

bauching legislatures and robbing our citizens of the results of their labors at the ballot box, making a government of the people, by the people, for the people a farcical phrase, while King Alcohol sits enthroned in the legislative hall.

As a citizen I note that it is alcohol which fills our prisons, whether taken in the form of a stronger beverage as whisky or beer as a representative of the milder beverages.

It is at the bottom of most crime—domestic infelicity, poverty, seductions, murders; it is allied to all that is evil and destructive of the high aims of civilization.

Those are interesting experiments cited by the Rosanoffs and adverted to by President Eliot of Harvard in his paragraphs in the Ladies' Home Journal (March, 1909), where the typesetters were tested with type-written copy under moderate drinking and after abstinence, when it was found that while they often thought they were doing more work under the influence of the drug in reality they were doing far less. It is evident from these experiments that a liquor-imbibing nation assumes a heavy handicap in the race for industrial supremacy.

The Brewers' and Distillers' Plea for Moderation Silly.

I hear the makers of alcohol, at last roused by the prohibition wave, crying out that they stand for its moderate, not for its immoderate, use.

In reply to this I answer that if they make it and sell it the use is practically beyond their control, and that their plausible declarations are as light as the paper on which they are written, and can in no way affect its use, whether moderate or immoderate. I further inquire why these gentlemen have been so long in reaching this benevolent conclusion. I declare that I believe their contention and their expressed desires are specious and false, and, further, I aver that, judging by such scientific evidence as we now have, there is no such thing as a moderate use of alcohol.

An Atrocious Insult to Civilized Life.

Cardinal Manning said for the Roman Catholic Church:

I impeach the liquor traffic of high crimes and misdemeanors. It is mere mockery to ask us to put down drunkenness by moral and religious means alone.

I often wish this great church, with her unexampled control over great masses of our citizens, would speak out more in public about this and all the mighty moral issues which are stirring us to-day.

We sadly want authoritative utterances from this source from the hierarchy.

The public opinion of the day is thus well set forth in the New York Tribune:

Upon what does the liquor traffic depend? Upon debased manhood, wronged womanhood, and defrauded childhood. It holds a mortgage over every cradle, a deed written in the heart's blood over every human life.

My associate, Doctor Burnam, but a few days ago returning from Kentucky, sitting in the Pullman car with a number of traveling salesmen, was deeply interested on noting the changed attitude of this observant class of men toward this great problem. In the first place they themselves had no thought of drinking, while they were eagerly engaged in discussing the effects of the recent change in the laws of the State of Ohio, and the prospective changes of a still more drastic nature, to do away not only with the sale but with the manufacture of alcoholic beverages as well. These gentlemen stated that in their own personal experiences, representing a diversity of interests, they had noted the greatest improvement in the tone of the communities they visited. One man remarked:

I used to see men coming to town to get drunk every Saturday night, and now, since the local-option law, these same men come in Saturday afternoon driving their wives and children in a wagon and buying the various necessities of life.

Am I My Brother's Keeper?

That which is by many considered the greatest movement in modern times, namely, altruism, is foreshadowed in the writings of Moses in Genesis 3, where Cain impudently asks, "Am I my brother's keeper?" As a result of this attitude we see him driven out crying, "My punishment is greater than I can bear."

He who confesses that he is his brother's keeper will let alcohol alone and will fight it as the deadliest peril that has ever threatened to engulf our race.

This is the age of great professions of altruism. A true altruism will indignantly reject as a beverage to be taken for pleasure that which can only be had at such an enormous percentage in the destruction of life and morals.

Finally, let me add that were this whole community to adopt at once the will of this assembly and to sweep alcohol from the land I would have no hope of any permanent betterment, unless with the movement there went that dependence on God through Christ to whom the Christian looks for all that is good and transforming and effective in his life. A real moral principle is transforming in its efficacy; mere repression is not transformation. Transformation is wrought in the soul when it stands consciously before God with the desire of seeing sin and dealing with it according to His will.

The Army Canteen

In an article in The Continent of December 7, under the caption, "The Truth About the Beerless Canteen," Colonel L. Mervin Maus makes this emphatic statement:

Practically all of the crime committed in the army, directly or indirectly, can be traced to the effects of alcohol. Murders, robberies, desertions, courts-martial and dismissal of officers, prison and guardhouse sentences of enlisted men, fights, brawls, broken friendships, misery, wretchedness and moral degeneracy should generally be ascribed to the use of intoxicants.

As touching the health of the soldiers with reference to the beer in the canteen, Colonel Maus gives the following facts as shown by official statistics:

Decrease in Sickness from Alcohol.

The rate of admission to sick report for alcoholism from 1885 to 1900 was 41 per 1,000; from 1901 to 1910 it was only 26 per 1,000. These figures will, no doubt, prove a surprise to the beer advocates who claim that intemperance has been so much greater in the army since the prohibition act. From 1901 to 1910, during the prohibition of intoxicating drinks in the canteen, the rate of alcoholic admission per thousand was 40 per cent less than from 1885 to 1898, and 16 per cent less than from 1890 to 1900, during which two latter periods the beer canteen was in operation in army posts. When we consider the character of service from 1901 to 1910 as compared with that from 1885 to 1900, the alcoholic rate from 1901 would naturally have been much larger—if the anti-beer policy had not intervened to reduce it.

So far we have found nothing to lead any fair-minded person to conclude that the absence of beer from the canteen has increased the admission to sick report, the ratio of constant sick or rate of alcoholism.