL OPTION FAILS IN AN EDUCATIONAL POINT OF VIEW.

The power of education supposed to be in the law is, with most of its friends, its principal charm. It is thought that the frequency of voting on this question will insure such full and oft-repeated considerations of the subject that the education of the people will, in that way, be secured. I am sure, however, that philosophy and the facts contradict this position. When we say that the rum-trade should be licensed in communities where it is desired, we present the whole matter before the world as a question of policy, and, so far as the educational influence of the law is concerned, the truth is not taught the people.

The facts in connection with local option are far from satisfactory to those who have been long in the temperance work. Where local option prevails it is voted on, in nearly all cases, in connection with the men who are to hold the offices for the ensuing year. These are nominated by party leaders and political tricksters, so that the masses

have but little opportunity to vote on the question, and, in the canvass, temperance men are usually whipped into the harness and made to vote with the favorite party, while the rum-men break ranks from moneyed interests and depraved lives. The result is that whisky prevails in the contest, though the majority of the people do not favor it. Hence the education afforded by local option amounts to little or nothing that can be of any service to the cause of temperance.

6. Local option furnishes protection to those who have but little need of it, but to the communities who are most in need of assistance it offers no help. This is so self-evident that it needs no argument. A county or city that carries prohibition in the face of all the political wire-working of party leaders and whisky rings has less need of the law than those places where the people are compelled to have this demon rule over them.

7. A LOCAL OPTION LAW IS DIFFICULT TO OPERATE.

This statement is in direct antagonism to all that the friends of the law have been wont to say of it. The usual argument in its favor is that it is the only law that can be enforced. Somebody must be mistaken. (1.) I have already shown that there will never be the necessary respect for any law, the principles of which are not regarded as settled. Hence the very fact of the changeableness of policy under this *regime* prevents that loyalty and respect necessary to the obedience of law. (2.)

A local option never provides the means by which obedience may be compelled. In communities where the license sentiment prevails no such provisions would be demanded. Hence, in State enactments there is no system of enforcing prohibitory measures such as are needed. (3.) A large portion of the State is left out, and, of course, have no assistance of law, not being able to vote prohibition. (4.) By reason of contiguity, men have every opportunity of evading the law by going to the neighboring town or city.

8. MY LAST CHARGE AGAINST LOCAL OPTION IS THAT IT TENDS TO DISUNION.

The question of State rights has not yet been forgotten. It was argued by the ablest minds in this country that if a State might withdraw from the Union a county might withdraw from the State, a town from the county, a colony from a town, and an individual from the colony; hence, that the State rights plea meant simply the abandonment of government. But this is the very position on the whisky question taken by local optionists. They will turn our counties and towns loose to do as seems to them good in this matter. While this strikes a blow at the existence and power of law, it also tends toward those differences of sentiment and feeling that will eventually sectionalize and localize the country in its friendships and trade.

We have found by a very sad experience in this

country that local option on the subject of slavery, or even an attempt, by the General Government, to limit it to a portion of the country, was a poor governmental policy. In the nature of things, we would have to practice slavery throughout the Government or dismiss it altogether. And yet, whatever there were of wrong, and corruption, and power in slavery, it was a white infant compared to the question that we are now considering. I am not an alarmist. I do not mean to say that disunion will certainly come of it. We may avert the danger. But the tendency of the system is clearly what I have declared it to be.

Local option was born of political and legislative cowardice. Politicians found their constituency hopelessly divided on the question. Afraid to do what was right in the premises, and supposing, on the other hand, that it would not do to favor license out and out, they have adopted this plan, so that they might conciliate the people in different localities. Like the boy, when he went to shoot at the deer, not being sure if it were not a calf, he took such aim, or tried to, that if it should be a deer, he would hit, or if a calf, he would miss. Such has been the twilight uncertainty and legislative charlatanry with which this cause has been managed. I don't wonder at office-seekers for this dodge of the issue; but it taxes my patience, and charity too, to think that good Christian men can be hoodwinked into pleading

for the system. I will accept local option when I can't do any better. Though I know it is not what we want, still it is better than no option at all.

I am indebted to the *Chicago Journal*, of December 5, 1878, for the following official statement, which shows both the worth and the weakness of local option:

“The Clerk of the Circuit Court in Edwards County, in this State, submits the following interesting facts:

“There has not been a licensed saloon in this county for over twenty-five years. During that time our jail has not averaged an occupant. This county never sent but one person to the penitentiary, and that man was sent up for killing his wife, while drunk, on whisky obtained from a licensed saloon in an adjoining county. We have but very few paupers in our poor-house, sometimes only three or four. Our taxes are 32 per cent. lower than they are in adjoining counties, where saloons are licensed. Our people are prosperous, peaceable and sober; there being very little drinking, except near Grayville, a licensed town of White County, near our border. The different terms of our Circuit Court occupy three or four days each year, and then the dockets are cleared. Our people are so well satisfied with the present state of things that a very large majority of them would bitterly oppose any effort made in favor of license, under any circumstances.

“The temperance people and organizations of Macon County are sending circulars over the State, asking for signatures to a petition to be submitted to the coming Legislature for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks within the jurisdiction of the State.”

ONLY A COMPLETE LAW CAN EVER BE FULLY ENFORCED.

Sometimes I hear men say we have more law

now than is observed, and if we can not enforce the law we now have, a severe law would be null.

This reminds me of the story some one tells on Paddy. He had never slept on feathers, but had often heard that they made a very pleasant bed. One night being compelled to sleep out-doors, he found a feather, put it on a rock, and took it for his pillow. His opinion was not favorable to the use of feathers, since he was not able to sleep on *one* with any comfort. Most people think that if Paddy had had feathers enough he would have enjoyed the pillow very much better.

The trouble is, just where we need law we have none. A license law makes no provision for the enforcement of prohibitory measures, and, in itself, proposes nothing by which the evil can be removed. If we now had such a law respecting murder we would find ourselves unable to make the law respectable or cause it to be obeyed, and could as reasonably argue that we should not legislate against that crime until we had *morally-suaded* the people up to the enforcement of the law already in existence.

Some think we must bring men up to the level of prohibition by degrees, and that the German element, at least, in this country, while they may be reached by moral suasion, would be thrown off entirely, if we should announce to them the real facts in the case, that we intend eventually to soft-soap them into a willingness to approve of pro-

hibition. This, however, is contrary to all I know of Germans in this country. It is true that they are largely represented in our Western States, but they are only a respectable minority. And we are no more to provide for the privilege of Germans, to practice in this country as they have been accustomed to in the Fatherland, than we are to provide for the Chinese. We ought to say to our German neighbors, You are welcome here if you can live under such laws as are thought best for our people. And we may say the same to other lands, as well as to Germany, but you are not at liberty to institute arrangements here by which our sons are to be decoyed into evil.

I know that politicians court the German vote, and permit 40,000 Germans to rule 200,000 of our American born citizens. I like the Germans for their industry and frugality, but rather than that our rights are to be made hideous with drunken revelry, and our streets disgraced with midnight orgies, I would have them all return in peace. And, so far as any German having to be won by moral suasion, and little by little, to the ground of prohibition, there is nothing in it. Our moral suasion is having no effect on him whatever. The sober German is one of our most intelligent and useful citizens, and is as approachable by logic and financial calculations as any man in the nation, and I would sooner undertake to direct his vote on this question than the average American born

citizen, for he is a little more likely to be true to his principles. He is not the soft kind of creature that some of our men have taken him to be. And, so far as the drinking German is concerned, if he can be reached at all, it is by the logic of facts. He can be much more easily approached by facts and figures, and be gotten to vote and act with his financial interests, than he can be won from his company and beer-garden frolic by moral suasion.

BUT THERE ARE SOME LOCALITIES THAT WOULD NOT
SUBMIT TO PROHIBITION.

If that were true, still it would not justify an unrighteous law on the subject. When God was thundering from the smoking summit of the quaking Sinai, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," just down in the valley Aaron was fixing up a calf for the people to worship, and that, too, by their request. If God had reasoned as men do now on this temperance question he would have licensed the calf, and Aaron as its keeper, and then given them a little moral suasion. If the same line of policy had been observed by Jehovah, that men now contend for on the whisky question, we would have had no decalogue yet. Law is a teacher, and must be in advance of the moral sentiment of those it is intended to govern. Hence, if we could know that there are cities in which a prohibitory law would be disregarded, it would be no argument against the law itself.

Let me ask how the people have gotten so low in some of these cities that they will not observe a righteous law on the subject? For fifty years, in these same cities, we have licensed the rum-seller to sell his stuff and then we have morally-suaded the people not to buy. And now, at the end of half a century, the people are so debased that they won't bear a prohibitory law! Let me say, neighbor, if fifty years of license and moral suasion have so utterly failed as that, in the name of common sense we have enough of such pitiable performances.

I find no fault with moral suasion. It is all right. But the license undoes all that can, in that way, be accomplished.

But there are no communities that can not be conquered, in two years' time, under a prohibitory law, with proper provisions for its enforcement. By the appointment of State officers over their work, in two years' time, the State constables of Massachusetts were enabled to report that there was not left a single open bar to tell the story. In this way the power of the whole people may be brought to bear on this question, and the cities that have not the stamina in them for the enforcement of the law would be helped to its observance by the State at large.

There is no philosophic reason why men may not be restrained from selling and drinking whisky as well as prevented from any other crime against

themselves or the community in which they live. Our law does not propose to license or permit infamy. It is based upon the presumption that, though the law may not be perfectly regarded, yet it can be, to some extent, at least, executed. And yet there are many reasons why a law prohibiting that nameless crime can never be perfectly enforced that do not exist as obstacles in the way of the enforcement of a prohibitory liquor law. The appetite for intoxicants is not natural, and the disposition to sell it comes only from the love of money, without the necessary conscience to determine the right course by which the end shall be reached. And there can be found no reason, in the nature of things, why that crime may not be restrained as well as others.

But if the law, by prohibiting the crime of which we speak, could not be any better enforced than the law against adultery, still it would be a shame against our common humanity not to prohibit it. It ought, at least, to free itself from the charge of conniving at the crime. The law can, at least, make it disreputable to engage in the business.

But just what makes it necessary for us to reach prohibition by local option or license no man can tell. Why not approach the suppression of every other crime in the same way as well as that of intemperance? Suppose that our Legislature, in undertaking to prevent the lottery stealing arrange-

ments of the sons of Belial, should give us local option on that subject? And what would we think of the head and heart of the man who would claim that such a law can not be executed in all communities, and, therefore, should only exist in those places where the people have been sufficiently educated on the subject? We might suppose that he had some kind of interest in the business himself, or that he felt himself in need of the patronage of those who had! If a man should argue that a law against murder will be violated and disrespected in some localities, and, therefore, that that crime should be dealt with by license and local option, you would not regard him a fit person for the next Legislature.

If I were a wholesale dealer in liquors and wished to monopolize the business, and were situated in a city of the first or second class, and felt sure that license would carry in that place, then I would favor local option, since it would give me the trade that might otherwise be divided among a great many small dealers in rum.

If I were a politician of the first or second class—a mere politician, and felt that I must have office; that I could not live without office; and that, in order to get it, I must do something that would quiet the "*temperance fanatics*," and yet not to any particular extent injure the business of my whisky friends, to whom I would have to look for the money to conduct the campaigns—

then I might favor it; seeing that in that way I could "become all things to all men, that at least, by all means, I might gain some" votes. But why any man, with common sense, untrammelled with business or political aspirations, should favor a "local option" law to a full and complete prohibition, I can not understand.

Of what we have said, then, this is the sum:

1. License is wrong and inoperative, and wholly incompetent to do good.

2. The traffic in intoxicants is an unmitigated evil, and no just law can tolerate it.

3. There is but one thing that law can do with it, and that is to prohibit it, and attach such penalties to the violation of the law as the magnitude of the crime deserves. It is the only way that men of legal sense have proposed to treat crime.

4. We have seen that local option is neither fully wise nor just, and though it is better than license, still it is not what we need. It would be as reasonable to make lotteries, gambling, thieving, infamy, and murder, questions of local option as the whisky business.

Can the Liquor Traffic Be Restrained By a Prohibitory Law?

CHAPTER VIII.

I MUST notice the arguments in the negative. Unreasonable as they may seem to us, there are those who regard them as being of importance.

1. Humanity will do about so much wrong any way; and if the waywardness were not in the way of drinking, it would be in opium-eating, or some other indulgence quite as injurious. Hence, if we could suppress the traffic, no particular good would thereby be accomplished.

Our answer to this is, that there is no such a law in human nature as that which has been assumed. Humanity is not bound by any law to commit a given amount of folly and crime. Hence, removing one sin does not simply make room for another. But, on the other hand, every evil that fastens to us and fixes itself in our lives, renders us weaker and less able to stand against any other temptation to wrong. The argument, then, is very unsound in its philosophy. Still further, it has

been proven by facts undeniable, that sins and vices of all kinds disappear in the ratio of the diminution of liquor drinking. The following statistics reveal the average facts:

In 1837, the cases of murder and assault, with evil intent, in Ireland, amounted to 12,096. In the following year there were 11,058. In 1839, the number only reached 1,097. But, in 1840, the number of cases was reduced to 173. Why? During this time Father Mathew had induced 250,000 to sign the pledge of total abstinence.

Thus it appears that there was, with total abstinence, only one case of crime to seventy without it. And yet the people were not all on the list. This would charge about ninety-eight per cent. of all their outrages up to the account of strong drink. There is, then, every reason why the traffic in alcoholic liquors should be abolished.

2. It is sometimes argued that no law prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors will ever be obeyed. But we will see that it is as well observed as any other law. Perhaps no law is perfectly kept, and yet there can be found no reason against the law on that account.

3. IN THE FACE OF ALL THE FACTS, MEN SOMETIMES SAY THAT MORE LIQUOR WILL BE SOLD AND DRUNK UNDER A PROHIBITORY, THAN UNDER A LICENSE LAW!

I confess to a sense of shame when I realize that it is my duty to notice this nonsense. It is both

unreasonable and diametrically opposed to all the facts in the case.

Everywhere, both in the Old World and in the New, where prohibition has had anything like a fair trial, it has worked well.

I presume that liquor men understand their interests in this matter. They are men of business shrewdness, and have no moral questions to occupy their attention. They give themselves wholly to the money phase of the question. If they could sell more liquor under a prohibitory, than under a license law, they would, every one of them, be in favor of prohibition.

But what are the facts? Do they favor prohibition? Not a man of them. Why?

But men say that the liquor, under prohibition, will not be sold by saloon keepers, but is smuggled in, and that these men fight prohibition because it keeps them from doing, in a proper way, what the people will do any way. But the wholesale dealers would suffer nothing from a prohibitory law, for whoever ordered the liquors, they would be the merchants. And yet these wholesale liquor men are as bitterly opposed to prohibition as the saloon-keepers. The speeches made, papers read, and resolutions passed at the Brewers' Congress, exhibit this very clearly. If, then, prohibition does not hinder the rum-trade, rum-sellers are deplorably ignorant of the facts. I still hear, now and then, a second-rate simpleton

mouthng over that superlative nonsense. Some of these may be thoughtless enough not to know any better, and are entitled to our pity, but it would be base flattery in most cases to call them fools.

We are authoritatively informed that the drink bill for Maine, 1877, was less than one-half million, whereas her quota of expenses would have been about twenty-seven millions. Before the passage of the prohibitory law Maine drank more than her full share. Hence, it is a fact that prohibition is worth to Maine twenty-six millions per annum, without calculating any of the secondary expenses, of waste of time, mistakes in business, by reason of intoxication, criminal costs, pauper expenses, penitentiary pets, police force, etc., etc., which would multiply those figures by three. This is why Maine has suffered so little from the depression in the money market.

But they say, "You are not now to deal with Maine, but with Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, etc." I ask pardon, but I don't see the point. Was Maine more easily managed than these? Why will not the same system that succeeded there succeed here? I imagine that if the Maine law had been a failure that no man on that side would have made the discovery that a law, on this question, adapted to the wants of the people in that State, would not do in the West. Before the law was passed in Maine her people drank their full share of liquors. Now they only get about one-fifty-

fourth of that amount. Are the people there more easily controlled than we are out here?

Maine has not many large towns, and on that account has less perverse humanity to deal with in the lump than Massachusetts, or even the Western States mentioned already. But her northern latitude more than makes up for this, as the people in the North are much more inclined to the use of alcoholic stimulants than those in the South. All observing travelers and statisticians are agreed in this. Besides, the employment of a great number of her men was in the forests and in lumbering. Those acquainted with the lumbering regions will agree with me that men in that business are most difficult to control, with respect to strong drink. We have no classes of men in the West as hard to manage as they. And yet the work has been accomplished in a quarter of a century, by prohibition, that two centuries of moral suasion and license law would not have done. About the efficiency of the Maine law, then, there remains no doubt. When it began its career, it was, in this country, only a philosophy, but now it is an absolute demonstration. Listen to Neal Dow, while he tells how it succeeded:

“MAINE A CRUCIAL TEST.—Eleven clergymen of the city of Portland, representing seven distinct denominations, appended their names, in 1872, to a declaration, as follows: ‘We say, without hesitation, that the trade in intoxicating liquors has been greatly reduced by it—the Maine law.’

“In this city the quantity sold now is but a small fraction of what we remember the sales to have been, and we believe the results are the same, or nearly so, throughout the State. If the trade exists at all here, it is carried on with secrecy and caution, as other unlawful practices are. All our people must agree that the benefits of this state of things are obvious and very great.

“The venerable Enoch Pond, Professor in the Bangor Theological Seminary, expresses his concurrence with the certificate heretofore given from the officials of that city.

“The pastors of Free Baptist churches in various parts of Maine, assembled at a Denominational Convention in Portland, in 1872, unanimously agreed to a declaration, ‘That the liquor traffic is very greatly diminished under the representative power of the Maine law. It can not be one tithe of what it was.’

“The census of 1870 gives us another glimpse at what the progressive enforcement of this law has done for Maine. Thus the number of persons convicted of crime in 1860, is given as 1,215, while, in 1870, the number had fallen to 431. So the number of paupers in 1860 was 8,946; in 1870, only 4,619.

“And the Overseers of the Poor in Portland, in 1872, united in the declaration: ‘The favorable effect of this policy is very evident, particularly in the department of pauperism and crime. While the population of the city increases, pauperism and crime diminish, and in the department of police the number of arrests and commitments is very much less than formerly.’

“The editor of the *Chicago Advance*, the leading Congregational paper of the West, in 1874 wrote to prominent citizens of Maine for ‘their opinion of the efficacy of the prohibitory law, formed from their personal observation of its working.’ In publishing their replies in full, the *Advance* remarked: ‘Their testimony is shaded according to individual acquaintance with the operations of the law, but will be found to agree for the most part in the main points of interest.’

“Most of the letters were from public men, whose testimony we have given. The most discouraging one is from the Rev. John O. Fiske, D. D., one of the most ‘conservative’ of men, residing in Bath. This is a sea-faring community. According to this account, the law at that time had lax enforcement. He says: ‘In the leading hotels the free sale of intoxicating liquor is notorious, at the same time that the proprietor of one of them has given his bond not to sell any. I often meet with drunken men in the streets, and there is no doubt that drinking alcoholic liquors in places of public sale, as well as private houses, is very common. What is true of Bath is true of many other places of equal importance in the State.’”

Yet, he goes on to say:

“The law is all that the best friends of temperance can desire; only there is wanting in many places the needed public sentiment properly to enforce it. In many small country places almost no liquor at all is sold by the glass; and this happy condition of things is attributed, whether with justice or not I can not say, to the force of the prohibitory law.

“It seems to me to be very well and right to brand by law, as illegal and criminal, a traffic which is actually disgraceful and exceedingly dangerous. It is well at any rate to have good laws, and to prohibit what is so obviously and largely detrimental to the public interests, even if we can not hope by such legal prohibition actually and entirely to suppress it. I am inclined to think that the influence of the law, on the whole, is decidedly beneficial in helping to maintain a proper tone of public sentiment. The sale of liquors is kept out of sight as an illegal business, and probably less liquor is sold than would be if our system of prohibitory legislation was repealed.

“The testimony of clergymen has special significance only so far as they are accustomed to that kind of religious work, which brings them to the homes of all

their people. We close our evidence, therefore, with a letter from the rector of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church in Portland. It is evident that he knows whereof he affirms:

“‘PORTLAND, MAINE, *June 4, 1872.*”

“‘*My Dear General:*

“‘I was surprised to learn from you that the cause of temperance is damaged in England by an impression that it has been retarded here from the Maine law and similar enactments. That the contrary is true I feel sure, and am certain that it is, within the sphere of my observation for the past fifteen years. Many, in the humble classes of society particularly, have correct views, and form good resolutions, which they carry out successfully when not solicited to drink by the open bar. Many wives have assured me of the improved condition of their families through the greater restraints put upon their husbands. Families whose homes are in drinking neighborhoods, or in streets where formerly were many drunken brawls, have gratefully acknowledged the happy change wrought by the due administration of the law suppressing tippling-shops. To make this law a still greater blessing all that is needed is to enforce it as faithfully in the future as at the present time. Yours, truly,

“‘A. DALTON.

“‘TO HON. NEAL DOW.’”

UNITED STATES OFFICIAL STATISTICS.

The United States Census Report for 1870, and the last Internal Revenue Report which I have at hand (1875), supply proof of a different kind, tending to the same result. Let us compare Maine with two other States under license laws, one in New England and the other in the Middle States, and selected not as the worst of their class, but as nearly related in population:

Maine, population, 626,915; distilleries, 1; breweries, 3; retailers, 842; liquor revenue, \$49,237 77.

Connecticut, population, 537,454; distilleries, 68; breweries, 23; retailers, 3,353; liquor revenue, \$336,743 49.

Maryland, population, 780,894; distilleries, 43; breweries, 65; retailers, 4,285; liquor revenue, \$1,285,700 15.

The number of retailers in Maine, of course, includes the town agencies.

These sums are the aggregate liquor revenue of all revenue collections on spirits and fermented liquors, as given in Report for 1874, pp. 78, 79.

To all this weight of evidence of various kinds, I should have said, until recently, that Mr. Murray, the British Consul, stands opposed. For he has been annually writing to his Government upon the strength of the police reports of Portland, which, as it is a seaport town, where the law has been variously and spasmodically enforced, show a considerable number of arrests for drunkenness, that "the Maine law is a failure." But I learn from an English paper that his report for 1875 contains this important admission: "As regards the town and village, there can be no manner of doubt that the law has been nearly successful."

Well, if that were all, the towns and villages, the homes of the major part of the people, and the nurseries of all that is ultimately great and

powerful in the cities, were well worth the saving. But we have seen that the law is not without beneficent action in the cities.

In view of what has been accomplished since the testimony above given was obtained, and of the recent action under the more stringent penalties of the law of 1877, it will seem to our friends in Maine proper to make an under-statement of their present condition.

From the testimony we have now adduced, it would seem that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives of the United States were justified in saying in their Report upon the Commission of Inquiry, made in January, 1874, through their chairman, Judge Poland, as follows:

“For a considerable number of years the general opinion of those most interested to break up and suppress the use of intoxicating drinks has been that the only sure and effectual mode was by prohibiting their manufacture and sale, and thus cut off the means of supply of those disposed to drink. In many of the States such laws have been passed, and more or less rigidly enforced. That they have ever been, or ever will be, enforced so strictly that no intoxicating liquors will be used, probably no one believes or expects; but that their effect has been greatly to lessen the consumption in all the States having such laws, the committee believes will be conceded by every candid man living in such States. It is often asserted that the use of liquor has increased in such States; but the allegation is uniformly found to come from persons who are hostile to a prohibitory law.”

Some one says that it is also a fact that the Maine law has not succeeded in other States. The only reason is, that it has not been adopted and kept before the people. It has only been adopted in part in other States, and then usually without provision for its enforcement. But just to the extent that prohibition has had a real place in any code, the drunkard-making traffic has disappeared. We have no right to argue that, because a feeble law on the subject has not put down the rum-power in any given State, there is, therefore, no power in a sensible law, with proper measures for its enforcement.

I will just call attention, then, to the "*revenue on spirits in 1873:*"

	Population.	Revenue.
Massachusetts under Prohibition.....	1,231,360	\$1,674,460 07
Ohio under License.....	2,339,511	10,887,498 53
Illinois under License.....	1,711,951	3,727,790 43
Indiana under License.....	1,350,428	5,065,229 03
Maine under Prohibition.....	628,297	81,114 80.
Maryland under License.....	687,049	1,084,396 40
New Hampshire under Prohibition...	326,173	79,679 63
New Jersey under License.....	572,037	773,188 44

Now, let it be remembered that the prohibitory laws of Massachusetts and New Hampshire are a long ways from perfection, and then we will begin to see what the effect of such laws are. Let us balance two States, Maine and Maryland. Maryland had a few thousand the largest population, and paid in revenue \$1,084,396 40 under license, while Maine under prohibition, with almost the same population, paid \$81,114 80, or about one-

thirteenth of the amount, according to her numbers, that was paid by Maryland.

Ordinary common sense ought to be sufficient to teach any man that a prohibitory law with any power of enforcement at all, would prevent, to a very great extent, the sale and use of intoxicating beverages. Rumsellers themselves know this; and hence they use every possible means to prevent the enactment of such laws. And I am fully convinced that the facts will bear me out in this mild statement, that even imperfect as such laws have been, and as feebly as they have been enforced, they have reduced the sale and use of intoxicants, where they have been tried, seventy-five per cent. below what has obtained in those States where the traffic has been licensed, and that crime in general has been abated in the same ratio.

I. SOME STATES HAVE RETURNED FROM PROHIBITION TO LICENSE.

The people of Massachusetts are frequently cited as favoring license, after having found by experiment that prohibition in that State could not be enforced. That a man in favor of the rum-trade should present this as containing something akin to an argument is not strange, but that any temperance man should suffer himself to be deluded by such false logic and false statements is unreasonable.

If the people of Massachusetts ever did vote for a license, that would not prove that the license

was better adapted to remove drunkenness than prohibition, for two reasons: first, the people may have preferred the opportunities for intemperance, and voted for license in order to secure them; second, if they wanted temperance and voted for license, it may have been because of an error in judgment. Hence, if it could be proven that the people of that State voted to return to license, and that they did it with the view of promoting the interests of the temperance cause, as they have not yet been proven to be infallible in judgment, there could be nothing gained except the merest shadow of an argument. Every fluctuation on any political question could as well be employed as an argument as this.

And yet it is not a fact that the people of Massachusetts voted for license after having tried prohibition. The people voted with their parties in the election of a Legislature. Those favoring rum voted with the party most favorable to their wishes. But the temperance men, as usual, suffered themselves to be driven into their old party lines, and in this way the rum-power elected a license Legislature, which repealed the law. If we find that State in an unsettled condition, it says nothing as to the profitableness of prohibition; that must be learned from proper statistics. We must then appeal to the records, and not to a change in politics, or the fickleness of a people, to know which of these systems of law has succeeded the better

in preventing drunkenness and the crime consequent thereupon. I will quote a little authority on that subject. The law was first enacted in 1852. It was subject to many changes; sometimes it was strong, at other times it had less vital power, till 1865, when the State police regulation was enacted. This was a feature of efficiency that threatened the rum-trade with sudden extermination. The constable of the Commonwealth made this report:

“Up to the 6th of November, 1867, there was not an open bar known in the entire State, and the open retail liquor traffic had almost entirely ceased. The traffic, as such, had generally secluded itself to such an extent that it was no longer a public, open offense, and no longer an inviting temptation to the passer-by.”

Dr. James B. Dunn gives his observations as follows:

“During the year 1867 we made several thorough examinations of Boston to see how the law worked. In North Street we counted fifty-six closed stores, with the significant words, ‘To let,’ on the shutters, while in the other places where liquor had formerly been sold, honest and lawful business was carried on. In those dark and narrow streets of ‘The North End,’ once crowded with throngs of thieves, harlots, and the most degraded wretches—where the dram-shops, dancing saloons and houses of prostitution pushed their nefarious trade—now quietness and sobriety reigned. In one night, during the month of May, we visited, between the hours of nine and twelve, many of the liquor, dancing and gambling saloons on Brattle, North, Commercial, Hanover, Union, Portland, Sudbury, Court, Howard, Fleet, Clark and Friend Streets, and in no place was

there seen, nor could there be openly bought, one glass of intoxicating drink.

“On another occasion, we visited, in the evening, principal hotels - such as Parker’s, Tremont, American and Young’s, and there found the same state of things to exist—bar-rooms empty, some of them closed—and where they were open, this significant notice was hung up, ‘No liquors sold over this bar.’”

But, in the fall of 1867, the election came off which resulted in favor of the liquor interest, and in the next four months there were 2,779 new liquor shops opened. In 1869 prohibition carried again in the Legislature, but the law was feeble till 1873. This law was again defeated by the election in the fall of 1874. But of the results of that year, while they had prohibition, Louis Shade, the Special Agent of the Brewers’ Congress, says:

“Had our friends in Massachusetts been free to carry on their business, and had not the State authorities constantly interfered, there is no doubt that, instead of showing a decrease of 116,585 barrels in one year, they would have increased at the same rate as they did the preceding year.”

Testimony may be had to any amount that the prohibitory law in Massachusetts was enforced as well as any other law on her statutes. Sometimes, as we have said, the form of it was very weak, and its enforcement was attended with very meager results; but when it had its proper form it succeeded in reducing the sale of liquors to a mere nominal amount, and removed about seven-tenths of the crime.

What, then, if the law has been several times repealed, and as many times re-enacted? We know that the law was holy and good, and was attended with the very best of results. Of course the number of large towns in that State, and the immense numbers of foreigners of the lowest order, make it one of the most difficult States to manage, on the liquor question, in the Union. Legislators are bought and sold by the wholesale liquor men, when they can find them on the market, and they employ every advantage that money will procure by which license shall be caused to prevail.

So far, then, as Massachusetts testifies on this subject, prohibition is both desirable and possible.

Is it said that the State derived a revenue from the license law? The State Auditor reports the revenue thus: Liquor licenses, \$118,200; tax on sales of liquors, \$15,773 05; confiscated liquors, \$3,858 92. Total, \$137,831 97. A paltry amount! This money will not pay the current expenses of the courts in the State, which were, in 1868, \$193,569 38. It is only one-third the amount of the State "charitable" expenses in 1868, as reported by the Auditor—\$426,459 82—"four-fifths" of which, as we have seen, was occasioned by intemperance. Four fifths of \$426,459 82 is \$321,167 84. More than double the amount of the revenue! And this is but one item. We can find hundreds of families in the State, neither one of whom would accept that paltry revenue in lieu

of the prosperity and happiness with which they parted under the effects of the license law!

INFLUENCE OF BOSTON.

To appreciate the influence of Boston, we must see what Boston is. She was doubly cursed by the license law. For the last quarter of 1868, the Chief of Police reported—

Number of arrests,	5,596
“ “ lodgers,	7,617
	<hr/>
Total,	13,213

For the corresponding quarter of 1867, the year of enforced prohibition, the Chief reported—

Number of arrests,	1,530
“ “ lodgers,	2,617
	<hr/>
Total,	4,147

Over *nine thousand* more, in a single quarter, under license than under prohibition! Or, deducting 617 arrests and lodgers in Roxbury, which was annexed to Boston in 1867, there is a net increase of 8,449 persons under license. Lodgers are counted by police officers as the victims of the liquor traffic.

Comparing the preceding quarter of 1868 (from July 1st to October 1st), with the corresponding quarter of 1867, with reference to those offenses which are the direct results of rum-selling, and we have the following:

	1867.	1868.	Increase under License.
Drunkenness,	1,728	1,918	190
Disturbing the peace,...	257	397	140
Disorderly,	300	658	358
Lodgers,	3,216	4,387	1,171
Assault and battery,....	368	478	110

In whatever way we compare statistics, the result is a decided rebuke to license. Nor should one fact be overlooked. In 1867, when the State police were enforcing the prohibitory law in Boston, the city police were engaged in arresting every person who was at all disguised with liquor, in order to increase the number of arrests for drunkenness, and make it appear that prohibition increased intemperance. On the other hand, in 1868, under license, the city police made no special effort to increase the number of arrests for drunkenness; nor could they arrest a drunken person without a warrant, under license, while they could under the prohibitory law. This fact shows how much more vigilant the city police were in 1867 than in 1868; and yet the Chief's own figures, notwithstanding this conniving and effort *against* prohibition, show remarkable results *in favor of it!*

The Chief reported 2,052 liquor shops in Boston in 1868, with their usual accompaniment of gambling hells and houses of ill-fame. Of the latter he reports—

Number of houses,.....	123
Assignment only,	49
Houses keeping girls,.....	73

All of these existing in defiance of law, with four hundred commissioned policemen standing powerless in their presence, and reporting their inefficiency to the Commonwealth by announcing the number of these dens of infamy *which they know exist!* Gambling and prostitution usually increase with grog-shops. With rum-selling, they constitute that infernal trio of corruption on which Satan depends for the management of great cities.

Rev. George P. Wilson, of Lawrence, who has been a very successful city missionary for twelve years, says, in his report of April 4th, 1869:

“The city of Lawrence has never been so entirely given over to this demon of drink as during the last year. This I confidently assert from personal observation, in the street, at the homes of the poor, and in the prison. Every one can see the increase of tippling shops in the most conspicuous places, boldly, as never before, advertising their nefarious traffic. And, secondly, never have there been seen in the same length of time so many drunken persons on our public streets. Thirdly, never were so many young people learning the soul-destroying habit of moderate drinking. This can be seen by any one who will notice the public saloons. This we consider the worst feature of the new order of things; this making of drunkards by the increased temptations furnished by the multitudes of open bars, showing our children what has not been seen in Lawrence before for over sixteen years. . . . Fourth, never in any year have we heard so many complaints from wives and mothers of the ruin of their homes through intemperance. Fifth, never have we seen so much neglect of husbands toward their wives, wives and parents toward their children. Many of the stories of cruelty and suffering have pained my heart more

than I can express. Oh, these poor sufferers, have they no claim upon us? I speak for those who can not speak for themselves, the poor, helpless, hungry, naked children, the heart-broken wives and mothers, the poor slaves of the cup who would break away, but can not, amid the fearful and wicked temptations now shielded by law."

Rev. Horatio Wood, of Lowell, who retired from missionary work in that city, January 1, 1869, after his long and faithful service of twenty-four years, speaks thus in his last report:

"I said last year that I could not but regard the attempt to revive among us the discarded license law as 'the coming of a dark day for the interests and prospects of the suffering and perishing classes.' The forethought proved correct. The enactment of the law caused at once a large increase of the sale and drinking of intoxicating liquors. In September it was reported on good authority that the last year there were 873 engaged in the liquor traffic in Suffolk County; this year 2,300. At the House of Correction, in East Cambridge, the increase of inmates has been as follows. There were committed for drunkenness —

	1867.		1868.
In July,.....	30	In July,	47
“ August,.....	37	“ August,.....	55
“ September,	35	“ September,..	45
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	102		147

"In Lowell, it is well known that liquor shops have multiplied in our streets, and are more freely visited; that more come out of them staggering, or helped along to places of privacy; and that our young men, our hope, are the most frequent victims of unprincipled and cruel mammon. I know that many among the poor

drink twice where they drank once, and some five times where once; that the earnings in many a poor family go more for drink, to line the pockets of men of prey, or to uphold others in laziness and rioting, while the families are more than ever screwed out of a living, and prevented from a decent appearance in society. I know that many wives have worse husbands, and many husbands worse wives this year than last; many children more cruel fathers and more indifferent mothers, estranging them to their ruin. I know—but why need I declare further? All know enough to convince them, if they will but think and reflect, that a mighty evil is increasing among us.”

That the burden of taxation increases with the growth of pauperism and crime is evident from the following fact: The town of Vineland, New Jersey, was incorporated and built up as a temperance town. No land can be sold except in small lots, and to actual settlers, and the purchaser forfeits his land by the sale of liquor on it. The overseer of the poor, T. T. Curtis, Esq., says in his last report:

“Though we have a population of ten thousand people, for the period of six months no settler or citizen of Vineland has required relief at my hands as overseer of the poor. Within seventy days there has only been one case among what we call the floating population, at the expense of \$4.

“During the entire year there has only been one indictment, and that a trifling case of assault and battery among our colored population.

“So few are the fires in Vineland that we have no need of a fire department. There has only been one house burnt down in a year, and two slight fires, which were soon put out.

“We practically have no debt, and our taxes are only one per cent. on the valuation.

“The police expenses of Vineland amount to \$75 per year, the sum paid to me; and our poor expenses a mere trifle.

“I ascribe this remarkable state of things, so nearly approaching the golden age, to the industry of our people and the absence of King Alcohol.

“Let me give you, in contrast to this, the state of things in the town from which I came, in New England. The population of the town was nine thousand five hundred a little less than that of Vineland. It maintained forty liquor-shops. These kept busy a police judge, city marshal, assistant marshal, four night watchmen, and six policemen. Fires were almost continual. That small place maintained a paid fire department of four companies, of forty men each, at an expense of \$3,000 per annum. I belonged to this department for six years, and the fires averaged about one every two weeks, and mostly incendiary. The support of the poor cost \$2,500 per annum. The debt of the township was \$120,000. The condition of things in this New England town is as favorable in that country as that of many other places where liquor is sold.”

Governor Washburn, in his annual message to the Legislature in 1874, said:

“Some honest reformers may urge the fact that the present law is not thoroughly enforced in our large cities as a reason for its repeal and the substitution of a license law in its stead. But shall we repeal the laws against gambling, prostitution, pocket-picking, and burglary, simply because they can not be thoroughly enforced in densely populated localities? This would be equivalent to saying that we will not have any laws that are unpalatable to the worst classes in our cities. It would be sacrificing the State to the city; it would be leveling downward rather than upward. Furthermore,

the idea that a license law would be efficiently administered through local agencies is a delusion and a snare. The experiment has been tried again and again. But did the authorities of these same large cities ever show any greater anxiety to enforce a license law than they now do to enforce the existing prohibitory statute? The friends of this statute may safely challenge its opponents to the record."

Hon. Thomas Talbot, in his message vetoing the Liquor License Bill, in January, 1874, said:

"The history of the struggle with the evils of intemperance is most instructive. The earliest attempts to check the use of intoxicating liquors were in the direction of license and regulation. These attempts continued in the Commonwealth for more than two hundred years, with a constantly increasing stringency, which can only be explained on the ground that mild measures were found to be insufficient, until, in 1855, the experiment was determined upon of adopting prohibition, as the only logical and effective method of dealing with the matter. Without asserting that this has proved so successful in overcoming the evils it was meant to remedy as was hoped by those who initiated and those who sustain the prohibitory policy, I am fully of the opinion that more progress has been made toward the desired end than was ever before made in the same period under any other system. In considering what has been accomplished, we must recognize the great changes that have taken place since this system was inaugurated.

"I am aware that it is said intemperance increases under our prohibitory law that the sale of intoxicants is as great as it would be under a license law. But I call your attention to the absence here of the flaunting and attractive bar-rooms, that spread their snares to capture the thoughtless and easily-tempted in cities where licenses prevail; to the constantly growing sense of disfavor with which the liquor traffic is regarded by

the country generally; and to the powerful, systematic, and unrelenting activity of those interested in it to break down the law and the officers who try to enforce it. Here is an evidence that the statute does impose an active and crippling restraint, from which relief is sought in the elastic and easily-evolved providence of license."

George Marston, district attorney for the Southern District, said:

"There can be no doubt that the enforcement of the law decreases crime. No other logical result can be reached. As intoxication is the cause of a large majority of the crimes that are committed, it follows, of course, when the sale of intoxicating liquor can be suppressed or repressed, crime will decrease. Experience shows that practical result; when the law is most fully enforced crime has decreased."

John B. Goodrich, district attorney for Middlesex County, said: "Generally, the strict enforcement of the law largely reduces the business of the courts."

Major Jones, formerly Chief of State Police, said:

"The law is as well enforced generally through the State as any other law; but in Boston the liquor sellers and dealers spend money freely, and are well organized. There are about three hundred and sixty towns, and in three hundred of them the law is well enforced, and it exercises an influence upon the others."

General B. F. Butler said: "This law was enforced in all the cities and towns, with the exception of a few of the larger cities, as much and as generally as the laws against larceny."

The city marshal of Worcester testifies that

drunkenness decreased forty per cent. in that city in one year under the prohibitory law.

Oliver Ames & Sons, North Easton, say:

“We have over four hundred men in our works here. We find that the present license law has a very bad effect among our employes.

“We find on comparing our production in May and June of this year (1868) with that of the corresponding months of last year (1867), that in 1867, with 375 men, we produced eight per cent. more goods than we did in the same months in 1868 with 400 men. We attribute this falling-off entirely to the repeal of the prohibitory law, and the great increase in the use of intoxicating liquors among our men in consequence.”

I have been thus particular in furnishing evidence respecting the work of prohibition in Massachusetts because, since the last return to license, those who favor the traffic in alcoholic liquors have paraded the *lapse* as an evidence of the inutility of the law in that State. The fact of the success in Maine is generally admitted. But they would find that it is because Maine has no large towns, and but little of the foreign beer element recently imported into the country. Hence, though Maine may be benefited by the law, there is no evidence that other States, containing an entirely different element, would be improved by such a law. But we have now seen from every possible source that Massachusetts, when she was under a proper law, with proper provisions for the enforcement of the law, was as thoroughly controlled as was Maine. This was the cause of the effort to

repeal the law, which, by the aid of the political machinery of which we have spoken, succeeded; not because the people desired the repeal, but because temperance men held to their parties; thus giving the balance of power to the liquor interest.

I quote the following from "Prohibition Does Prohibit," by J. N. Stearns, respecting

VERMONT.

Governor Peck, Judge of the Supreme Court, said:

"In some parts of the State there has been a laxity in enforcing it, but in other parts of the State it has been thoroughly enforced, and there it has driven the traffic out. I think the influence of the law has been salutary in diminishing drunkenness and disorders arising therefrom, and also crimes generally. You can not change the habits of a people momentarily. The law has had an effect upon our customs, and has done away with that of treating and promiscuous drinking. The law has been *aided by moral means*, but moral means have also been wonderfully strengthened by the law.

"I think the law is educating the people, and that a much larger number now support it than when it was adopted; in fact, the opposition is dying out. All the changes in the law have been in the direction of greater stringency. In attending court for ten years I do not remember to have seen a drunken man."

Governor Convers said:

"The prohibitory law has been in force about twenty-two years. The enforcement has been uniform in the State since its enactment, and I consider it a very desirable law. I think the law itself educates and advances public sentiment in favor of temperance. There is no

question about the decrease in the consumption of liquor. I speak from personal knowledge, having always lived in the State. I live in Woodstock, sixty miles from here, and there no man, having the least regard for himself, would admit selling rum, even though no penalty attached to it."

W. B. Arcourt, Associate Justice for Washington County, said: "Public sentiment is growing stronger in favor of the law every year."

CONNECTICUT

Has had some experience in prohibition. Her Legislature adopted a prohibitory law in 1854 by a large majority. The next October Governor Dutton said:

"The law has been thoroughly executed, with much less difficulty and opposition than was expected. In no instance has a seizure produced any general excitement. Resistance to the law would be unpopular, and it has been found in vain to set it at defiance."

In his Message in 1855, he said:

"There is scarcely an open grog-shop in the State, the jails are fast becoming tenantless, and a delightful air of security is everywhere enjoyed."

Governor Miller, in 1856, said:

"From my own knowledge and from information from all parts of the State, I have reason to believe that the law has been enforced, and the daily traffic in liquors has been broken up and abolished."

Rev. W. G. Jones, of Hartford, in 1854, said: "Crime has diminished at least seventy-five per cent."

“Rev. Mr. Bush, of Norwich, said: “The jails and almshouses are almost empty.”

Rev. David Hawley, city missionary of Hartford, said:

“That since the prohibitory law went into effect his mission school had increased more than one-third in number. The little children that used to run and hide from their fathers when they came home drunk are now well dressed and run out to meet them.”

Mr. Alfred Andrews, of New Britain, said:

“This law is to us above all price or valuation. Vice, crime, rowdyism, and idleness are greatly diminished, while virtue, morality, and religion are greatly promoted.”

Rev. R. H. Main, of Meriden, Chaplain of the Reform School, testified that “crime had diminished seventy-five per cent.”

In New London County the prison was empty and the jailers out of business.

In New Haven the commitments to the city prison for crimes arising from intemperance, in July, 1854, under a license law, were 50; while in August, under prohibition, there were only 15.

In the city workhouse there were 73 in July to 15 in August; making a balance of 92 in both institutions in one month in favor of prohibition.

Similar testimonies were received from all the principal towns in the State, giving the most unqualified approval of the law and admiration of its happy results.

Rev. Dr. Bacon, of New Haven, after the law had been in operation one year, said:

“The operation of the prohibitory law for one year is a matter of observation to all the inhabitants. Its effect in promoting peace, order, quiet, and general prosperity, no man can deny. *Never for twenty years has our city been so quiet as under its action.* It is no longer simply a question of temperance, but a governmental question—one of legislative foresight and morality.”

The Legislature of 1873 repealed the law, however, substituting license, and the official records show that crime increased 50 per cent. in one year under license.

At a public hearing before the Legislative Committee, in 1875, Rev. Mr. Walker, of Hartford, presented official returns showing that crime had increased four hundred per cent. in the city of Hartford since the prohibitory law was repealed.

The report of the Secretary of State shows that there was a greater increase of crime in one year under license than in seven years under prohibition. The report says:

“The whole number of persons committed to jail during the year is 4,481, being 1,496 more than in the preceding year.

“The two counties most clamorous for license in 1872 show the greatest increase of the crime of drunkenness in 1874. Hartford County has an increase of commitments for drunkenness of 115 per cent., and New Haven County 141 per cent. That is, Hartford County shows 215 commitments for drunkenness this year for every 100 made two years ago, and New

Haven County shows 241 for every 100 of two years ago."

Does some one say that Connecticut has repealed her prohibitory law and returned to license? She did; and again the same scheming by political managers, and the same blind adherence to party by temperance people has been exhibited that has everywhere been the bane of the cause of prohibition.

In no State has the prohibitory liquor law been repealed because of inefficiency. But, on the contrary, the liquor men have fought and continue to fight it because it does succeed in putting down their traffic. That these men have succeeded in carrying their purposes is attributable not to any righteousness in their cause, nor to any failure in the law where it has had any provision for its enforcement, but to their money and the corruption in political circles.

How Can We Secure and Enforce the Law We Need?

CHAPTER IX.

THOSE who have just entered the temperance work, generally know how to remove the evil of intemperance; but those who have been in the field twenty years, as has the writer of this, have had plenty of opportunities to witness their own folly, and plenty of time to reconsider many of their positions. It is no time for lovers of the cause to bandy words or fling insinuations respecting motives, that are sinister. And yet with shame we are compelled to confess the weakness manifested among ourselves, from which we have more to fear than from all other causes combined.

Our enemies are doing much to prevent the enactment and enforcement of wholesome laws in relation to the traffic in intoxicants. But our pretended friends are doing much more. This has always been true; it is the history of all reformations. The battle has to be fought by a few courageous men and women, who have to meet an

organized and united enemy, and also to arrange for their own invalids, who never have any ability to resist the enemy. If they were only dead they would be out of their own misery and our way. But no, they will neither live nor die for the good of the country. Whisky men can give three millions to influence our general election; but if we were to ask a large class of so-called temperance men to make any reasonable expenditure of means for any such purpose they would absolutely look at us a second time. Up to this time we have not made any effort that is worthy of the cause we plead.

Liquor men have been united and consistent; they have paid their money freely, and have evidently influenced legislators, judges, jurors, and officers of every grade and rank by their free distribution of mammon. True, we have provoked this liberality by endangering their craft. But we speak of facts, and not of moral qualities. To call these men liberal because they have given great sums of money for the purpose of having the privilege of continuing in their work of ruin, is to commit a serious blunder. But though there has not been one noble impulse in all they have done, yet we are not to be blinded to the fact that what they have done and are now doing have a potency to influence our law-making and law-executing powers in their favor. And though, for the good of mankind, the little that we have done for the cause of temperance is many hundred times the amount

ever performed by rum-sellers, except for selfish ends, yet we are frank to confess that we have manifested but little of that good sense and liberal effort that the world had a right to expect of us. We have been wont to expect too much from the justness of our cause, without the proper means of bringing it before the people.

Again: Our professional men have been unwilling to take any certain position on the subject. Editor, doctor, lawyer, and politician of every grade and rank, for fear of losing patronage, custom, or votes, either indirectly favor rum-sellers, or do so little as to be almost wholly worthless to the cause which they pretend to love. Many of these would be glad to work in the interests of the temperance cause if they were only sure that it would immediately triumph. Now the man who will rent a building for saloon purposes, who will sign a license bond, publish a whisky advertisement in the columns of his paper, or manage a case in court for a saloon-keeper, vote for a license law, or for a party that supports it, in all or any of these ways assists the cause of the drunkard-maker, and, in so far, helps to ruin the country.

Even preachers have trimmed their sails before the popular breeze. They have feared that the church coffers would be empty, that their popularity would be endangered, and their audiences diminished, if their pulpits should give any certain sound in opposition to the death-dealing traffic.

Many of them are entirely too religious for any such worldly considerations.

I do not speak of all preachers, nor all of any other class, for many of these are men of principle and common sense; have love for God and love for men, and are not too religious or too political to do their duty; but I speak of many in all these classes, who, by reason of their selfish unwillingness to assume just responsibilities, are a standing disgrace and an immense clog to the temperance reformation.

The present political parties are a hindrance of fearful proportions to any effective legislation against the whisky business. They occupy no position on this question. A man may be just as good a Republican or Democrat either, when drunk as when sober; and, I am sorry to say it, about as apt to have the support of the leaders of these parties for any office that he wishes, if he is in the habit of drinking as if he were a sober man. Both of these bodies are hopelessly divided on the question. Hence neither can take any definite stand on the subject and live. It is impossible, therefore, that either of these parties as a national organization should give us any effective legislation in the matter. Up to the present time they have indicated their worldly wisdom, in satisfying the temperance element, by enacting a law that, on the surface, shows a willingness to suppress the liquor traffic, but inwardly is wanting in every ele-

ment of vital energy. Thus they have aimed to quiet all, giving to one class a law, and assuring the other that the law is impracticable, and therefore impotent to hinder their trade. This is especially true with every license law that has been enacted; and, up to this time, we can hardly say that prohibition has been fairly tried in a single State except Maine. Not that these legislatures are wanting in the ability to frame a just and effective law, but they have had to save their parties.

Not only so, but the executive offices are filled by these same parties. And whatever may be the individual desires of the men elected, they are made to know that they are the representatives of a party whose policy is to have no position, and take no action, looking to the suppression of the liquor traffic. Of course we now and then get a man elected by one of these parties who will be true to his convictions, whether he pleases his political masters or not. But such a man is doomed to a short political career. The wire-workers of the party will not favor his second nomination. Most men, knowing these things to be so, and hoping for a continuation in office, will do as little as they can, for fear of offending one wing or the other of the party that elected them. Hence the condition of the political powers that now are, will probably continue, as in the past, to prevent both the enactment of righteous laws on the subject, and their enforcement when enacted.

I do not now stop to ask what kind of a law we want, and pass over the ground of stringent license or local option. Here, again, I must take it for granted as, having already been established, that we want a total prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of anything that can intoxicate, except as alcohol may be needed, or thought to be needed, for medicinal or mechanical purposes, and that such prohibition should be in the Constitution, so that it will remain.

The only question that is now before me is, How can such a prohibitory law be obtained? If this law can be obtained without the creation of a new political party, I should favor it, because it would save time, labor, and much expense. But if not, then we must inaugurate new measures. At this point we are kindly reminded of all the difficulties attending such an effort. In behalf of my ears, however, let me beg to be excused. I know what these difficulties are. I know they are numerous and great; but that is not the issue. Can we secure the desired law by the parties now in existence? If we can not, then the questions of ease and preference are out of order. There is but one other course left, and that is the inauguration of a new party. Do you say that we are not even then sure of success? That may be, but we will not know till we have done all we can in that direction. Hence the effort will as surely be made as that we are in earnest on this subject.

And it will as surely succeed as that prohibitionists love humanity and the prosperity of their country more than they do their present political parties. If the present organizations are to be used, I would recommend the following course:

1. Organize a club in every voting precinct, in the party of which you are a member, whose duty it shall be to secure a prohibitory plank in the platform of the party; attend the primary caucuses and conventions, and see that none are nominated but sound temperance men.

2. When the Legislature convenes, let every county petition its members in the House to work for a strict and full prohibitory law, sending copies of said petitions to the members of the Senate in whom these counties have a direct interest. The common mode of petitioning is almost valueless. A petition to the Legislature or Senate may have forty thousand names, but no man will regard it a particle unless it contains a majority of the voters of the party to which he belongs in the county or district which he represents. The average American office-holder expects to be elected again—the next time to a higher position—and hence is the servant of those to whom he looks for the next election. What your constituents may want respecting such a law is not his concern. But let him know that his own supporters demand this at his hands and he will act.

3. And yet, if we determine to vote with our

parties, right or wrong, our petitions will have but little effect. The office-seeker cares less for the wish of his people than for his own relation. If you could assure him that two-thirds of the voters that put him into office wish a prohibitory law, and yet that they will remain in the party and vote with it, whether their wish is met or not, but that the other third want license, and will bolt the party unless their wish is carried out, he will vote for license and in opposition to the petition of two-thirds of his constituents. There are honorable exceptions, but the rule is as I have stated. At first thought, however, it would seem that he would look to the two-thirds for the nomination. But, if you will notice, the nominations come from the ring-masters of the party which, as a rule, is on the license side of the question. Knowing that he must retain their good will or fail of the nomination, without which his election would be impossible; and knowing, too, that if he should offend the temperance people he will only suffer inconveniences, but not suffer the loss of any votes, he will work according to the directions of the masters for whom he must work, or lose his position. Hence, to me, it is idle to hope for success as long as we are pledged to stand by our parties, right or wrong. In using the party, I would, therefore, demand that it hear the prayer of the people, and give us prohibition, or do without my support. If the dominant party knew that

temperance men would absolutely break ranks on every license man, there would be but few of them presented for the suffrage of the people. But it is otherwise, as yet, and these men find nothing in our movements to fear, and as long as we are ready to stand by the party, whether our interests are considered or not, they will continue to despise us and mistreat us just as they have done. In view of these facts I can not recommend any working or voting with the parties beyond our interests.

The effort has ever been made by scheming politicians to make it appear that the only safety of the people is in remaining in full communion with the party. Generally, the dear people are to be defended by the good old party, and if the party should fail, the country would run to ruin. Ordinarily this has its desired effect, and temperance men go to the polls to "choose between evils." Having befooled us year after year in this way, they feel confident of future success on the same plan. The saloon men and the brewers stand by their business and vote for no man who will not legislate to suit them. Their spirit may be seen in the following quotations, which I have clipped from the most reliable sources. As they have appeared in many of the papers throughout the country, they will not be denied. The *Abend Post*, their organ, says:

"The compulsory Sunday weighs like an Alps upon our good city of Detroit. All citizens who are not in

the ranks of the fanatics and hypocrites look with envy to other places (as St. Louis, Chicago, Cincinnati, and Milwaukee), where Sunday is a day of recreation to the laboring classes; a day on which the workman, resting from his every-day task, goes out a pleasure-walking with his family, or visits a hall to refresh himself with a cheering draught, to listen to the sound of music, and to gossip pleasantly with friends. But this, so beneficial and reasonable a method of spending the day, is forbidden the people of Detroit, through a law prepared by fools and distorted visionaries. . . . To shake down this Alps is the endeavor of the German citizens, but there is little prospect of success. . . . The Supreme Court construes the law in harmony with the views of the hypocrites; and the municipal government, notwithstanding the popular expression, is not authorized to concede the open Sunday saloon—that provision having been stricken from the law by the last Legislature.

“Under such circumstances, what is to be done? The Agitation Union has given a short, energetic answer: Direct opposition against this outrageous law! and a test case to be made by holding a picnic at Arbeiter Hall next Sunday!

“We can not say we think this will reach the desired end. Free-thinking Americans want the necessary courage in the matter, and but little can be expected of them; and since the whole English press inclines to the side of the temperance hypocrites, our opponents will have occasion to denounce the movement as exclusively a German one; thus rousing the prejudice of nationality.”

The picnic was held, and several arrests were made, and a mob, headed by two attorneys, tried to force the release of the prisoners, but failed. The ringleaders of this picnic and the mob were convicted of conspiracy.

The Brewers' Congress in Cleveland, Ohio, passed the following resolution:

“Resolved, We are against all laws which infringe on the natural rights of man, such as temperance, Sunday, and other prohibitory laws, since they are unworthy of a free people.”

Brewers' Congress of Buffalo, New York:

“Resolved, That this Congress now protest against the action taken in opposition to the malt liquor interest, by temperance agitators and prejudiced legislators.

“Resolved, That we regard the invitation to vote for a temperance fanatic as an insult.

“Resolved, That sooner than cast our votes for any of those apostles of bigotry and intolerance, we will war with all political predilections.”

At the Brewers' Congress in Cincinnati, in June, 1875, the following was passed:

“Resolved, That when restriction and prohibitory enactments exist, every possible measure be taken to oppose, resist, and repeal them.

“Resolved, That politicians favoring prohibitory enactments, who offer themselves as candidates for office, be strenuously opposed.”

The Brewers' Congress in Chicago, and other places, have passed similar resolutions.

A few weeks ago the temperance work was begun in Wheatland, Iowa, and the beer men becoming enraged, organized a League, and adopted the following as their basis of action:

“We, the undersigned, citizens of Wheatland and vicinity, hereby organize ourselves into a club for the purpose of working against the most fanatic Blue Ribbon prosecution, and to labor to repeal the Maine liquor law now in force.

“SECTION 1. Only through our representatives in Des Moines is it possible to change the law; therefore, be it

“*Resolved*, That we pledge ourselves to vote only for candidates who have courage, and are willing to energetically further our interests.

“SEC. 2. *Resolved*, That we stand and act together on all important public questions, irrespective of party, without regard to nationality, and that we discard all jealousy.

“SEC. 3. *Resolved*, That for the purpose of reducing the expense account to the State, through the many liquor prosecutions, we agree to be careful in the selection of our county officers, namely, clerk, sheriff, supervisors, and township trustees; especially to charge trustees to be careful in the selection of men to serve as grand jurors.

“SEC. 4. *Resolved*, That we will work against any temperance prosecution, and that we, in the transaction of business, will give preference to members and friends of our association.”

The saloon-keepers of Chicago held their annual meeting last year (April, 1878), at Aurora, Turner's Hall, John Feldkamp in the chair, and adopted the following pledge, which they should require candidates for city offices to sign before giving them their support:

“The undersigned hereby declares that he is opposed to all so-called temperance, and that if elected to the Common Council he will not vote for any ordinance prohibiting the sale of liquor on Sundays, or to minors, or at any time between the hours of 5 o'clock, A. M., and 12 o'clock at night, or for any ordinance which is calculated to injure the legitimate traffic in intoxicating liquors.”

Selling on Sunday and to minors is what they call legitimate traffic.

The threats of these men are something more than idle bluster. Their money is in the issue, and they will vote as they resolve. Knowing this, politicians will not legislate contrary to their wish, unless it shall be demanded in the same way by a number superior to the rum power. Hence a blind marriage to either of the parties now before the people is certain defeat to the cause of prohibition.

If we remain in the present parties, I recommend that we give them to understand, at the outset, that unsoundness in any candidate on the question of prohibition, will cause us to remove his name from the ticket. If we would do this, and stand by it, we would find relief.

Some one will say: "You will break up our party." That may be, but the party that stands in the way of a righteous law ought to be broken up.

I am told, again, that we have gained nothing yet by the inauguration of a new party.

This, however, is only partly true. In the States where the new party movement has been pushed with any reasonable determination, concessions have been gained, and in the municipal elections in our cities we have had all our gains by the new party movement. Hence, I can see no reason for any alarm at any want of success in this way; for where it has been tried with any sort of thoroughness it has succeeded. Now, when we can carry a majority of our towns for prohibition, it would be easy to carry the whole country for it, since

seven-tenths of the farmers in all our Western States demand that the traffic in rum shall be discontinued. It is only by political trickery that the license system is bound upon our people:

More than twenty years ago, the people of the State of Iowa voted for a prohibitory law of the strictest kind, and would adopt it again, by an overwhelming majority, if the opportunity was granted. Free this question from the possibilities of affecting the parties of the day, and prohibition would carry in any State in the Union. In any one of the Northwestern States it would receive, at the lowest calculation, three votes out of every five, if not two out of every three. Thus we can see what our parties are worth to us at this hour. They are simply furnishing the machinery by which a very inconsiderate minority are binding the dead carcass of licensed robbery upon the honest yeomanry of our country. We are now at liberty to make our choice, either to remain the cowardly, cringing slaves of political demagogues, or rise up in the strength of our God-given manhood, and in the use of our sovereignty, cause the business of drunkard-making to be driven from the land.

One of the modern tricks of political manipulators is to work up a large mass-meeting for temperance, at which (either by having managed to have none present who can not be controlled to their liking, or by running in a large amount of

picked material), they can secure the adoption of some resolution to the effect that the temperance question can only be dealt with by moral means. Then they can use this as whitewash for the party through another campaign, while they truckle to the whisky interest.

They sometimes insult us by saying: "Our party stands upon its record." There is no party, as such, that has any definite record on the subject of prohibition. The temperance workers in Maine and Vermont succeeded through the Republican party. And yet that party in the State of Iowa has dared to sell out for the German vote. The first thing, almost, that the party did when it came into power was to repeal the prohibitory law that had been offered the people by the Democratic Legislature. If a man in Maine should say that he stood by the record of the Republican party in that State, I would understand him to mean that he favored prohibition. But when he says I will stand by the record of the party in Iowa, I understand him to favor the licensing of saloons for the sale of ale, beer, wine, and whatever else may be smuggled through, under the pretense of selling these commodities.

In my opinion the time has come for an advance all along the line. Any delay will be a weakness and an injury. In many counties the temperance element is strong enough to control the dominant party, and elect the representative and senator

over the loss of all the rum votes that will be given to the opposite candidate. In such counties we may work with the parties if we prefer. There are other counties in which we must bring out a separate ticket, as neither party will give us a true prohibitionist to vote for. In such cases we may defeat the Republican party and elect a Democrat. Be it so. If that party shall persist in selling out the interest of the State for a few beer votes, it ought to be defeated. We have petitioned these leaders every year for ten years to give us just one chance to vote on this subject, and our entreaties have been answered by repeated injuries. Hence, it seems to me, that it is time for us to rise from slavery to a party that dares to insult our innocence longer.

But whether the time has come to introduce an independent party or not, or whether it is better to work in the old party lines, we must not be so wedded to any party as to support any man for office who will not vote and work for the prohibition of the liquor traffic. No music must decoy us, and no lash drive us from this work of removing drunkard-making from our land.

No temperance effort that leaves the people under its influence, satisfied with the existence of saloons, can be of any permanent benefit to the cause. And no political party that persists in selling out our sobriety and civilization, for a few thousand rum votes, can be anything else than a curse

to the country. Here is my creed: 1. Total abstinence from anything that can intoxicate. 2. Total prohibition of the manufacture, importation, or sale of anything that will intoxicate. 3. All temperance effort must aim at these two objects. 4. I will support no man for office who will not work and vote for prohibition. 5. Just law must annex penalties for the commission of crime, equal to the magnitude of the wrong committed.

I am reminded that Hon. Neal Dow says that the Republican party has always had in its platform the policy of prohibition. Here is just what he says about the party and the law:

“At first it required some courage, persistence, and fidelity to duty, on the part of municipal authorities, to carry through this law, regarded then as so extraordinary and revolutionary. Large pecuniary interests were destroyed by it, a most lucrative trade was overthrown, and many influential men of sensual habits were touched and offended by it. And the politicians generally, of high and low degree, the ward caucusmen, and the county-convention men and grog-shop orators, felt themselves wronged and insulted by it.

“By all these people who generally run the political machine, who set up statesmen and pull them down at will, it was thought an intolerable wrong that they should be summarily set aside, and that a law should be passed without consulting them, and only in the general interests, and with no reference to the will of party hack politicians or to the interests of any party. These men generally assumed an attitude of active and bitter hostility to the new law of prohibition; and it was only after many crushing defeats by the people at the ballot-boxes that these men abandoned their opposition, and

came into the new movement as prohibitionists *par excellence*, and assumed to lead it; precisely as the pro-slavery politicians came into the triumphant anti-slavery movement, as its special friends and leaders, carrying off all the honors and fruits of the victory they did not help to win.

“Now the Maine law in Maine is executed as easily and as promptly as any of our other criminal laws, and with no more friction in our courts or elsewhere than with our laws punishing smaller offenses against the general good; namely, robbery, house-burning, outrages of whatever sort against property or persons. The result of this policy of prohibition has been to drive out of the liquor trade every man with any claim to a decent character, leaving it entirely in the hands of a few of the lowest and vilest of our foreign population, who carry it on secretly, on a very small scale, and only in our larger towns and cities. The men in Maine now engaged in this great crime against society are literally of the dregs of the people. I do not think it is doing them any wrong to say that they would as readily rob, burn, or murder for money, or for passion, if the penalties on detection were no greater. As the result of the Maine law, the liquor traffic is absolutely driven out of more than three-fourths of the territory of the State. It is entirely unknown in all the rural districts, in all the smaller towns and villages, and exists only on a very small scale in the larger towns, and only in the low, bad parts of them.

“The Republican party in Maine has always had in its platform the policy of prohibition and the vigorous enforcement of laws to that end, as its most prominent feature. This party owes its ascendancy in Maine chiefly to the hearty indorsement of that policy, and a withdrawal from it would be instantly followed by its overthrow. No considerations of State or National policy, aside from the question of supreme importance, would be sufficient to induce the temperance men of Maine to support or countenance any political party which should

oppose or ignore the great question of prohibition of, and annihilation to, the liquor traffic."

The following is the present plank in the Republican platform for the State of Maine on the subject:

"Temperance among the people may be greatly promoted by wise prohibitory legislation, as well as by all those moral agencies which have secured us beneficent results; and it is a source of congratulation that the principle of prohibition, which has always been upheld by Republicans, is now concurred in by so large a majority of the people, that it is no longer a party question, the Democrats having for several years declined to contest it."

From this it appears that prohibition is no more a Republican policy in Maine at the present time than it is a Democratic policy. And when Mr. Dow says it has always had the policy of prohibition, it should be remembered that Maine had a prohibitory liquor law some four or five years before the Republican party was born. Republicans in Maine who have held to prohibition have been successful in controlling their party. It does not follow, however, that the Republican party everywhere can be so directed. The party managers will evidently look in the future, as they have done in the past, to the probabilities of success, just as they did in Maine when they favored prohibition. In some of our Western States they may have to be defeated before they will know that temperance men will not suffer themselves to be insulted longer.

Mr. Dow writes to the *National Prohibitionist*, of recent date, the history of the movement in his State. He says:

“As some of your able contributors to the *National Prohibitionist* differ on ‘Modes of Action,’ a few words upon Maine ‘Modes of Action,’ by which we were successful in our endeavor to prohibit the liquor traffic and drive it from the State, may help to solve this question. One of our ‘modes of action’ will be found necessary everywhere. The people must be thoroughly instructed and convinced that the liquor traffic is in deadly hostility to every public and private interest. The watchword must be ‘No compromise’ with wrong, and accept nothing short of entire prohibition of this crime of crimes.

“We have driven the open dram-shops out of Maine. To accomplish this, meetings were systematically held all over the State; in small towns, villages, and rural districts, as well as in the larger towns, and occasionally large, central, open-air meetings, at some convenient spot. At all these, the point was to prove to the people, by a thousand illustrations of the fact, that the grog-shops were inconsistent with the general good; that more mischief, misery and ruin come from them than from all other sources of evil combined; at the same time that no possible good of any sort can come from them to the State or people.

“In doing this, some persons with no pay, not even of their expenses, traveled everywhere over the State, furnishing their own transportation, and the people came out in great numbers, and of all parties, to hear them. Short, condensed tracts were prepared, and these were scattered freely everywhere by these traveling missionaries. The people were taught that there *was no possible way by which the liquor traffic could be overthrown, except by an absolute refusal to vote for any man or any party who would not respond to the popular demand for protection from the grog-shops.*

“Our people were so well indoctrinated in this respect, that old politicians, who believed themselves to have a prescriptive right to any elective office they might desire, were voted down and turned out ignominiously, though belonging to the party with a large, regular majority.

“One of these gentlemen, of high position and character, was so badly beaten (by 20,000, though he confidently expected a majority of that figure), that he immediately left the State and never returned.

“I am confident that in all our Northern States, and in many of our Western, Middle, and Southern States, the temperance men are numerous enough to command success even now, if unitedly they will resolve not to vote for any man or any party that will not respond to their wishes in this matter. Such a policy, if adopted, must be pursued with an inflexible determination to accept no compromise short of the entire prohibition of the liquor traffic.”

It is probable that we will have to pass through the same experience in all the States before we reach a prohibitory law and the means of enforcing it. And any adherence to party that will cause a neglect of this one question will be so much of a hindrance to our cause.

So far as I can now see, it will be necessary in most of the Western States to form a new party. The parties now in existence, made up of both elements, feeling unwilling to take a definite stand in the matter, will delay the nomination of candidates till it will be too late for prohibitionists to do anything by way of an independent movement. In the meantime it is understood between the party leaders and the beer men that no harm shall

come to the rum-trade from their party. And after these late nominations temperance men have nothing to do but to submit to the rum-policy.

We must not pledge ourselves beforehand to the support of either party, unless that party shall first pledge, by platform resolution, to support the cause of prohibition.

We are sometimes given to despondency. But when we think of the lethargy and thoughtless indifference on this subject a few years ago; and compare the public sentiment of those times with the activity and energy manifested in the matter to-day, we have reason to thank God and take courage. And yet we do not expect that time alone will remove the evil. We are fully convinced that, while we are gaining ground, we must continue to fight until the last saloon is closed and the last distillery ceases its operations.

Public sentiment has already decided, and all men know that the sale of alcohol is an abominable business. Once our taverns had bars—they all had them; indeed, tavern and whisky were nearly synonymous terms. Every public gathering had to be disgraced with rum. A man could not harvest without whisky. It was thought to be indispensable, in wet weather, to keep a man dry; in dry weather to prevent him from being too dry; in hot weather to cool him, and in cool weather to warm him! For wounds, bruises, and snake-bites, it was the only panacea. But the

world advances. Alcohol has been convicted of all the crimes known to history. It has been dismissed from the harvest and the public gathering; in the respectable hotel it has no longer a place. It has been crowded out of the public walks and elbowed out of decent society. If it exists in connection with the hotel, it is put off down in the cellar, or out of the hearing of respectable guests. If a man opens a saloon on the street, he puts a screen in the door for the simple reason that it has become so disreputable to attend such places that young men would not go there unless there was something to protect them from the public gaze.

On the other hand, temperance is becoming popular. Almost all men now claim to be temperance men. If the saloon-keepers of the nation were to come together in council, the first resolution that they would likely pass would be that they are in favor of temperance. They would only claim that they differed from other men in the manner of promoting the good cause.

Long years of warfare may yet intervene between us and victory. The enemy is crafty and powerful; he is intrenched behind several billions of money now invested in the rum business, and has the assistance of the depravity and infidelity of the age. We have many weaklings among us. They are no account to us. Their counsel is always for compromise, which to us is ruin. But with all these disadvantages we will succeed. The

cause is God's, and must go forward. I believe that the child is now born that will see the dethronement of the rum-king, when husbands will be sober, when wives will be happy, when children will be cared for; when our penitentiaries will be empty; the fountain of idiocy, insanity, outrage and moral impurity will be dried up; when the highways of sin and folly shall be brought low, and the rough and uncultered ways of humanity shall be made smooth; when those living in the valleys of poverty and despondency shall be lifted up to the enjoyment of the glad day of sobriety, industry, virtue and peace. When that day has come, then shall there be one grand song of joy. On the morning of the beginning of the year of Jubilee, ancient Israel stationed her trumpeters within hearing distance of each other all over the land. The sound of the first blast from Jerusalem announced that all servants were free. These notes of freedom swept from hill-top to hill-top till the whole land was full of the bugle notes of liberty. So it will be when our enemy shall be deposed. The shout of joy will pass round the earth, and we will hear it said that the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our God and his Anointed.

THE END.





