

HV
5089
.58

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. Copyright No.

Shelf HV 5.089

.S2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

PRICE, 10 CENTS.

PROHIBITION IN POLITICS

QUESTION:

SHOULD PROHIBITION TO BE MADE A POLITICAL QUESTION? IF SO, WITH WHAT LIMITATIONS?

NEGATIVE: SAMUEL T. SPEAR, D.D., of the *New York Independent*.

AFFIRMATIVE: I. K. FUNK, D.D., of the *Homiletic Review*.

(From Symposium in *Homiletic Review*.)

COPYRIGHTED.

THE VOICE EXTRA.—NO. IV.

August, 1885.

[Published Quarterly. Yearly Subscription, 40 Cents.]

FUNK & WAGNALLS, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street, New York.

Entered by New York Postoffice as second class mail matter.

HV5081
27

GEORGE ELIOT'S POETRY AND OTHER STUDIES.

BY ROSE ELIZABETH CLEVELAND.

PRICE, CLOTH, \$1.50.

This is Miss Cleveland's *maiden* book, upon which she has spent much time, care and labor. It was written previous to President Cleveland's accession to the Presidency. Beautifully bound.

CONTENTS: George Eliot's Poetry; Reciprocity; Altruistic Faith; History; Studies in the Middle Ages; A Series of Historical Essays; Old Rome and New France; Charlemagne; The Monastery; Chivalry; Joan of Arc.

GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP says:

"Miss Cleveland's Essays seem to me valuable for their quality of insight and earnest feeling. I am greatly pleased by her sincere, womanly tone, and think that her presentation of historical episodes is calculated to arouse the imagination and impress readers vividly."

R. H. STODDARD IN THE NEW YORK WORLD says:

"Miss Cleveland's ideas are high, and her self-respect is great. This volume shows that she can be what few women are—critical, and that she is able to form an independent opinion. . . . Miss Cleveland's analysis of the verse of George Eliot in 'The Spanish Gypsy,' and her comparison of that over-rated and prosy production with Aurora Leigh proves that she possesses the true critical faculty. . . . Miss Cleveland considers curiously the verse of George Eliot, and wherein it comes short of Mrs. Browning's verse. Is it in her prosody? It is as faultless as Pope's. There is never a syllable too much or too little in her metres. The metre of Mrs. Browning is often slovenly, and her rhymes always poetry and music, which that of George Eliot always lacks. . . . Miss Cleveland reaches what so few writers attain—style."

CHARLES A. DANA, EDITOR NEW YORK SUN says:

"Miss Cleveland's literary style is characterized by vigor of expression, abundance of imagery, and a certain rhythmic quality that makes passages here and there read almost like blank verse. Although the essays are critical and expository rather than imaginative, her frequent use of figurative language, often in metaphors original in conception, elaborately wrought out, shows the power and scope of a fancy which a somewhat severe intellectual habit has not wholly restrained. The President's sister, as we see her in these essays, represents a type of the American woman very interesting to study. She has read a good deal, and her active intellect has attacked many of the unsolved problems in the philosophy of life. The most stupendous subjects of thought or speculation do not terrify her. She stands up in the presence of the wisdom of all ages with quite as much self-possession as a clever and courageous Yankee school-mistress might be expected to display if confronted by the whole French Academy. Intellectually she is something of an ascetic, something of a mystic, something of an *exaltée*. She has no patience with the modern pessimists. She discusses with equal readiness the teachings of Gautama, Carlyle, Mr. Hume and Mahomet. The problems of ethics, the disputed points of aesthetics, and the conundrums of history she grapples with eagerness; and whether we find her sharply challenging the opinions of a leading infidel or subjecting to critical analysis the emotional side of Joan of Arc's character, we find her equally positive, aggressive, and interesting."

THE NEW YORK JOURNAL OF COMMERCE says:

"Those who were privileged to read the proof-sheets of Miss Cleveland's book and praised it in advance, did not overrate its excellent qualities. In its entirety it is a fresh, original work. The interesting fact that Miss Cleveland is sister of the President and mistress of the White House will, of course, pique public curiosity and give 'George Eliot's Poetry and Other Studies' a wide circulation. But she does not and need not ask any favors on account of her position. Her essays can stand on their native merit. She has an active brain and a generous, sympathetic heart. She thinks for herself and has the courage of her opinions. Her style is sententious to a degree rare in this age of effusiveness. It would be hard to find a superfluous word in her crisp, antithetical sentences. Her diction is choice, her fancy is lively, her intense earnestness is at times relieved by gleams of humor; and she knows how to make and introduce quotations. The latter indicate an extensive range of reading and familiarity with the

OUGHT PROHIBITION TO BE MADE A POLITICAL QUESTION? IF SO,
WITH WHAT LIMITATIONS?

No. I.

BY SAMUEL T. SPEAR, D. D.

THE importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors, when considered commercially, supply the demand created by their consumption; and through this consumption, and not otherwise, the well known evils resulting from the liquor business make their appearance. These evils arise only when the consumption is that of a common beverage, frequently repeated, by the same persons, in considerable quantities, and for a considerable period, so as to form the habit of such use. Not every use of these liquors, as a beverage, comes within this description. Some people use them so moderately that, if such were the practice of all liquor drinkers, there would be no occasion for any special legislation on the subject. It is not true that all such drinkers are drunkards, or that they in the end become such; and yet it is true that, in respect to a large number of persons, liquor drinking becomes a confirmed and most injurious habit, and that from this source arise evils of awful dimensions.

It is this fact, and this only, that creates the necessity for remedial restraint, with a view to lessen or wholly remove these evils. The history of legislation in this country shows that, for the purpose of such restraint, special laws have, from time to time, been enacted by most if not all of the States of the Union, and that these laws were intended to be a tax upon the liquor business, generally imposed in the form of a license fee. All such laws have assumed the right of these States to regulate and control the action of the inhabitants thereof, to any extent demanded by the public good, subject to the limitation of certain inalienable rights belonging to individual persons, of which the right to manufacture and sell intoxicating liquors is not one, and subject to the further limitation of vested rights of property, of which no one can be deprived "without due process of law." (*Bartemeyer v. Iowa*, 18 Wall. 129.)

Prohibition, considered as an application of this legal principle, declares that there shall be no manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors, except under circumstances and for purposes carefully specified. The design is to keep these liquors out of the general market, and to stop their consumption as a beverage by cutting off the supply. What is called the license system excludes the sale of intoxicating liquors, except by designated persons who, in distinction from the great mass of the people, are permitted to pursue the business under the regulations and restrictions of law. The two systems do not differ in kind, or in the evil had in view, but only in the degree of their re-

striction. Both are meant to be remedial, and legal restraint is alike the object of both.

Theoretically considered, Prohibition is the high-water mark of the idea. But if it is not practicable in a given State, and the license system is practicable, then the latter, though less restrictive than the former, is, in such a state of facts, practically the better system, certainly better than no restraint by law. Those who denounce every form of the license system, and will have Prohibition or nothing, make a grave mistake. What they denounce is much better than nothing, since it imposes *some* restraint upon the liquor business, and makes the evils less than they otherwise would be.

Let us concede to Prohibition all that its most enthusiastic friends claim for it, and that it should be established by law when and where this can be done; and a very important question then arises, not as to the end to be sought, but as to the way of seeking it. Shall a distinct and separate Political Party be organized in the several States, and also in the nation, and shall distinct and separate candidates be nominated by that party for National and State offices, on the basis of Prohibition as the leading if not the exclusive issue to be submitted to the votes of the people, certainly as the controlling reason for the existence of such a party? Some Prohibitionists answer this question in the affirmative.

And, in order to judge as to the wisdom of this answer, it may be well in the outset to note the following facts:—1. That this country has never had at the same time more than two great political parties, either in the nation or in the several States, and that these parties, either with or without a change of their respective titles, have perpetuated themselves down to the present time. 2. That the great mass of the voters have uniformly been divided between these two parties. 3. That, for a rule, the party that has controlled the General Government has also controlled the majority of the State governments, and that in this respect national and State politics have been identified. 5. That comparatively small political parties have, nevertheless, appeared from time to time, in opposition to one or the other or both of the great parties, without displacing either, and without obtaining control of the affairs of government, and that these parties have not lived longer in some cases than a single election, and that, whatever has been their duration, they have in the end disappeared altogether, being swallowed up and lost in one or both of the two great political parties of the country.

The task of creating an absolutely new political party that will, in the presence of the parties already existing, perpetuate itself and obtain control of the Government, or, to any considerable extent, of the State governments, is not, in the light of these facts, so easy as some people imagine. It has never succeeded, even once, in the whole

history of this Government. The Republican party of to-day is not an example of such creation. This party, formally organized in 1856, was not a new party contending for the mastery against two other parties in the field, and finally conquering both, but was simply the old Whig party under a new name, with elements of strength derived from the Liberty party and also the Democratic party, while some of the Whig elements, especially in the Southern States, went into the latter party. The Whig party gave place to the Republican party and was merged into it, and, with added elements, took a new name. Such are the facts in the case.

One need not look far to see why it is so difficult to create and perpetuate an absolutely new political party, and place it in power. There is practically no room for it, and no general demand for it. The ideas of the few, as compared with those of the many, make no such demand. The majority of the people can always get all they want, through one or the other of the existing parties, by simply voting it into power. These parties are constantly watching public sentiment, and, from time to time, adopting new principles or measures in accordance with its supposed demands. Their plan is not to lag behind this sentiment or go contrary to it; and neither proposes to disband or commit suicide, in order to make room for a third party. It is the constant study of both to keep on good terms with the majority of the voters; and the people can always get all the legislation they want through either of them.

How then is a third party, as a distinct and separate organization, to crowd itself into power, in the presence of the two great parties that already have the field, either of which stands ready to respond to the demands of public sentiment, and both of which are seeking to interpret these demands? This is a question which those who are so ready to extemporize new political parties, simply to suit their ideas, are not apt thoughtfully to consider. They practically forget that the majority of the people, speaking through the ballot-box, rule in this country, and that this majority has no occasion for a third party, and will not use it. Two parties are enough for all practical purposes, and a third party is just one too many.

The prospects of Prohibition, by the agency of a third political party organized for this special purpose, do not, in the light of these general facts, appear very promising. Such a party can give no legal expression to its views until it gets itself into power, and this it cannot do until a majority of the voters shall adopt its views; and when, if ever, this becomes a fact, the party will be wholly unnecessary to attain the result. Let public sentiment move up to the mark of Prohibition, so as to give signs that this is or is soon to be the choice and purpose of the people; and there will be no difficulty in realizing the end through an existing party, without any new organization. What

is wanted is not a new party, but a prevalent, popular opinion in favor of Prohibition ; and until this is gained, political Prohibition is powerless to attain the end.

It may, however, be said that a third party, though for the present powerless, is, nevertheless, the shortest and surest way to create the necessary popular opinion in favor of Prohibition. I do not regard this as a correct view, but, on the contrary, believe that Prohibitionists will sooner and more certainly gain their end by identifying themselves with the political party that, by reason of its character and constituent elements, is most likely to sympathize with their views, and from which, by co-operating with it and helping to place it in power, they can most hopefully expect the necessary legislation on this subject. Let them work within the lines of such a party and make themselves part and parcel of it ; let them participate in its nominating conventions and support the candidates thereof ; let them attend its primary meetings ; let them seek to educate it up to the standard of their ideas ; let them agitate the question of Prohibition as much as they please ; let them do their utmost to enlighten the popular mind as to the merits of their cause ; and if by thus acting with and within such a party, they can convert neither the party nor public sentiment to the adoption of their views, how can they hope to succeed by setting up a third party ? Standing up to be counted, as a comparatively small minority, will not give them Prohibition, or increase their power to attain it, or add to the force of their argument, or change public opinion in their favor. The effect will rather be to disclose their own weakness and the hopelessness of their task by this mode of action.

But may not Prohibitionists, though gaining no victory for themselves, nevertheless, by taking a course that defeats an existing party, so discipline and punish that party by its defeat as to compel its acceptance of their views, as the only condition upon which it can have their support ? The party to which such an argument is addressed, will always answer this question in the negative whenever compliance with the condition named will bring to it greater losses than gains. No party will ever seek the votes of Prohibitionists upon a condition that, in its judgment, involves the loss of a larger number of votes. Every party will take the hazard of being defeated by the former, rather than that of being defeated by the latter. The argument *in terrorem*, however plausible it may seem to Prohibitionists, will not work, unless they are so numerous that they can by their own strength make their cause victorious ; and if this be the fact, then they do not need to use the argument at all, since one or both of the existing parties will, without the argument, be certain to adjust their action to the fact. There is no difficulty about the success of Prohibition, without a third party, whenever and wherever such a fact exists.

What then shall be done when both of the great parties are equally opposed to Prohibition and equally refuse to adopt it? This question virtually concedes that the predominant sentiment of the people is against Prohibition. If this were not the fact, the attitude of the existing parties would not be against it. The organization of a third party on the basis of Prohibition is not, so long as this fact remains, going to turn a powerless minority into a successful majority. The candidates of such a party will not be elected; and Prohibitionists will not thereby acquire any additional power more strongly to influence the public mind than they might otherwise have done. They will not be able to preach any better, or reason any better, or better do anything to change the thoughts of the people, and make their cause triumphant. They cannot vote themselves into power until they get the necessary popular opinion on their side; and there is nothing in the mere organization of a third party to secure this result. The opinion being given, such a party is not needed; and, without it, the party would be politically powerless.

The wise course for Prohibitionists, in the case supposed, is to accept the situation as it is, and then, by earnest efforts, seek to arouse public attention to the enormous evils connected with the liquor business, and to the urgent necessity of stringent legislation to abate these evils. Here is an ample field for the exercise of their best powers in the way of argument and persuasion; and if they are successful in leading the people generally to adopt their views, the end they desire will be gained without organizing a third party for that purpose. The existing political parties, assumed to be opposed to Prohibition, will, upon this supposition, change their attitude; and either, if placed in power, will give to the principle the sanction and force of law. No new party is needed when public sentiment demands a prohibitory law, and, in the absence of such a sentiment, no new party can secure the result.

The existing public sentiment, whether right or wrong, will, in this country, be practically the law on this subject; and no law, in advance of it or against it, can be effective as a corrective or reforming remedy. No political party can get into power, or, if in power, long stay there, against public sentiment. The many, in the matter of making or unmaking law, will have their own way, whether the few like it or not. The latter may and should do what they can to change the thoughts of the many, if believing them to be wrong; but they cannot establish Prohibition, and no party can establish it, against the judgment of the many.

Something may be learned on this subject from the strategy of what is called the rum power. That power never gets up a third party, never has a separate and independent ticket as the rum ticket. What it does is to ally itself with one of the existing parties, and, by

voting with it, to strengthen that party, and thereby control its action, so as to prevent the legislation it does not desire, and secure that which it does desire. This is good strategy in the pursuit of a bad end; and I am of opinion that the friends of restrictive legislation can do no better than to imitate this strategy in the pursuit of a good end. The fact that the children of this world are sometimes wiser than the children of light is no credit to the latter, and is the reason why the former often succeed when the latter fail.

It is well to remember that Prohibitionists, by organizing a third party, at once dissolve all their relations to the other two parties, except as an opposing and disturbing element, and that they may in this way do positive damage to the real interests of the temperance cause. They may get votes from one of these parties, the one most favorable to their cause, and which they would otherwise have supported, and in this way give victory to the other party, the one least favorable to their cause and most in alliance with the liquor interest, and in this sense the rum party. This surely is not a victory for Prohibition, but rather defeat. The party most likely to co-operate with them, if supported by them, is defeated; and the party least likely to act with them, and supported by the liquor interest, is successful, and they have contributed to that success. This is defeat to their cause, and in part by their own hands, and nothing else. It is well known that the Democratic party, in the recent election, calculated upon the Prohibition votes to be drawn from the Republican party, as one ground for the hope of success. Was this party in favor of Prohibition? Not at all. It simply wanted to use Prohibitionists for its own political purposes. Its hostility to their theory is without any disguise.

Prohibition, so far as it has won any victories, has done so, not through the organization of a third party, but by co-operation with an existing party. This certainly was the fact in Maine. The Prohibition amendment in Iowa succeeded as a Republican measure, and the Prohibition laws of that State were enacted by a Republican legislature. The same fact meets us when we turn to Kansas. The truth is that a distinct and separate Prohibition party has not yet won a single victory for its own cause, and that all the victories actually won have been gained by the agency and support of an existing party, with which the advocates of restrictive legislation had the good sense to co-operate, thus working with the party and through it, and not outside of it or against it. What has been done in this way can in the same way be done elsewhere, if at all, and much sooner and more easily than it can be done by the organization of a third party.

If, moreover, this third party enlarges the area of its principles beyond the single one of Prohibition, so as to embrace questions also embraced by one or both of the two great parties of the country, then, in relation to these questions, there is no occasion for the existence of

the party, since in respect to them the people can just as well and even better secure all they desire without it, and are not likely to attach themselves to it for this purpose. If, for example, they want to establish womans' suffrage, or repeal the anti-Chinese law, or maintain a protective tariff, they do not need a third party to attain any one or all of these ends. A Prohibition party is not likely to attract voters from either of the other parties by broadening its principles beyond the single one which constitutes the only occasion for its existence; and it is quite likely in this way to raise new difficulties with voters.

If, on the other hand, this party confines itself to the one principle which is the only reason for its organization, and, consequently, excludes all other political ends, then the basis of its action is plainly too limited to give any hope of ultimate success. He who supposes that a majority of the people, already having two great parties through either of which they can make their will effective on all questions that concern the public welfare, will attach themselves to a party of such narrow dimensions in what it proposes, gives full proof that he has some things yet to learn. There are other great interests, besides the one involved in Prohibition, which the people will and must consider in casting their votes.

The result then is that a distinct Prohibition party, if, in the presence of the other two parties, flinging to the breeze a flag broader than the one principle which calls for its existence, or if confining itself exclusively to that principle, really has no prospect of getting the majority of the voters on its side and electing its candidates, and thus enabling itself to realize its own idea. The final success of such a party through its own adherents is not among the probabilities of the future. The probabilities are that it will run a comparatively short race, and at last take its place among defunct political parties.

The correctness of this view is confirmed by the fact, not only that the overwhelming mass of the voters in this country have hitherto declined to attach themselves to such a party, but also that the party has not by any means secured the votes of all who believe in the principle of Prohibition, or of that large body of voters who do not believe in this principle, and do believe in the wisdom and utility of the license system. The elections in this country show this fact, and, in showing it, show the practical judgment of the people. Prohibitionists may scout and denounce the popular judgment as indicated by the ballot-box; but this will not affect that judgment, or alter the verdict rendered thereby, or change a minority into a majority. Every voter has the right to vote as he thinks best. The way in which the majority of the people vote tells the story as to what they think; and if we test political Prohibition by this standard, the prospect of its final success is very remote. The principle may succeed; but I do not believe that it will succeed by a separate party movement.

The difficulties are not removed or lessened, but rather increased, when it is proposed to make a Prohibition party *National* in the scope of its action. One of the things to be done by such a party, in order to realize its own idea, is, once in every four years, to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President respectively, and also to nominate Presidential electors who, if chosen by the people, will vote for these candidates. The chance of success, by setting up this electoral machinery, in the presence of the two great parties of the country, amounts simply to nothing at all; and if such a party could elect its candidates for President and Vice-President, neither of these officers could establish Prohibition over a single foot of the territory of the United States.

Another thing to be done by a National Prohibition party is, once in every two years, to nominate and elect, from the several States, candidates for membership in the House of Representatives, and to do so to an extent that will give it the majority in this house. The same party must be numerically strong enough in the States to control the action of the majority of the State legislatures, and thus secure a majority in the Senate of the United States. In a word, it must, by the election of its candidates, either directly or indirectly, obtain control of both Houses of Congress. A condition of public sentiment, in the several States, rendering all this possible, would entirely supersede the necessity for the party, so far as these States are concerned, since the end could and would be gained by State action; and if such a condition did not exist, then the end could not be gained by such a party. The tug of war on this subject is to supply the necessary public sentiment; and this is not to be done, on a scale adequate to the result, by the organization of a National Prohibition party. Such a party may by its action defeat one party and give victory to another; but this will convert neither to the adoption of its principles, so long as such adoption will cost more in votes than it will gain.

If, moreover, we suppose this party to become strong enough to control both Houses of Congress, it would then be confronted with the fact that Congress has no power to establish Prohibition within the territorial domain of the States. The utmost that Congress can do is to legislate on this subject in the District of Columbia, in the Territories of the United States, and in places used for forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings belonging to the general government, and to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, and commerce with the Indian tribes, including commerce in intoxicating liquors. Congress, as the Constitution now is, has no power to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the several States, any more than it has to prohibit the manufacture and sale of bread in these States. It may, for the purpose of raising a revenue, impose a tax on the liquor business; but this, upon the very face of

the case, would not be Prohibition. To impose a tax so heavy as to make it absolutely prohibitory would be to defeat the constitutional end of the tax, and, without any warrant in the Constitution, to suppress a business allowed by State authority.

Far the greater part of the evil to be removed exists in the States, and hence beyond the legislative power of Congress. And if the public sentiment in the States were such as to secure a majority of the members of both Houses of Congress favorable to Prohibition, then, as already remarked, this sentiment would be abundantly able to establish Prohibition in the States by State action, without any legislation on the part of Congress, even if we suppose it true, as it is not, that Congress has power to enact a prohibitory law to operate in these States.

The only way in which Congress can be put in possession of such a power is by an amendment to the Constitution, giving it the power. If political Prohibitionists propose to secure this result, then they must elect a Congress that will by a two-thirds majority submit such an amendment to the legislatures of the several States, and must also gain such control over the State legislatures that three-fourths of them will ratify the amendment; or, if they do not adopt this method, then they must get two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States to ask Congress to call a Federal Convention to propose the amendment, and then get this Convention to adopt it, and then secure its ratification by conventions in three-fourths of the States. Is there any prospect that an effort to gain the result in either of these ways would be successful? Absolutely none whatever.

If the people of the several States were universally in favor of Prohibition they could and would establish it by State authority in these States, and would not seek to do it by Federal authority. To establish it by the latter authority would be to change the character of the General Government, and also that of the State governments, as much so as if Congress were authorized to pass laws in respect to all the rights of property in the several States, or in respect to all crimes committed in these States, or in respect to any other subject that is now properly regarded as a matter to be regulated by State authority. Whether intoxicating liquors shall be manufactured and sold in a given State is a question for that State to determine; and it cannot be determined by Congress without working a fundamental change in our system of Government. He who thinks that the requisite majority can ever be persuaded to sanction such a change in the "supreme law of the land," has passed beyond the reach of reason; and the attempt to reason with him would be labor lost.

These considerations show that the difficulties of the problem are not lessened or simplified, but rather increased, when it is proposed to create and perpetuate a Prohibition party that shall be national in

the scope of its action. The effort, however persistently made, can result in nothing but its own failure. Prohibition, as a third party movement, should not, at the very utmost, pass beyond the sphere of State politics; and, even here, the chances of its success are reduced to a minimum quantity. The conditions upon which it can succeed entirely dispense with its necessity as the means of that success. These conditions being given, the movement is not needed; and if not given, it is a failure.

I have, in this argument, purposely omitted to consider the question whether Prohibition can, in this country, be put into practice to such an extent that, by removing the facility for the use of intoxicating drinks, it would wholly or mainly remove the evils resulting therefrom. My object has been to show that, if this question be answered in the affirmative, the organization of a third party to attain the end, whether in National or State politics, is not a wise mode of action. Whether such a party shall be organized and supported or not is not at all a question of *principle*, but simply one of ways and means. I have never acted with any such party, and I do not expect to do so. I do not believe in its practical wisdom with reference to the end sought.

The political Prohibitionists, who form but a small fraction of the real friends of temperance in this country, have not, in my judgment, advanced their cause at all by their course at the recent election. They have indirectly helped the Democratic party into power, and, in so doing, they have done the very thing which the liquor interest desired to have done. The triumph of this party is not, in the light of its well known antecedents, to be regarded as a victory for Prohibition. Nor is the defeat of the Republican party, in part by the Prohibitionists, to be reckoned as such a victory. This party is not likely to be converted to Prohibition by any such process, especially when the conversion would be sure to secure its defeat. The political Prohibitionists are to-day a very small minority of the whole people of the United States, and a small minority of the whole people in each of the States; and I do not believe that their policy of organizing a third party will ever make them anything else. The reasons for this opinion I have stated in the preceding argument.

SYMPOSIUM ON PROHIBITION.

OUGHT PROHIBITION TO BE MADE A POLITICAL QUESTION? IF SO,
WITH WHAT LIMITATIONS?

NO. II.

BY I. K. FUNK, D.D.

THE Rev. Dr. Spear, in the able paper with which he opened this Symposium, justly observes that there is room in the country for but two great parties. The advocates of the National Prohibition party fully recognize this truth, and fully expect that their party will be one of the two. They believe it essential and wholly practicable to so push prohibition into politics as to make it the dominating political issue, until the liquor traffic is brought under control. Those who think this policy a wise one rest their belief chiefly on the following propositions:

1. The liquor traffic is a stupendous injury to society and to our Government, and is a portentous and continuous menace to both; responsible, according to Chief Justice Noah Davis,* for eighty per cent. of all crime; according to Premier Gladstone, for the infliction of more harm on man "than the three great historic scourges, war, famine and pestilence, combined;" according to the late eminent physician, Dr. Willard Parker,† for 35 per cent. of lunacy, 45 per cent. of idiocy, 75 to 90 per cent. of pauperism, and 10 per cent. of deaths; according to the *New York Tribune*, "this traffic lies at the centre of all political and social mischief, it paralyzes energies in every direction, it neutralizes educational agencies, it silences the voice of religion, it baffles penal reform, it obstructs political reform;" according to Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, so intimately connected is the traffic with crime in England—and the same is certainly true in almost equal degree in America—"If we could make England sober we would shut up nine-tenths of her prisons;" and according to the *London Times*, it is an evil of such vast and growing magnitude that "it may crush and ruin us all." Hence it is a question of importance sufficient to be the dom-

* *HOMILETIC REVIEW*, Jan. 1885, p. 25.

† Preface to Richardson's "Ten Lectures on Alcohol," p. 10.

inating and dividing issue in politics—other questions, however important, to take, for the time being, subordinate places; for the country settles only one great question at a time; and it is the dominating issue, not the subordinate ones, which, in a breaking-up of parties, exerts the determining influence in the recrystallization of voters. Other questions which have divided parties, as that of the National Bank and that of tariff, are, in comparison with the liquor question, of little moment; even the question of slavery, which crystallized the voters into two great opposing parties in 1856 and 1860, is dwarfed by this question. Drink is now reducing millions of negroes and whites to a far worse slavery than that which Lincoln's proclamation ended. Says Canon Farrar: "Important as great questions in English politics may be, such as the franchise and the land laws, they are matters absolutely infinitesimal compared with the urgency of the necessity of controlling and limiting with a strong hand this drink question."

2. The methods employed to stay this evil have proved insufficient. These methods have failed not only to bring this *monstrum horrendum* under control, but have proven wholly inadequate during these past thirty years, to prevent its constant and rapid increase, until now it has attained most alarming proportions, often defeating and electing candidates in municipal, state and national elections, and dictating political policies to both parties. Effort to turn back or even check the incoming tide of public opinion in favor of a National Prohibition party is labor lost, unless he who undertakes it clearly sets forth a remedy which will be manifestly adequate to meet the portentous and imminent danger against which this party is organized. It is to be regretted that the Rev. Dr. Spear, in his paper, did not think it worth while to suggest an adequate substitute for the one proposed by political prohibitionists.

3. License, low or high, is not an adequate substitute. License is greatly responsible for the present immense proportions of this evil. With the masses the knowledge that an evil is under the ban of the law is restraining and educative in a very high degree. Whatever may be the subtleties of our theories touching license, and the explanations which justify it with metaphysicians and philosophic statesmen, with the masses it comes within the scope of this logic: *that which the law permits is right, that which the law forbids is wrong.* Rev. Dr. Curry says license is "partial prohibition;" with the masses it is *partial permission*. As indulgences in the middle ages, license has debauched the public conscience. Houses of ill-fame are licensed in Paris, and bastards are nearly as numerous as children born in wedlock, nearly fifty per cent. of all births being bastards.* Dr. Herrick Johnson, after witnessing the effects of the high license law in Chicago, denounces the law as "a sham and a delusion," and Hon. John

* Von Ottingen's "Moral Statistik," 3rd ed., 1882. Bibliotheca Sacra for Jan. 1885.

B. Finch, to whom is attributed the suggestion for the high license law of Nebraska, the first in this country, regretfully says, "It was the greatest-mistake of my life." The resolution of the Nevada Liquor-Dealers' Association voices a sentiment which licenses everlastingly tend to create. They say :

"Resolved, That so long as our business is licensed by the United States, State and County, we consider it perfectly legitimate and honorable, and do not think we deserve the censure which is constantly being heaped upon us."

This logic is irresistible with the people. It is largely responsible for that undertow which for these many years, in spite of all our efforts, has been sweeping us farther and farther to sea. The editors of *The Voice* sent to all the mayors of Illinois questions regarding the effect of the high license law in that State. They have received 79 answers; 47 of these declare that the effect has been to decrease prohibition sentiment, 14 notice no change, and only 18 think that the law has tended to increase prohibition sentiment. So it appears that high license is actually a step from, instead of toward, prohibition. In a letter just to hand Dr. Herrick Johnson confirms this conclusion.

4. Local prohibition, whether by town, county or State, is necessarily defective, inasmuch as it cannot prevent the introduction of liquor from adjoining counties or states; it can prevent the manufacture, but cannot protect itself against inter-state commerce, nor is it practicable for it to do so. This defect can be remedied only by National prohibition, and this can be secured only through an amendment to the Federal Constitution. And this would greatly simplify the work necessary to suppress the liquor traffic. The government has already at hand the machinery which could, if proper authority is given, accomplish the work. The Internal Revenue system, which now places an officer in every brewery and distillery in the land to prevent the manufacture of "crooked" whiskey, could close, if so ordered, all breweries and distilleries; and the present Custom House machinery could take care of all importations from abroad. The government, with machinery similar to that with which it prevents the manufacture of "crooked" whiskey and the importation of smuggled goods, could prevent the manufacture and importation of liquor. This method of procedure would give prohibition a tremendous advantage in many ways.

5. So strong has the liquor power become with its enormous capital and its ramifications, and so thoroughly organized is it as a political power, that it is impossible to secure the rigid enforcement of prohibitory law by the dominant party, as parties are now constituted, even though the law is passed by a majority vote of the people (in Maine the vote was, last September, three to one in its favor, and yet, on the testimony of General Neal Dow, the dominant party most reluctantly enforces the law, because of threats of the

National Liquor Association against the party in doubtful States); the liquor power is able to defeat either party almost at its will, although it is greatly in the minority. That the minority can rule, Dr. Spear easily demonstrates (?) impossible; but an ounce of fact is worth a ton of logic. The liquor power has great advantages in other elements of strength, and these compensate for lack of votes; it has an unlimited supply of money, and this counts for very much; it is not troubled with conscientious scruples in the using of money to corrupt executive officers and legislators, and in this way often thwarts the will of the people. Then it is the *business* interest of liquor men to defeat the law, and hence they can be counted on to be *all* at it and *always* at it, and having the *negative* result to secure, the non-enforcement of the law, it is not strange, as the parties are now organized, that these men should come off victors almost every time, and this notwithstanding keen logical demonstrations that minorities cannot rule in this country.

6. By forcing the liquor question to the front as the dominating and dividing issue, and compelling a reorganization of the political parties at this dividing line, the whiskey men will be driven into one party. Their corrupting influence must then exhaust itself on that party. Hundreds of thousands of men who do not believe the drinking of liquor wrong, *per se*, and who now drink in moderation, will vote, when such a division of parties takes place, against a party dominated by the rum power. The majority of the people can be counted on to vote on the right side when that conflict comes, for it is comparatively seldom that prohibition is defeated when submitted to a popular vote, North or South. Here is the great advantage: when such an anti-whiskey party gains control, every politician in it will understand that he has nothing to fear or expect from the saloon; that his party is so organized that it will go down or up as the saloon goes up or down; and those mightiest of political forces, party spirit, party prejudice, party machinery, and what I may call party *inertia* (the inclination of one to stay in a party because he is in it, because it requires an effort and thought to make a change), will then be on the side of prohibitory law, and not against it, as now.

To these six considerations mainly is due the tremendous energy which is forcing the liquor question to the front as a party question.

The Rev. Dr. Curry, in the March number of the *Methodist Review*, says:

"This incoming flood is not the result of some temporary local storm, but of the rising tide of convictions that have come to possess the public mind. * * It is plain, too, that the force of these convictions has as yet only very partially expressed itself; and it is safe to anticipate that, instead of the present rippings of the waves, a mighty ground swell of awakened purposes will sweep over the land. The presence of this movement was manifested in the late general election chiefly

as a disturbing force, but quite sufficiently so, not only to indicate its existence, but also to suggest that it was backed by an unmeasured reserve of power. The votes cast for what was called the "Prohibition ticket" can, in no just sense, be taken as a measure of its extent and influence. The interests of the people were drawn away, with almost unprecedented intensity, to other issues, and uncounted thousands of the most determined Prohibitionists were saying, 'Not now; the contest for the presidency is now the great issue, and for the time being the paramount one.'

Never before in the last thirty years has there been as much liquor consumed in this country as to-day, and never before has the increase been so rapid as during the last five years. These two facts are indisputable. The past methods employed against this gigantic evil are not sufficient to cope successfully with it. Have we not a right to say this after thirty years of trial (the Republican party, which in the North is the more disposed toward temperance, being in power nearly all this time)? Who has the courage to assume the tremendous responsibility of continuing the trial another thirty years? During these years of experiment the liquor traffic has wasted a wealth which, with its ordinary increase, would equal the present total valuation of property of all kinds in America, so that had the traffic been ended thirty years ago, the time the Republican party was coming to the front, the nation's wealth to-day would be double what it now is; and who will estimate the wrecked lives, the ruined homes, the wretchedness here and hereafter, which have been wrought during these years by this deplorable traffic!

It is not a sufficient answer to say that the increase in the traffic would have been greater had not these methods been employed. That claim we readily admit. But if a deadly disease is eating toward the vitals it is not enough that the remedy employed *retards* the progress of the disease. No remedy that does not wholly check the onward march of the disease is sufficient.

It must not be thought that the advocates of the political method would substitute their method for those already employed, as the pledge, moral suasion, gospel temperance, education, county and state prohibitory laws, etc. They wish to *supplement* these methods, not to set them aside. They would have those methods worked, if possible, a hundred-fold more enthusiastically and efficiently than ever, nor do they forget their indebtedness to these methods. Had they not prepared the way the political methods would not now be possible.

The series of tables published in *The Voice* during the last few months leave no room for reasonable doubt that the consumption of liquor has greatly increased during the last thirty years, and, more startling still, that the rate of this increase is being accelerated year by year. Dr. Dorchester, in his late book,* says that since 1850 there has been a great increase—much greater than appears in the official

* "The Liquor Problem in all Ages," pp. 613-16.

government figures; for the government makes no note of the vast expansion of distilled liquors by adulteration since the imposition of a heavy tax in 1863, this tax having made the art of adulteration most profitable. Thirty years ago the consumption of beer was about two gallons per inhabitant; last year it was over *ten* gallons for every man, woman and child in the land; and at the same time there has been an increase *per capita* in the consumption, as a beverage, of distilled liquors (whisky, brandy, gin, etc.).

The increase of foreigners and the drinking habits of the negroes are elements which help to swell this increase; but that which remains to be accounted for is exceedingly large, as is easily demonstrated.

A notable fact is that this stupendous increase in the consumption of liquor is not confined to America. It seems to mark this era of our civilization. In Berlin the *whiskey* saloons are increasing threefold more rapidly than the population; the beer saloons are also increasing, but less rapidly. So is it in Switzerland, in France, and throughout Europe. Beer and wine are but developing the appetite for whiskey and brandy. Crime of every kind is increasing with startling rapidity, and this is attributed to the great increase in the consumption of liquors. European statesmen are becoming profoundly alarmed.

Every civilization has had its great mastering evil, growing upon it as a parasite, and in the entire past history of the world this nourished evil has destroyed the civilization that fed it, and has thrown the world back toward barbarism. Alcoholic mastery is the evil our present European and American civilization is developing with an ever-increasing rapidity; we must find the way to end it, or it will end us.

The conservative London *Times* is constrained to cry out:

"Drinking baffles us, confounds us, shames us, and mocks us at every point. It outwits alike the teacher, the man of business, the patriot and the legislator. . . . Let us do something towards staying the huge mischief which, one way or another, confounds us all and may—for we cannot be sure—crush and ruin us all."

And says Carron Farrar, who certainly is no fanatic:

"It has come to this, England must in this matter mend her ways; she must get rid of this curse and crime, or she must ultimately perish."

These solemn words are as true of America as they are of England.

The remedy with which the advocates of party prohibition propose to *supplement* past methods is: *National Prohibition through an amendment to the Federal Constitution, backed by a successful National Prohibition Party.*

Against this policy many objections are presented with consummate skill by the Rev. Dr. Spear in his opening paper. Let us carefully examine these objections:

"Whether intoxicating liquors shall be manufactured and sold in a given State is a question for that State to determine; it cannot be determined by Congress without a fundamental change in our system of government."

No amendment to the Federal Constitution can be secured except by the consent of three-fourths of the States. Surely, if the States discover that the National Government can accomplish a work vitally important to the welfare of the *whole* people, and also discover that the States cannot accomplish this work in their individual capacity, the wise thing for the States to do is to have the central government do this work. That is what the central government is for—to do that which the States cannot do independently. If the good of the people requires it, and the people say Yes, how is it going to change fundamentally a government that is *by* the people and *for* the people? The “fundamental” idea of the American government is that the government is made for the people, and not the people for it. This objection is not a new one. Dr. Spear will remember the yeoman service it did thirty, forty years ago. We were told (the Doctor will remember how it was dinned into our ears) that whether there shall be slaves or no slaves in a given State was a question for the State to determine; for the central government to determine it would be to change fundamentally our system of government. But slavery *was* abolished by the central government, and slavery *is* made impossible to-day in every State, by Federal instead of by State law, and yet our system of government survives. Even an amendment to the Federal constitution has been adopted which compels Broadway stages, San Francisco hotels, Philadelphia theatres, and so on all through the land, to admit negroes! Our system of government also stood that shock. It cannot be that it will now be wrenched from its foundations, if, at the command of three-fourths of the States, the National government brings the manufacture and importation of liquor under its control.

This national policy, we are told, is *impracticable*, because it cannot secure the needed majority in its favor. To amend the Federal Constitution will take a two-thirds vote of Congress and the subsequent majority consent of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. Dr. Spear dismisses this point with considerable emphasis:

“He who thinks that the requisite majority can ever be persuaded to sanction such a change in the supreme law of the land has passed beyond the reach of reason, and the attempt to reason with him would be labor lost.”

That ought to settle the question. The learned writer enters the temple of all truth and slams the door with such a vim as to take all heart out of one who thought the truth lay in quite the other direction. But may not such an one venture to intimate what he would have said had not this *ipse dixit* put him out of court? If there is anything in the objection, beyond what we have already answered, it means that it is impossible to get a majority of the people in three-fourths of the States to favor prohibition. The majority in three-fourths of the States will give us a majority of three-fourths of the legislatures, and with such a majority in the States, of course

the requisite two-thirds in Congress would be secured. Surely our learned opponent will admit that much. So the problem resolves itself to this: Is it madness to suppose that a majority of the voters in three-fourths of the States can be secured to the side of prohibition? Let us see if this expectation is without reason. In one way or another, and at one time or another, the people, either by direct vote or by a majority vote of their State legislators (who are never apt on questions of this kind to go ahead of the people), have voted in favor of prohibition: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Indiana, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota,* Kansas, Delaware, Texas and South Carolina, three-fourths of Georgia, nearly all of Mississippi, a large proportion of Florida, North Carolina, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, West Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, New Jersey, Alabama, Illinois and Wisconsin. In all, nearly, if not quite, three-fourths of the people of the United States have already voted, at one time or another, for prohibition. To secure an amendment to the Federal Constitution we will need a majority vote in twenty-eight States. With a clear policy, and a union of the friends of temperance on this line, and the agitation which the cause is worthy of, surely it is not so absurd a thing as the Doctor would lead us to believe, to think that an enthusiasm can be awakened which will sweep the country from Maine to California. Look at Canada. The General Government has taken the question of prohibition in hand and submitted it to the vote of the people by districts. Great majorities are rolling up almost everywhere. So far in but four counties has prohibition been defeated; and there is every reason to believe that at no distant date the liquor traffic in Canada will be destroyed wholly by the action of the General Government. The question of prohibition possesses all of the elements essential to kindle an irresistible moral and religious enthusiasm. Unless the signs are very misleading, never before were all things so favorable for a great temperance awakening. And here it is well to bear in mind that an aroused public sentiment which will place prohibition in the Federal Constitution, will have accomplished a work that cannot be undone when the tide of enthusiasm is at its ebb. That wheel has a ratchet that the liquor power will never be able to break or lift.

A third objection is that the national movement is impracticable because this question cannot be pushed to the front so as to compel a division of parties at the whiskey line. Dr. Spear in presenting this objection thinks it necessary to remind party prohibitionists that a new party cannot succeed as a *minority* party; that it must get a majority of votes before it can carry an election. Artemus Ward used to tell in a most amusing way, how, when he was young, a man of learn-

*Prohibition of Spiritous Liquors but not of Malt.

ing and dignity once said to him: "Young man, you have your future all before you." "Until then," the witty Artemus would remark in droll way that never failed to bring down the house, "I thought my future was *behind* me." If it were not so amusing it would be humiliating to prohibitionists to discover that so able a thinker and close observer as the Rev. Dr. Spear deems it necessary to solemnly warn them that they must be able to carry an election before they can elect. The following extracts present the Doctor's main point:

"The majority of the people can always get all they want, through one or the other of the existing parties, by simply voting it into power. These parties are constantly watching public sentiment, and, from time to time, adopting new principles, or measures in accordance with its supposed demands. Their plan is not to lag behind this sentiment or go contrary to it; and neither proposes to disband or commit suicide, in order to make room for a third party."

"Such a party can give no legal expression to its views until it gets itself into power, and this it cannot do until the majority of the voters shall adopt its views; and when, if ever, this becomes a fact, the party will be wholly unnecessary to attain the result. Let public sentiment move up to the mark of Prohibition and there will be no difficulty in obtaining it through the existing parties."

"They [Prohibitionists] cannot vote themselves into power until they get the necessary popular opinion on their side. . . The opinion being given such a party is not needed."

"If they are successful in leading the people generally to adopt their views, the end they desire will be gained without organizing a third party for that purpose. The existing political parties, assumed to be opposed to Prohibition, will, upon this supposition, change their attitude; and either, if placed in power, will give to the principle the sanction and force of law. No new party is needed when public sentiment demands a prohibitory law, and, in the absence of such a sentiment, no new party can secure the result."

"The conditions upon which it can succeed entirely dispense with its necessity as the means of that success. These conditions being given, the movement is not needed; and if not given it is a failure."

Over and over again with wonderful tact this argument is brought to view: a new party cannot come to the front until it secures a controlling public sentiment on its side; but the very existence of this sentiment will render the party unnecessary, for one of the existing parties will be quick to adopt as its own the principle demanded. Never did a juggler handle his balls with more consummate skill than does this accomplished dialectician this argument all through his paper. The advocate of political prohibition is tossed from one horn of the dilemma to the other with a bewildering rapidity.

The argument is plausible, but not sound:

1. It is true only in a degree, that: "The way a people vote tells the story as to what they think." It tells the story rather of what the party manipulators wish. In the argument no account is made of those tremendous elements of the strength of a party: party machinery, party spirit, party prejudice and party *inertia*. Nine in ten of Democrats would vote for the Democratic party if its principles were reversed; and the same is true, in a less degree, of Republicans. After a

party has been in existence for some years the attachment of its adherents, could this attachment be resolved into its component parts, would be expressed by something like the following formula:

Party machinery and "spoils" 3 parts; party spirit and prejudice 2 parts; party inertia 4 parts; principle 1 part.

To pit a principle against parties and leave the party organizations untouched, as Dr. Spear would have us do, would be to give the opposing principle the tremendous advantages of party machinery, and of the spirit, prejudice and the *inertia* of party. This is precisely what the friends of Prohibition have been doing for these many years, and the result is what we have seen.

This was the difficulty which the anti-slavery men encountered in the 'fifties.

Horace Greeley* in 1854 wrote:

"It has long been our belief that a thorough dispersion of parties, with an obliteration and disuse of all their machinery, watchwords and discipline, as often as once in twelve years, if not at the close of each Presidential contest, would be a public blessing. We have witnessed such baleful results of blind partisan bigotry—of unreasoning devotion to this or that party standard because of the name thereon inscribed—of dishonest practising on this fanaticism, in the confident belief that the great body of the party will swallow anything that bears the approved label—that we should be perplexed, if required to say whether party spirit has done more good or evil."

It is exceedingly instructive to remember that although public sentiment was becoming in the North overwhelmingly anti-slavery, yet up to the very breaking of the old parties in the 'fifties these parties became more and more pro-slavery. They did not reflect at all the growing sentiment. On the contrary, with their expiring energy, they enacted the most obnoxious of all pro-slavery measures, as the Fugitive Slave Law, the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and made possible the Dred Scott Decision. Again an ounce of fact is worth a ton of logic. The anti-slavery principle had no chance to be heard until the Whig party (the party "more likely to sympathize with" abolition) was smashed, and party spirit and machinery got out of the way.

But we are told by Dr. Spear:

"The creating of a new political party has never succeeded, even once, in the whole history of this government. The Republican party of to-day is not an example of such creation. This party, formally organized in 1856, was not a new party contending for the mastery against two other parties in the field, and finally conquering both, but was simply the old Whig party under a new name, with elements of strength derived from the Liberty party and also the Democratic party, while some of the Whig elements, especially in the Southern States, went into the latter party. The Whig party gave place to the Republican party and was merged into it, and, with added elements, took a new name. Such are the facts in the case."

What besides these four elements constitutes a party—(1) name, (2) party machinery, (3) dominating principle, (4) membership? The

* *N. Y. Tribune*, July 18, 1854.

Republican party had a new name, brand new party machinery, and, for its dominating principle, hostility to slavery, denouncing it as a "relic of barbarism," while the Whig party was pro-slavery. As to membership, in 1840 the Whig party polled a majority of all votes cast in the Southern States. There was its great strength, under the leadership of Henry Clay. In 1860 the Republican party had practically no vote in the South. The Doctor must admit the "some" to whom he refers was quite large in the South. In 1852, in the North, the Whig party polled 1,012,864 votes; the Republican party in 1860 polled, in the North, 1,866,452. Where did this vast increase come from? Multitudes of Whigs in the North went into the Democratic party, and multitudes of Democrats, following the lead of such men as Salmon P. Chase, went into the Republican party. With name, party machinery, dominating principle and membership changed, surely the Republican party was a new party. If it was the old Whig party, it must have been after the manner the revolutionary gun of the old hero was the same old gun, although it had a new barrel, new breech, new stock, ramrod and hammer. "Well," persisted the old hero, "the touch-hole is the same."

Let the National Prohibition party be as much of a new party as was the Republican, and its advocates need ask for no more. Let it have a name different from either of the old parties; for its dominating principle, hostility to the liquor traffic; new party machinery; and then give it as large a proportion of the intelligent voters of the South as left the Whig party and went into the Democratic party—that is, a majority of the whole Southern vote—and let there be an abandonment of the old parties for the new in the North equal to what there was of the Whig and Democratic parties for the new Republican party, and then give it, to make the parallel complete, victory in 1888, as had the Republican party in 1860—give it all this, and then Prohibitionists will not be very apt to care if some learned successor to the Rev. Dr. Spear in 1915 writes, in a Symposium to THE HOMILETIC REVIEW of that date, to prove that *the National Prohibition party*, which, then, for a quarter of a century had been in control of the Government, was *not* a new party; that a new party "has never succeeded even once," and from the very nature of the case *cannot* succeed. Horace Greeley declared that the "Whig party was not only defeated, but overwhelmed;" and Smalley, in his history of the Republican party, speaking of the defeat in 1852, says "the disaster to the Whigs was so overwhelming that it *killed* their party." Dr. Spear says the Whig party simply "took a new name." The facts are with Greeley and Smalley.

Again:

"Prohibition, as a third party movement, should not, at the very utmost, pass beyond the sphere of State politics."

The aim is to make prohibition a *first* party movement. A political party which "should not, at the very utmost, pass beyond the sphere of State politics" is an absurdity. The creating of such a party "has never succeeded even once in the whole history of the government"—and for obvious reasons.

It is asked, why not adopt "the strategy of what is called the rum power"—the Prohibitionists, instead of forming an independent party, to ally themselves with the party (in the North the Republican) "that is most likely to sympathize with their views?" Much of what I have said already will apply in answer to this question. This has been the policy of Prohibitionists for thirty years, and it has signally failed, and must continually fail. There is to-day less territory in the North under prohibition than when the Republican party came into power. In 1863, the first year of the Internal Revenue tax, 62,000,000 of gallons of beer were consumed; in '84 this amount had increased to the enormous quantity of 588,000,000; during the same time the use of whiskey as a beverage greatly increased *per capita*. True the Republican party submitted Prohibition to a popular vote in Iowa and Kansas; it is also true that the same party repealed prohibition in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and Michigan. Gen. Neal Dow reveals the reason for this in his recent letter, in which he announced his intention of hereafter identifying himself with the Prohibition party. He says that, although the people in Maine last fall voted three to one in favor of prohibition, the Republican party fears to enforce the law because of the effect this enforcement will have on the whiskey vote in doubtful Republican States. History repeats itself. Salmon P. Chase, in a speech in Oberlin, in 1850, said:

"You ask me why we need an Abolition party; is not the Whig party sufficiently abolition? The Whig party can't oppose slavery, because that party needs the votes of the border States in order to carry elections."

Besides, it is impossible to rally Prohibitionists, North and South, under either the Republican or Democratic banner.

A movement of this kind, we are reminded, is likely to help the party least favorable to the temperance cause; that it so resulted last fall. This evil is temporary, and is unavoidable in any movement to bring to the front a new party. Dr. Spear will call to mind that this result followed the Liberty party and probably defeated Clay in '44. And yet, if there had been no Liberty party there would be to-day no Republican party. Can the Doctor suggest to Prohibitionists a solution of this problem: How may a man work into a new building the materials of his old building, and occupy the old one until the new one is complete? *The N. Y. Independent*, a paper with which Dr. Spear is connected, contained, last fall, in defence of the attitude of Prohibitionists, the following, which seems to be a very pat answer to the Doctor's objection: "You cannot make an omelet without break-

ing some eggs." The whole question is, is the omelet worth the egg breaking?

The Doctor further urges :

"A condition of public sentiment, in the several States, rendering the amendment of the Federal Constitution possible, would entirely supersede the necessity for the party, so far as these States are concerned, since the end could and would be gained by State action."

The need of a Prohibition party is not so much to secure the *enactment* of prohibitory laws (a comparatively easy task), but to secure their enforcement. Besides, "these States" would not be protected against importation from a non-prohibition State. If all the States in the Union save one were to adopt State prohibitory laws, in that one State sufficient liquor could be manufactured to supply all of the States, and no State could prevent its shipment across its borders. If prohibition could be secured in *all* the States by separate State action (certainly a much more difficult task than amending the Federal Constitution), the liquor men by concentrating their power on a single small State would be able easily to compromise Prohibition in all the States. This defect can be met only by Federal action.

Finally, it is objected that the Prohibition party has but a single principle. The answer is, this country settles but one great question at a time. This question becomes for the time being the controlling one, other questions taking subordinate places in the platform of the opposing parties, and having little to do with the determination of voters. It is somewhat surprising that this should occur as an objection to so staunch a Republican as the Rev. Dr. Spear, for, over and over again, his own party, in its early history, had to meet it. He will permit me to quote in answer from the celebrated Rochester speech of William H. Seward in 1858:

"The secret of the Republican party's assured success lies in the very characteristic which, in the mouth of scoffers, constitutes its great and lasting imbecility and reproach. It lies in the fact that it is a party of one idea; but that idea is a noble one, an idea that fills and expands all generous souls."

To push to the front a national party which has prohibition as its dominating issue, and to secure a prohibitory amendment to the Federal constitution, we are reminded, will prove a herculean task. We believe the task a wholly practicable one. But what though it proves herculean? The good results of the combined labors of Hercules were as a drop to the ocean compared with what would follow the suppression of the liquor traffic. The Christian heroism of this age and nation is capable of more than a herculean effort.

best authors. The essay which gives the chief title to this book is a shrewd valuation of George Eliot's poetical genius. It consists of a dozen pages, with as much substance in them as some writers of reputation would spread over thrice the space. The succeeding paper on "Reciprocity," or the need of interchanging affections and thoughts, is a still more remarkable example of compression and suggestiveness. "Altruistic Faith"—a plea in behalf of living for others, with Mahomet's first wife as the example—is better than a great many of the average pulpit sermons. "History," "Charlemagne," "Old Rome and New France," "Chivalry," "Jean of Arc," etc., form a group of subjects upon which Miss Cleveland has bestowed much thought; and her treatment of them, while it may provoke dissent from some sources, must be admitted to be novel and impressive. The whole effect of the volume is to create a desire to hear again from a lady who speaks so frankly and well. Funk & Wagnalls have published these essays in a handy form."

THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE says:

"Miss Cleveland has a style which may fairly be called her own and though it is plainly composite, impassionable, receptive, yet there is an individualism which frees her from the suspicion of imitation. The style is bright, flexible, often florid, but lucid. It has also much nervous force, and her thoughts are expressed in appropriate language and with gracefulness. In short she writes pleasantly, clearly, and with a profusion of ornamentation which adds color and light to her essays. Few who read will be wearied by them."

THE COURIER-JOURNAL, LOUISVILLE, says:

"This lady is undoubtedly a woman of convictions and intellect. She is a representative American working woman. Her life has been devoted to practical employments and studies contemporary with the wonderful progress made by the women of the Nineteenth century toward emancipation. Though a doctrinaire, Miss Cleveland is no amateur, and precisely at that point where her mind and character may be said to have reached their best maturity is she transferred from the school room to the White House. She finds herself by magic, as it were, taken out of the obscurity of an earnest, but comparatively voiceless pursuit of duty and belief, and given a commanding eminence and conspicuousness. She loses no time in improving the opportunity thus offered. With a courage which can have been born only of the sublimest faith (for what need has she to go further if glory or vanity whisper their allurements into her ear) she proposes to convert the Executive Mansion into a lecture platform, and to make the nation her audience. She is right as she is brave, and from the glimpses we have had of her work, we do not believe that she, or any one, will have cause to regret that she cannot be content with the attained, but as far as the general public is advised, the unearned position of the first lady of the land. Her refusal to accept this great social distinction as the ultima thule of feminine ambition gives her a claim to the homage of her countrymen, and adds a new dignity to womanhood. To be sure, her book must stand or fall by its merits, but whatever its fate may be, all honor to the Christian hero which called it into being, and the pincky spirit which gives it to the world."

THE NEW YORK HERALD says:

"This is a book which, from the high position occupied by its author, will naturally excite curiosity and attention. It is a very creditable production, indeed. Miss Cleveland's style is attractive. She is a lady of much culture and evidently of wide reading. . . . The book is printed well, and is launched in a manner highly creditable to the publishers."

THE NEW YORK MORNING JOURNAL says:

"No book of recent times has created such wide-spread interest and comment in advance of its publication as that of Miss Rose Elizabeth Cleveland's maiden venture in the field of literature. The author is a remarkably bright woman, gifted with a lively imagination and originality of thought and expression."

JOAQUIN MILLER says:

"I congratulate the publishers, the country and Miss Cleveland. This is the best and bravest expression for poetry and religion together that America has yet produced."

THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE says:

"Miss Cleveland is a highly educated, thoughtful woman, just a little bit of an *esprit fort*, but not in the least a bine-stocking. Her book is sure to be very interesting. Miss Cleveland is a type of robust American womanhood, with feelings akin to those of the rest of her countrywomen. She has a broad, generous heart."

THE INDIANAPOLIS SENTINEL says:

"Miss Cleveland belongs to the *literati*. Her exceeding great earnestness alone will secure for the book the widest possible circulation."

THE ALBANY (N. Y.) EVENING JOURNAL says:

"In all frankness we say that an examination of Miss Cleveland's book convinces us of what we at first assumed, that she is a woman of talent and much practical sense; that she has worked hard on her essays and has grasped a good opportunity of introducing them to the public, under the most favorable circumstances."

FUNK & WAGNALLS, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey St., New York.

"THE VOICE."

Men who Dispute its Political Views, Think it Invaluable as a Temperance Educator.

Published every Thursday. Sample copy, 3 cents [2d.]; per Year, \$1.00 [4s.].

Hon. NEAL DOW says:

We have had no such temperance paper before in all the years of work for the temperance cause.

HON. NEAL DOW.

Dr. CHARLES F. DEEMS says:

THE VOICE is the ablest temperance paper in America.

CHARLES F. DEEMS, D.D., LL.D.

Pres. J. H. SEELYE says:

THE VOICE is invaluable for the proper understanding of the current temperance movement.

J. H. SEELYE, D.D., Pres. Amherst College.

Ex-Pres. MARK HOPKINS' Testimony:

Though I do not believe in the political views advocated in THE VOICE, yet I have subscribed for it and wish it success, because I believe in the freest discussion, and I regard it as an earnest and able advocate of the temperance cause.

MARK HOPKINS.

Williams College, June 11, 1885.

Judge NOAH DAVIS bears testimony to its great merits:

I have been a reader of THE VOICE for many months, and though I do not concur in the wisdom of the political views it advocates, I wish to bear testimony to its great merits as a temperance newspaper. It is conducted with remarkable energy and ability, and its weekly collations of statistical information bearing upon the evils of intemperance as they affect the morality, the economics, and the general well-being of society, have never been surpassed.

You are deserving of great credit for the service THE VOICE renders to the general cause of temperance.

NOAH DAVIS.

New York City, June 12.

Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT, says:

THE VOICE is a very valuable mine of information.

LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D.

Editor *Christian Union*.

Cornwall-on-Hudson, April 28, 1885.

Dr. DANIEL CURRY'S Estimate:

THE VOICE is a thorough outspoken advocate of Prohibition. It is also in favor of political action for accomplishing its work, independent of existing parties, respecting those points temperance advocates are divided. It is well that both sides should be heard, and I know of no better authority for the *Third Party* than THE VOICE.

DANIEL CURRY, D.D., Ed. *Methodist Review*.

New York, June 12, 1885.

Dr. LEONARD BACON says:

I recognize the vigor with which THE VOICE is conducted, and the many indications of a spirit of fairness, which add value to its sentiments.

LEONARD W. BACON, D.D.

Philadelphia, June 11, 1885.

AXEL GUSTAFSON'S Hearty Estimate:

[Gustafson is the author of that greatest of temperance books "The Foundation of Death."]

Last night I received your campaign circular, and there saw that you had inserted my estimate of THE VOICE. At the time I wrote that estimate it was quite true, but is so no longer, for THE VOICE is not now on "the way to become"—it is the leading temperance journal of the world. I have now studied over four thousand books and pamphlets, in some eight languages, and have read, more or less faithfully, most of the periodical literature of the past on this subject (the drink question), and as I follow it up by examining the current publications on it in six languages, I cannot help feeling that I am warranted in pronouncing authoritatively upon this question, and it is upon these grounds that I feel conscientiously compelled to declare that THE VOICE is by far the ablest agitator of the drink question that has ever been published. I have written this to you because it is your due, and I am glad to pay such dues. Even during the fete at Gazeley Court I spoke my mind about THE VOICE to scores of people of influence, just as I have spoken it here, and gave the address of your journal to a great number.

AXEL GUSTAFSON.

London, England, July 27.

JOSEPH COOK says:

THE VOICE is decisive and incisive.

JOSEPH COOK.

Boston, Mass, Aug. 15, 1885.

Dr. J. M. LUDLOW'S hearty words:

I most heartily appreciate THE VOICE for the courage, intellectual vigor, and practical tact with which it is edited and managed. However one may differ with you regarding Prohibition, the entire community is indebted to you for the fair and manly way in which you advocate it. The temperance ammunition supplied by the statistics and arguments which appear in its columns is invaluable to every work in the cause.

JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D.

Brooklyn, June 12, 1885.

GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS says:

THE VOICE is a well edited temperance journal, advocating vigorously the principles of the Prohibition party, and is well supplied with temperance statistics.

GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS,

Editor *Harper's Weekly*.

New Brighton, N. Y., June 13, 1885.

Dr. HOWARD CROSBY'S wish:

While I am neither a Prohibitionist nor a total abstinence man, I am glad THE VOICE speaks out against the enormities of the liquor traffic, and I wish it God-speed.

HOWARD CROSBY.

New York, June 11, 1885.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 279 726 2