

ruin." In support of this Mr. PABST—whose business, be it remembered, is providing this temptation—arrays a mass of misrepresentations, fallacies and nonsequiturs, the most of which are decades, if not ages, old and have been refuted and disproved over and over again during the past half-century of discussion. Much of the matter which he presents as argument is so utterly puerile that the intelligent reader wonders why a reputable editor should admit it to his columns.

The significant feature of Mr. PABST's article is not its matter but its authorship, the fact that the man who writes it is himself at the head of a great brewing company; that the temptation which he professes to believe the public needs is enormously profitable to Mr. PABST; that Mr. PABST represents an organized traffic which has never hesitated to be a partner in any infamy or to violate any opposing law or to trample upon the will of the people when it has been possible to make money by so doing, and which continues its infamous course even to the present hour, while its fuglemen are prating of "reform."

Further, it must not be forgotten that the magazine in which these articles appear, and the HEARST papers whose editorials are being extensively used to advertise Mr. PABST's article, are controlled by a corporation—more properly by an incorporated egotism—to which the liquor interests pay every year many thousand dollars for *undisguised* advertising.

The only commendable feature of the *Cosmopolitan's* exhibit is the article by Dr. ALEXANDER ALISON, the secretary of the National Temperance Society. But Dr. ALISON's article is not what the *Cosmopolitan* presents it for, "The Argument for Prohibition Legislation"; rather is it an elaborate and excellent argument for total abstinence.

Thus far the *Cosmopolitan's* whole discussion of the question seems to have been based upon a complete misapprehension of the position of the Prohibitionists. Mr. BRISBANE, who may be assumed to be the directing genius of the symposium, has made the error of supposing that the Prohibition movement has to do with a something which he calls a "natural appetite" of the race for alcoholic stimulants. If the Prohibition movement has any relation to any such thing, it is exceedingly remote. The natural appetite of the race for alcohol needs just about as much attention as the natural appetite of the race for strychnin. In point of fact, a *natural* appetite does not exist in either case. There are in the human constituency weak elements that are susceptible to the action of the various kinds of poisons. Strychnin will kill quickly; alcohol will form a habit that debauches and kills slowly. If people had strychnin thrust upon them in attractive places existing only for its sale, mendaciously advertised before their eyes constantly, falsely recommended by physicians and praised by singer and poet, and its manufacturers and their commercial and political allies were interested in perpetuating and booming the traffic in strychnin, we should hear about the "natural" appetite for that poison.

The evil of the traffic in alcohol lies in the fact that it does exploit the human weakness which responds to the alcoholic poison. It creates the "appetite"; it fosters it into an overmastering habit; it feeds itself upon it to the degradation and ruin of the individual victim and to the peril of society and the state.

Prohibition is the act of organized society recognizing its duty toward the unfortunate victim of alcoholic poison and its own right of self-protection. To prove the validity of the right of society to prohibit the liquor traffic, it is not necessary to demonstrate that alcohol is wholly useless or that total abstinence from alcoholic

drinks is an essential to physical health or that occasional drinking is a sin.

When it was discovered in New York that the sale of skimmed milk presented an opportunity for fraud, imposition and the inflicting of injury, it was not thought necessary to prove that skimmed milk is essentially harmful, before, upon the broad general principle of public welfare, its sale was completely and totally prohibited by law.

More than a thousand years of human history conclusively have demonstrated in most practical fashion, wholly apart from the scientific and moral minutiae of the question, that the traffic in intoxicating liquors is productive of innumerable and unspeakable public and private mischiefs, and this, not because of removable conditions or circumstances or surroundings, but because of the essential character of the stuff that is dealt in.

The conclusive argument of this experience is the Prohibition of the traffic. To that position practically every thinking mind has come, the reformer presenting it as the indispensable agency for accomplishing the needed reform; the liquor manufacturer and dealer recognizing it as the inevitable.

THE WOES OF KALAMAZOO

Beware of Kalamazoo, Michigan! Buy no ticket to Kalamazoo! Refuse goods made in Kalamazoo! Pass not by the town! "Turn from it and pass away!"

We sound this alarm upon no uncertain and vague notion. Before us lies the documentary evidence of the peril—a printed instrument, startling, even shocking in its revelation.

"The minute you prohibit a man from doing a certain thing, that minute he is possessed with an overwhelming desire to accomplish it."

There it stands and thereto are appended the alleged signatures of the mayor of Kalamazoo, the mayor-elect, the publisher of the leading paper, sundry lawyers, bankers, physicians, druggists, manufacturers, etc.!

Surely such a statement is not lightly made. Born it must be of deep experience. Confession, is it not reasonable to suppose, of the impulses and desires of the hearts, the daily walk and conversation, of those who speak?

Therefore, again we cry: Beware of Kalamazoo!

Since the law of the state of Michigan forbids stealing, Mayor THOMPSON, upon the best of authority we have it, has filled his term of office under the strain of an "overwhelming desire" to plunder the city's treasury. By the same token Mayor-Elect MILHAM is only waiting his induction into office to be seized upon by the same "overwhelming," and therefore successful temptation. Since bank wrecking is under the law's ban, we must suppose, upon his own testimony, that President DAYTON of the First National walks the streets with a "desire" that must at length become "overwhelming," if it has not already so become, to seize upon the wealth of his trusting depositors and hie him away to parts unknown.

Unfortunate city of Kalamazoo! Its druggists compound prescriptions with an "overwhelming desire" to reach for the poison chest; its physicians sit at the bedside eyeing the jugular vein and fingering the lancet. Its editors (does not Mr. ROWE confess it?), since lying is forbidden by the Bible and discouraged, at least, by the statute, rest not day nor night from pouring forth mendacities.

And since there is the Seventh Commandment, these eminent signatories of this important document—

Nay, nay, draw the curtain upon her shame, poor, stricken Kalamazoo!

Go not near her! And ye who are within her gates, hasten forth, even to the desert!

THE HON. SEABORN WRIGHT

It seems to us that the announcement which is made in some of the daily papers that the Hon. SEABORN WRIGHT of Georgia will be the candidate of the Prohibition party for President, is both a trifle premature and a little unfair to Mr. WRIGHT, since that gentleman, up to the present time, has carried himself as a loyal member of the Democratic party, albeit his style of democracy differs very much from that which is in fashion in most of the states of the Union. *The National Prohibitionist* yields to no one in very warm respect for Mr. WRIGHT, and if we read the signs of the times correctly it would not be impossible for Mr. WRIGHT to perform for the Prohibition party and the Prohibition cause a service very similar to that which was performed by JOHN P. ST. JOHN in 1884; but, until Mr. WRIGHT sees his way clear to align himself with us, we have no claim upon him as a leader and, as it seems to us, ought not to embarrass him by announcements of a compromising character.

"Bretherin," whines the brewer's kept parson, "there is not a word in Holy Scripture nor a line in the teachings of the blessed fathers of the early church that forbids the sale or use of beer. Stand fast in your liberty." Sure now, and, while you think of it, there's never a word in the Ten Commandments against spitting on the sidewalk, selling dirty milk or taking railroad rebates. *Sic semper tyrannis!*



The issue of a license for a saloon on the other side of the river is wrong.—*The Missoulian, Missoula, Mont.*

True, whichever side you stand on when you say it.

High license and restriction is the only practical solution for the saloon problem.—*News-Press, St. Joseph, Missouri.*

Your grammar parallels your grasp of the subject—it's remarkably singular.

So far as this newspaper is concerned, it does not propose to lose its temper.—*The Chattanooga Times.*

What a pity you did not form such a resolution about your *honor* a few years ago.

We believe that Prohibition, instead of reducing the number of drunkards, will make more of them.—*The Morning Call, Paterson, N. J.*

No, you don't. Everybody knows you're a liar, but no one ever believed you such a fool as that.

It is amusing to watch the Democratic statesmen of Indiana endeavoring to side-step the liquor question.—*The Courier, La Fayette, Ind.*

If you enjoy shows of that sort, there's a "continuous performance," "double-ring," going on all the while.

The city of Charleston and a few other South Carolina communities stand in precisely the same relation [regarding the saloon], to South Carolina that Chicago stands to Illinois.—*Charleston News & Courier.*

Then, God save the commonwealth of South Carolina.