

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PROHIBITION

CHARLES W. SUPER
ATHENS, OHIO

HE who writes a history of the civilization of the nineteenth century will have to deal with three movements of primary importance. These movements are the crusade against slavery, the agitation for the enfranchisement of women, and the campaign in favor of total abstinence (usually but erroneously called temperance). The first was virtually brought to a close by the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, by President Lincoln, although slavery was not entirely abolished until about the beginning of the twentieth century. The first Woman's Right Convention met at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. Two years later an organization was formed to promote the equality of the sexes in the right to vote and to hold office. The Quakers were the first to affirm the parity of women with men; but in matters of religion only. For a long time total abstinence was advocated by what may be called inhibition; but after it had been demonstrated that voluntary abstinence fails to produce satisfactory results, and the total abstainers had become conscious of their numerical strength, they became prohibitionists. These three movements presented a curious commingling of appeals to the emotions, to the love of gain, and to the reason. At present we are, however, concerned with prohibition only. Although the Prohibition party has always maintained a friendly attitude toward woman suffrage, recent experience has proved that there is no "elective affinity" between the two. Entire states, to say nothing of municipalities, have voted dry in which women were without the franchise, and *vice versa*.

The Prohibition party dates its origin from a convention that met in Chicago in 1869, at which about five hundred delegates were present. This convention was followed by

another, held in Columbus, Ohio, in 1872, where Presidential candidates were nominated. Whether we agree or disagree with those who attended these conventions; whether we commend or condemn their motives we can hardly withhold our admiration from the zeal with which they pursued their self-appointed object. Many of them came long distances and at no little expense, without the inducements that usually bring men together to promote the cause of a party. It may be stated as a general fact that the devotees of prohibition have from the first been inspired with a spirit of self-denial which made their cause partake somewhat of the character of a religious crusade. The Prohibition party claims, that, notwithstanding its poor showing at the polls, it was the first to embody in its platform many principles that were afterwards adopted and put in practice by the larger parties. Among these were universal suffrage, civil service reform, direct elections, international arbitration, an income tax, Federal prohibition of child labor, conservation of natural resources, and others. The fundamental principle of the party did not, however, find general acceptance for many years, and in 1907 only three States had adopted Constitutional prohibition.

Since that time, however, it may be said to have moved forward with giant strides. Enthusiastic devotees of prohibition are even venturing the prediction that the time will come, and come at no very distant date, when men will look back upon the ages in which the right to drink was unquestioned with as much amazement as the present generation looks back upon the time when the right to hold slaves was virtually unchallenged. Demosthenes was stigmatized as a "water drinker" by some of his contemporaries, which may be taken as evidence that even in the ages long gone by there were men of prominence who practiced total abstinence. This epithet was, of course, used by his enemies to disparage him. It has often been affirmed, since the time of the great Athenian, that one cannot be a "real good fellow" unless he drinks and treats.

Men still living can recall when some members of our Federal Congress thought they could not do their best unless they had freely imbibed a stimulant in advance, and had the source of their inspiration within easy reach when on their feet. Not only the medieval church, but Protestantism, was the enemy of drunkenness, little as the clergy were able to do towards preventing it. They made the mistake of believing that the drinker should be competent to decide for himself how much he could imbibe without detriment. It has from time immemorial been a familiar admission that "I had been drinking, but I was not drunk." During all of this time the churches, or at least the great majority of nominal Christians, had little to say against the unrighteousness of slavery.

The limits of personal liberty cannot be marked out according to any rational or philosophical principles. Its limits are almost entirely matters of convention and compromise. If we are not justified in saying that "Whatever is, is right," we are not far from the truth when we affirm that Whatever is, is expedient. Albeit, where the majority rules, the thing that is expedient this year does not necessarily mean that it will be regarded as expedient next year or a century hence. Herbert Spencer, staunch individualist as he was, foresaw and foretold the "coming slavery" implicit in the constantly growing restrictions which the community as a whole imposes on each individual. These restrictions vary somewhat according to local conditions, but the trend is in the same direction everywhere. Comparing the country with the village, the village with the city, the average city with the metropolis, we can observe in its practical workings the irresistible encroachments of the whole upon its parts. The dweller in the country is pretty much his own master. If he moves into the village, he finds himself restricted in some of his former activities, although they may be entirely innocuous, except in extremely rare cases. If he transfers his residence to the city, he encounters still more restrictions. If a majority of his neighbors decide that they want "public improve-

ments," he is compelled to contribute his share to the cost whether he will or no, with the alternate of forfeiting his property. The majority may even take his property from him, paying for it, not what the owner thinks it is worth, but according to the value which the majority puts upon it.

The doctrine that the majority, however small, has the political right to impose its will upon the minority, however large, is thoroughly sound, if the rapidly growing movement toward universal democracy is sound. But it is an absurdity when a State like Nevada, with less than 100,000 inhabitants, has an equal vote with New York, with its 10,000,000. For this irrationality the framers of our Constitution were, as a whole, not responsible. The pigmy commonwealths like Rhode Island were a constant source of vexation, with their insistent demands to be regarded and treated as if they were giants. Albeit, the founders of our Government could not foresee in what direction and to what extent the Union would expand. Besides, there was a greater probability that Nevada would, at no very distant date, become one of our wealthier States, than that either Rhode Island or Delaware would attain such a preponderance. But even the final adjustment, which was the outcome of long and acrimonious debates, has vindicated its wisdom and has been copied by other states. The German system, which gave one state the preponderance, proved to be thoroughly bad when manipulated by an ambitious and unscrupulous military hierarchy, — a government virtually under the tutelage of a "divinely appointed autocrat." But there are factors in this case that make the inequality less in reality than appears on the surface. In some States women are allowed to vote, but not in others.

Moreover, apart from this fact, the population of a State cannot be estimated by the size of its vote. In the Presidential election of 1916, Florida, with a male population of almost 400,000, cast only 81,000 votes; Louisiana, with a male population almost twice as large, cast only 93,000 votes; while Mississippi, with a male population of over

900,000, cast but 86,000 votes. On the other hand, New Hampshire, whose male population is not much over 200,000, cast 88,000 votes; and Rhode Island, with a considerably greater population, cast but 88,000 votes. These facts signify that in some of our States one vote represents more than three times as many voters as in others. In this country, pocket boroughs differ more from each other by their color than by their size. Political divisions, except when founded on race, are always more or less artificial. If they were based on rational grounds, many of them would have to be changed every few years. A small boy and a large one can play on a teeter-board if the fulcrum is placed nearer the latter. But the same arrangement will not answer as the latter becomes heavier. All governments are teeter-boards; and fortunate are those who live under them if they are endowed with sufficient patriotism to shift their positions without bloodshed.

The doctrine that a bare majority of voters may impose their will upon the minority is a corollary of the doctrine, that all men, or at least all citizens, are equal before the law. It rests upon the absurd assumption that a majority, in other words a democracy, is, under all circumstances, the best judge of its own interests. The student of government is often impressed with the indefiniteness of political terms. An aristocracy ought to be the best government, for the reason that it is the government of the *best*. As nobility and aristocracy are interchangeable terms, and as the nobility is presumably composed of noblemen, who are also supposed to be noble men, we arrive at the same conclusion. Moreover, what do men mean when they apply the predicate "best" to government? The Mexicans seem to be satisfied with their present government; at any rate, the majority are making very little effort to change it.

Our entire governmental machinery is operated on the principle that the majority shall rule. A decision of a supreme court when rendered by five judges against four has the same validity with one that is unanimous. Most of our higher courts are composed of an uneven number of

judges, because experience has shown that if only unanimous decisions were valid, the number would be exceedingly small. Napoleon once said to a bench of judges, "It does not make so much difference how you decide as that you decide." The last stronghold of legal unanimity, the traverse jury, has been compelled to surrender to a majority, greater or less according to the nature of the case upon which they sit. In the perennial struggle between the different groups constituting the Great Society, for what some consider their rights, but which others refuse to consider as such, there is probably a slow but gradual improvement so long as the strife does not degenerate into bloodshed. But

"more than common strength and skill
Must ye display
If you would give the better will
Its lawful sway."

It is everywhere assumed, and has been taken for granted from time immemorial, that the father is the natural protector of his offspring. This assumption is founded on the fact that he is in a more favorable position than anybody else to know and to do what is best, and that he will make a judicious use of his knowledge. The ancient Roman *patria potestas* was based on this idea. Albeit, the more civilized a people becomes, i.e. the larger the fund of experience it has accumulated, the less it is disposed to accept this postulate. The law-making power, whether the collective will of a people or not, no longer trusts the father to make use of his individual judgment in this matter, but decides for him, within certain limits, what course he shall pursue. The law not only compels him to send his children to school, but even marks out a curriculum for them. If in the popular judgment either the father or the mother is found to be incompetent to take proper care of the children, they are removed and placed under competent tutelage. This is a far more serious infringement upon personal liberty than is the annihilation of the drink traffic. Even after young people have ceased

to be children, they are subjected to laws in the enforcement of which neither they nor their parents, even if living, are consulted. They are required to attend school, in order that they may acquire additional knowledge or skill for future service of which the community is the chief beneficiary. It is almost literally true that we live amid the snares and pitfalls of the law, according to a dictum of Sir Henry Hallam.

But the world has learned, by dearly bought experience, that it is far better to be governed by laws than by decrees. As the laws define acts that are illegal, and therefore punishable, those who live under them are always in position to know how to regulate their conduct, in order to avoid its penalties. On the other hand, a mere decree may be made retroactive and impose a penalty on an act that was legal when it was done. Abstractly considered, no task would appear to be easier to perform than to establish a stable and even permanent government. As the end of all government is to make life and property secure, it would seem that a company of reasonable men could frame a constitution that would secure these ends with hardly a dissenting voice. Unfortunately there are now, as there have always been, men who are reasonable only in their own estimation. Most people have heard the anecdote of the jurymen, who, after holding out three days against the other eleven, thus preventing a verdict, declared that his associates were eleven of the stubbornest and most unreasonable men in the country. A not inconsiderable portion of the citizens of every community do not particularly care whether any life and property are secure except their own, but they want other people to pay for this security.

An enormous amount of nonsense has been written and spoken in the discussion of political problems. For example, we read and hear a great deal about "right" and "rights," as if the meaning of these terms were self-evident. In fact, they are nothing of the kind. "The right to cast a vote" is a great absurdity. No man has a natural right to cast a vote. What is usually spoken of as the

right to vote is no right at all, but a mere privilege accorded by law. Why is it right for a man aged twenty-one years to vote, but not if he lacks one day of having attained this age? And while men may agree that a woman has as good a right to vote as a man has or to participate in the government in any way she desires, the same government which grants to her these privileges may also withhold them. We are not here dealing with a question of right and wrong at all, but solely of expediency. If the woman suffragists, therefore, insist that the gentler sex — tell it not in Washington — has as much right to cast a vote as a man has, they are on tenable grounds. But the case is different when they contend for the privilege on the assumption of a natural right. A good deal of breath has been expended, and ink wasted, to prove that you “can’t make men moral by law.” No man of sense affirms that you can, nor does anybody advocate prohibition laws for the purpose of making men moral. Laws are not passed to make men moral, but to make them orderly. It is a question whether there is such a thing as a natural crime. A crime is usually defined as “an act or omission which the law punishes in the name or on behalf of the state, whether because expressly forbidden or because so injurious to the public as to require punishment on grounds of public policy.” Criminality is a matter of law, not of nature. Hence many acts are made crimes under one government which are not so under another. On the other hand, the morality of an act depends upon the will, not on the deed. If I say that I would kill John Doe if it were not for the law against murder, although I am committing a moral wrong, I am not committing a crime. If, on the other hand, I make threats against the life of John Doe, I am laying myself liable to a penalty and may be bound over to keep the peace. Hardly any one will deny a man’s right to drink whatever and whenever he pleases, provided his beverage carries with it no actual or potential injury to others; but when the argument is shifted to the ground that the community may decide that it is expedient to prohibit entirely the drinking of

all intoxicating liquors, it rests on logical grounds, the same grounds on which all pure food laws rest. Some adulterants are admittedly harmless, yet their sale is almost everywhere forbidden under penalty. Constitutions, whether written or merely traditional, if they are to be abiding, must grow; they cannot be made to order or constructed according to any preconceived ideas of what such documents ought to be. An oyster shell is not an agreeable object to the eye nor pleasant to the touch; but it is exactly suited to the creature that inhabits it, and is doubtless built in full accord with the established principles of ostrean esthetics. We may venture the same affirmation of governments: none of those that have long perdured have been constructed in accordance with the principles laid down by the architects of utopias. Most of those still in existence have been built up from within, like the shell of the oyster, and almost as unconsciously. It is a question whether any government has been subverted by attacks from without. Most of those that have fallen, if not all, were weakened by internal strife to such an extent that successful resistance against foreign enemies was impossible.

The people called Methodists were the first to make virtual total abstinence a part of their creed. About 1740, when John Wesley formulated a set of rules for the government of his members, he placed among them one in which he declares that it is expected of all who wish to continue in these societies to abstain from "drunkenness, buying and selling spirituous liquors or drinking them except in cases of extreme necessity." It is true he also forbade "slave-holding, buying or selling slaves"; yet the Methodist Church, South, upheld slavery, and brought about a schism a little more than a century after Mr. Wesley began to form his societies. This schism was mainly due to the generally admitted racial inferiority of the blacks, and had no influence on the attitude of the Church toward the consumption of ardent spirits. This Church is recognized by the liquor traffic as its most formidable antagonist; and its

members have never shown a disposition to deny the impeachment. When it was first organized in this country, about 1784, the following entry was made a part of its minutes:—

“*Question.* Should our Friends be permitted to make spirituous liquors and to drink them in drams?”

“*Answer.* By no means.”

Since 1812 the attitude of this Church has been increasingly radical. At a meeting of the National Liquor Dealers' Association in 1914, one of the speakers uttered the bitterest denunciations against this “fanatical, aggressive, and sometimes unscrupulous force [the Methodist Church] which is leading the movement for political supremacy under the guise of temperance reform.” In the same year the brewers, who had met in New Orleans, gave utterance to similar sentiments; and a few months later Bonfort's *Wine and Spirit Circular* asserted that “we must realize that the entire Methodist Church is a solidified, aggressive and obedient unit in this warfare on our trade.” While it may be true that the churches classed under the generic name of Methodist are the most powerful enemy of the liquor traffic, because of the number of their adherents, they are not more radical than the Presbyterians. We have here a typical exhibition of the fatuity that has for decades misled the whole opposition to the temperance movement. No church, certainly no Protestant church, has the slightest intention of trying to gain control of the Government. No single church in this country is strong enough to accomplish such an end, even if a few leaders desired it. Besides, the doctrine that church and state should be kept separate is so generally accepted in this country, that it cannot be uprooted within measurable time. This doctrine has, furthermore, been gaining adherents rapidly in all nominally Christian lands.

The well-known, and at one time the much-read, Henry Thomas Buckle, seems to have foreseen, more than fifty years ago, the potency of the force which Mr. Wesley set in

motion. Although he had no sympathy with its underlying religious motives, he wrote:—

“Under two of the most remarkable men of the eighteenth century, Whitefield the first of theological orators, and Wesley the first of theological statesmen, there was organized a great system of religion which bore the same relation to the Church of England that the Church of England bore to the Church of Rome. Thus after an interval of two hundred years, a second spiritual reformation was effected in our country. In the eighteenth century the Wesleyans were to the bishops what, in the sixteenth century, the Reformers were to the Popes.”

And again:—

“The Wesleys displayed a genius for organization so superior to that of their predecessors, the Puritans, that they soon became a center round which the enemies of the church could conveniently rally. And what is perhaps still more important, the order, regularity and publicity by which their proceedings have been marked, distinguish them from all other sects, and by raising them, as it were, to the dignity of a rival establishment, have encouraged the diminution of that exclusive and superstitious respect which was once paid to the Anglican hierarchy.”

Whether it be true or untrue, as often charged, that English bishops are the chief supporters of the liquor trade in Great Britain, there is no doubt that several of them are financially interested.¹ Early in the war the story was told, that, when at a public banquet the King turned down his wineglass as an example, several bishops refused to do likewise. This incident is instructive as showing the determination of the typical Briton to assert what he considers his right, whether royalty agrees or disagrees.

Methodism was a revival, rather than a reformation in the usual acceptation of the term: at any rate, it was in no sense a religious revolution. Its purpose was not to destroy anything, but to build upon foundations already

¹Not many years ago a cartoon appeared in the *Westminster Gazette*, representing a prince bishop supported on one side by an inane-looking peer and on the other by a boozy-looking publican. Underneath was the inscription, “United we stand; divided we fall.”

laid. Hence it contributed greatly toward raising the moral tone of the class that was most susceptible to persuasion. It called for no change of creed, but merely a change of conduct. Stress is laid upon this fact by all recent English historians. J. R. Green, in language almost identical with that of Canon Farrar, writes of Wesley: "He recreated England. But for the new life created by the Wesleyan revival, Pitt never could have come into power, as there would have been nothing on which he could stand." Mr. Wesley's most ardent admirers never used stronger language than this. Although somewhat superstitious, he was an avowed enemy of mysticism in every form, and steadfastly directed his energies towards the attainment of practical ends. If we wish to render a verdict upon his mentality in its briefest form, we can hardly do better than to say that he was a representative Englishman. Perhaps for this very reason he never met with much success in Scotland. Goldwin Smith, in his "United Kingdom," writes of nonconformity in general: "Its annals are not poetic nor picturesque; but for it, England might have been an Anglican Spain, if the Nonconformist had not been there." Its strength lay in the middle class, whose members lacked culture because they were excluded from the universities; but they were not ignorant, nor devoid of a certain shrewdness and moral insight into the needs of the times and the necessities of supplying them so far as lay in their power.

The mass movement in favor of total abstinence, which was later overslaughed by the demand for the total destruction of the liquor traffic by law, originated among the Anglo-Saxons, although it has made more rapid progress in the former and present British possessions than in the homeland. This fact is not surprising when we consider that the liquor traffic had become so thoroughly entrenched on the British Isles by centuries of privilege, and so much money had been invested therein, that it was extremely difficult to eradicate it. It is an interesting fact, and one that is of far wider significance than most people suspect, that

the opposition to the use of ardent spirits originated in the emotions, and not in the reason. As late as the end of the eighteenth century, no man of science doubted the efficacy of alcohol as a curative agent in disease or as a prophylactic against almost all human ills. Ardent spirits were freely prescribed by physicians and constantly used in the preparation of their medicaments. Dr. Benjamin Rush was the first man of eminence who dared to lay siege to this almost universal faith, in his book "The Effects of Ardent Spirits on the Human Mind and Body." The work may almost be said to have created a sensation, and it was only the eminence of the author that saved it from being treated with ridicule. It is strange, however, that the distinguished author does not seem to have been aware of the inconsistency of his position; for, while he condemned distilled liquors, he believed that malt liquors contain food qualities. The injurious element in distilled liquors is also present in beer, although in smaller quantities. Half a dozen little devils may do more harm than one big devil.

The first total abstinence society in this country is believed to have been organized by Dr. James Clark in 1808, although its members were permitted to drink on the advice of a physician or at public dinners. He was probably influenced by Dr. Rush's book. He died at Glens Falls, New York, in 1867, at the age of ninety. In 1812 a temperance society was also organized in Maine. Thomas Jefferson was one of the early American advocates of temperance; but he also advocated the substitution of light liquors for ardent spirits. He wanted to tax whiskey out of existence. He was led to adopt this radical view by the trouble many of his officeholders gave him by their too free patronage of dramshops. He declared that "the habit of using ardent spirits by men in office has occasioned more injury to the public, and more vexation to me, than all other causes. Were I to commence my administration again, the only question I would ask respecting a candidate for office would be, 'Does he use ardent spirits?'" When President Jefferson uttered this dictum he had either forgotten or

ignored the fact that he was always more concerned to place good friends of his in office than sober men. Several temperance societies were organized during the following three or four decades, one of these among Congressmen, of which Lewis Cass was the first president. About one tenth of the Federal body were enrolled. After the Civil War the Honorable H. W. Blair was the foremost champion of total abstinence in his day, both in the General Assembly of his native State and in Congress. In the latter body he was subjected to much ridicule, and not a little abuse, both by his fellow members and by the general public. Nevertheless, he could not be diverted from his purpose; and, as he is still living, he doubtless looks back with not a little satisfaction upon the triumph of a cause which at one time, and for a long time, only "cranks" advocated. He doubtless often thinks of the proverb "He laughs best who laughs last."

The indictment so often and so persistently brought by the liquor forces against the men who are devoting their whole time to the prohibition cause, that they are acting solely from selfish motives, is so absurd as to be positively funny. They would have us believe, furthermore, that the thousands who contribute their money voluntarily to the cause are so gullible that a few score of men are able to impose upon them to such an extent as to elicit from them thousands of dollars to aid a cause in which they have no interest. If those paid agents are successful in making the whole nation dry, they will have destroyed their own business, and there will be nothing for them to do. Consequently they will have to seek some other occupation. The liquor interests would have the public believe that, by making themselves the champions of personal liberty in this one particular, they are the only altruists. We do not hear of any individuals who have become wealthy through prohibition; while the number of millionaires from the brewing and distilling interests is considerable. As long as those men have the legal prerogative to sell their product, no one should gainsay them. When they sell it illegally,

the case is different. It may be said that the liquor traffic is the only business that is conducted quite as freely outside the law as within it; for, wherever there are licensed dramshops, an illegal traffic flourishes with equal vigor. Perhaps the business cannot be reformed; at any rate, no determined effort seems to have been made. Time and again the liquor interests have been told, by men engaged in the same business, that saloons are a nuisance, and that it is their own fault. It would seem that common prudence, or what is often called "horse sense," would make it plain to a man who furnishes a commodity to the public under legal restrictions, that it is to his interest to prevent another from furnishing the same product without such restrictions. Whatever may be said of the wholesale dealers, it is notorious that saloon keepers are, with few exceptions, men who have no reputation to forfeit.

What is usually called the temperance movement has passed through stages or at least into the third stage. In the first stage its protagonists demanded no more of its friends than voluntary abstention from intoxicating beverages. Men were urged to practice abstinence by the strength of their own will. They were urged to signify their intentions by joining with others in an organization that had the same aim. This was the status of the case until a few decades ago. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, usually called the W. C. T. U., which was organized in 1883, grew out of the Woman's Crusade, that began its activities ten years earlier in Ohio. The chief purpose of its members was to induce saloon keepers to give up their business and to enter other vocations, also aiding them incidentally to do so. The Anti-Saloon League was organized at Oberlin, Ohio, in 1893. Its avowed object, as its title indicates, was virtually identical with that of the organization just named, but with a membership composed exclusively of men. It, however, undertook to secure legislation, and when secured to enforce it. It made no war on private drinking, although it frowned on the drinking habit. It strove for the closing of saloons, in

order to remove temptation from those who were too weak to resist temptation. The League met with considerable success in the smaller communities, and even closed many dramshops in the larger municipalities. It was discovered that many men who were by no means averse to drinking were glad to join in a movement which kept saloons at a distance from their families. These methods proving too slow in their operation, the radical reformers began to direct their efforts toward the total extermination of the dramshops.

The rapidity with which the prohibition forces marched over the final stretch into the land where there should be neither beer nor distilled liquors has been almost marvelous when we consider the long period during which they were engaged in marshaling and training their forces. It was a notable case of *vires acquirit eundo*. It is the final stage of a process of evolution effected almost entirely through the enormous amount of literature placed before the public by friends of the reform. It has kept pace with the growth of democracy. It is an error to maintain, as so many of its opponents are wont to do, that a prohibition state is unnatural. Francis Lieber, the eminent German-American publicist, pointed out long ago that one state of society is no more natural than another; that conditions more or less artificial may be produced temporarily by force; but that such conditions are always transient. Yet even these can hardly be called unnatural. The prohibition movement was greatly aided by our entrance into the World War. But the acceleration was not wholly due to solicitude of those who remained at home for the welfare of the soldiers who went abroad: it was largely owing to the fear of being charged with pro-Germanism by their fellow citizens. For reasons both politic and political, many men voted for statutory prohibition who had no sympathy with it. The German-American Alliance, which had for some time been the mouthpiece and protagonist of pro-Germanism in this country, had become arrogant, and its speakers had indulged in disparaging remarks upon almost every-

thing American, especially upon prohibition. It had entered upon the project of forming an *imperium in imperio*, one of the fundamental principles of which was to be the unchallenged right of every individual to drink without other restraint than that imposed by the individual will. It appears to have had no more doubt of success than had the Kaiser when he launched his great drives, westward, eastward, and southward.

In 1910, a prominent journal, published in the interest of the liquor trade, declared that "the Anglo-Saxon element from which we inherit the abominable remnants of Puritanism is fast disappearing from this country." We have here an instance of incredible fatuity. The prophecy was as false as the Kaiser's, that he would soon rule the entire world. Some years later we were told, in almost the same words, that the Anglo-Saxon churches "are the hotbeds of narrowness and fanaticism." In a speech delivered before a large audience in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Dr. Hexamer, the president of the Alliance, was reported to have used the following intemperate and foolish language:—

"In order to obtain for German-Americans the place in the sun which was always denied them, it is absolutely essential that personal liberty be guaranteed them, and that it be not curtailed by the attacks of nativists and prohibitionists. We have suffered long the preachments that 'you Germans must allow yourselves to be assimilated; you must merge in the American people.' But no one will ever find us prepared to descend to an inferior level. No! We have made it our aim to elevate others to our level. We will not allow our two-thousand-year old culture to be trodden down in this land. Many are giving our German culture to this land of our children; but this is possible only if we stand together and conquer this dark spirit of muckerdom and prohibition, just as Siegfried slew the dragon. Let us stand together for our good right and hold together. Be strong! Be strong and be German"!

The speaker's reference to "our two-thousand-year old culture" is decidedly refreshing. According to Tacitus,

the most conspicuous characteristic of the ancient Germans was their craving for strong drink. He assured his countrymen that they could conquer those barbarians far more easily by gratifying their appetite than with the sword. There is no doubt that it was the old culture which the Germans tried to impose upon the Belgians and the French, and, because of their refusal to accept it, inflicted upon them penalties which a dozen years ago were unthinkable — except, of course, by Germans. Now, however, its quondam champions no longer defend it, and apparently even the Germans have reached the conclusion that it is not the “real thing,” nor anything like it. At any rate, they no longer boast of its peerlessness. Those who were to lead its promulgators to the ends of the earth have tired of their job and resigned. What German culture means, as distinguished from the much-vilified Anglo-Saxon, is portrayed by Brand Whitlock:—

“For one of our Anglo-Saxon race and legal traditions, to understand the conditions in Belgium during the German occupation it is necessary to banish resolutely from the mind every conception of right we have inherited from our ancestors — conceptions that have long since crystalized into principles of law and have been confirmed in our charters of liberty. In the German mentality these conceptions do not exist; they think in other sequences; they act according to other principles — the conviction that there is only one right, one privilege, and that it belongs exclusively to the Germans, the conviction, namely, that they have the right to do whatever they have the physical force to do.”

“Our good right,” just quoted, is a decidedly “bad break.” The aforementioned speaker assumes that a man may take with him into a foreign country the political privileges and social usages to which he had been accustomed in his native land. He forgets, that, when his pursuit of happiness in the new environment is not in accord with that which he left behind, he must change his opinions, or at least his practices, if he would avoid trouble. This arrogant assumption is distinctively Prussian, and not German, except by trans-

fusion. One is here reminded of the dictum of Goethe, that the Prussian was always a brute, and education will make him ferocious.

With the record of the Belgian and French troops before us, it is not easy to find evidence that they would have displayed greater bravery if they had been total abstainers. Although they could not save Belgium from subjugation, they saved Paris from capture — a marvelous achievement under the circumstances. While it is true that most of these troops were accustomed to light wines only, the mere fact that in both Belgium and France there are many breweries, and that their output is in the main for home consumption, is evidence that there is a large demand for malt liquors. When we compare the British navy, now comparatively grogless, with its predecessors in the times when it was taken as a matter of course that a seaman would not fight unless he had been liberally supplied with strong drink, there is no difference. As it was in the days of Sir Richard Grenville, when, with but a single ship, he refused to run from a Spanish fleet although he knew that "to fight was but to die," an action which Tennyson has made familiar to everybody who reads English; so the gallant English seamen stuck to their posts, a few years ago, though knowing full well that the same fate awaited them. When Admiral Cradock's little fleet encountered greatly superior numbers off the coast of Chile, nobody asked, How many of the enemy are there? but, Where is the enemy? and all went down together. It is, moreover, a question whether it required more courage to engage in a conflict, that, in the very nature of the case, could last but an hour or two, than the unremitting vigil on the North Sea, kept up, year after year, by the Grand Fleet. On the other hand, no amount of "booze" could inspire the German seamen with the courage to "try again" after their experience off the coast of Jutland, although the Kaiser electrified his people with the announcement that a glorious victory had been won for them. Those who were expected to win another refused pointblank to make the

attempt. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and well into the twentieth, German savants were busily engaged in the search for new inventions and discoveries; but they did not succeed in finding any food or drink that would make their officers men of honor or instill into their soldiers the fundamental principles of civilization. It may be that, in their determination to be supermen, they never felt the need of those virtues of the olden time.

Many of the advocates of legal prohibition who believe their doctrines to be supported by the teachings of the New Testament misapprehend its spirit. The Letters were all addressed to professing Christians; and if their profession was genuine, they had no need of laws to restrain them from doing what might be a stumbling block to others or set them a bad example. Very few of them were Roman citizens, and they had therefore no direct influence upon the government under which they lived. They were expected to pay taxes and ask no questions. It was not until the fourth century of the Christian era that conditions began to change. It was in this spirit that St. Paul wrote that all things were allowable, but not all things were expedient, for him. He did not mean that *all* should be taken literally, as it might thus include theft, murder, and other acts that would be subversive of public order. The injunction to Timothy, "Do not continue to drink water only, but take a little wine on account of the weakness of your stomach and your frequent ailments," would be appropriate only if addressed to a total abstainer. Here wine is recommended as a medicament, not as a beverage. Since the sacrament was instituted as a memorial service, it was certainly not intended that the elements should henceforth and forever be the same with those of which Christ and his friends partook on that solemn occasion. If the example of Christ is to be followed exactly in every particular, the Last Supper would have to be partaken of in the night, or at least in the evening. (A few of the minor religious bodies do actually hold their communion services in the night.) There is a wide difference between obeying

a principle and following a custom. A fitting answer was once given to a literalist by John B. Gough. When he was lecturing on temperance, a heckler in the audience called out: "What about Christ turning water into wine?" To this question Mr. Gough replied: "I have no objection to wine that is made of water."