

One hundred objections to a Maine law : being a sequel to the 'argument' of the United Kingdom Alliance for the Legislative Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic / by Dr Frederic Richard Lees.

Contributors

Lees, Frederic Richard, 1815-1897.

Publication/Creation

Manchester : United Kingdom Alliance, 1857.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/ncqpbrbz>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

ONE

HUNDRED OBJECTIONS

TO

A MAINE LAW ;

BEING A

SEQUEL TO THE 'ARGUMENT'

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE

FOR THE

LEGISLATIVE PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

BY DR FREDERIC RICHARD LEES,

THE AUTHOR OF THE ESSAY TO WHICH THE ALLIANCE FIRST PRIZE OF ONE
HUNDRED GUINEAS WAS AWARDED.

LONDON :

W. SMITH & SON ; W. TWEEDIE, STRAND.

HESTER: UNITED KINGDOM ALLIANCE,
41, JOHN DALTON STREET.

—
1857.

K38880

11227851

WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	welMOMec
Call	
No.	WM



22101856899

Errata in: 'Argument.'

- Page 74, Note. For 'Statistical Society' put 'Statistical Survey.'
Page 101. In table of years change 1744 into '1743.'
Page 101, line 30 (§ 53), after 'distilled' insert 'IN LONDON.'
Page 104 (§ 56), l. 19, for 'same' read 'first.'
Page 184, line 16 from bottom, transpose the words *bad* and *good*.
Page 215, line 21, scratch out the SECOND 'i' in 'Wiveliscombe.'
Page 292, Note, erase the first 'i' in the figures 'iii.'
Page 298, line 5, erase the 's' in 'Taverns.'
-

In Second Edition.

- Page 47, line 11, change 'on' into 'no.'
Page 159, line 29, strike out the whole line beginning 'the innocent.'
Page 188, line 20, strike out 'on' before 'relatives.'
-

In Sequel.

- Page 17, for 'share' in the verse, line 3, read 'shame.'
-

Notice.

This *Sequel* will be followed immediately by a Tract, price 1d., printed uniformly, and paged continuously, containing the rest of the topics indicated in Chapter III., including *Index* to both *Argument* and *Sequel*. From time to time, the Author will notice other Criticisms.

Mottos from Foes.

"How are we English to deal with Drunkenness? No one denies that the vice has risen to frightful prevalence amongst us—no one *could* deny it without impugning the veracity of police reports chronicled from day to day. The evil being admitted, how is it to be dealt with?"

Morning Post.

"The World's history shows how much easier it is to *prevent* evil seeds being sown, than to extirpate the vicious weeds which they germinate."

Bristol Mercury.

"As the guardian of morality not less than of the lives of its subjects, the Government is *bound to remove the opportunity* [*temptation?*], as well as to punish the commission of Crime."

Morning Chronicle.

"We are wholly at a loss to understand that theory of society which admits,—what indeed is absolutely necessary to our peace and our very existence,—that we may and must maintain an expensive police to protect us from drunkards, to keep watch at the doors of public-houses, to observe the movements of their chief frequenters, and to protect their victims from being plundered; and that we must also build prisons and go to other vast costs for the punishment, correction, and cure of offenders, who became what they are by drunkenness—admits all this, and then maintains that we ought not to interfere at all with the practice itself, either as to its hours, its days, its places, or any other circumstance. The simple consideration that we must do the cure, and that the cure is very costly and difficult, imposes on us also the duty of prevention, at least as far as it is possible. Self preservation requires that we should stop an evil where we can, if we must stop it somewhere."

The Times, Aug. 25, 1854.

"The licensing system has the double vice of not answering a public end, but a private one. It has been tried, and has been found wanting."

The Times, May 13, 1857.

"There can surely be no question that if the Liquor trade were put under the ban of the law, it would be reduced to comparatively small limits, though it certainly would not be extinct; and if its total suppression be desirable, the result, so far as it went, would manifestly be good."

Manchester Guardian.

"From the days of the Pilgrim Fathers downwards, the Northern States have possessed a complete educational apparatus, yet in this chosen home of education, the Tavern has proved stronger than the School, the Publican mightier than the School-master."

The Commonwealth.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

OBJECTIONS TO THE POLICY OF THE ALLIANCE.

	Page
THE ALLIANCE: ITS PRINCIPLE AND POLICY	7
1. The <i>Morning Post</i> . John Bull <i>won't have a Maine Law</i>	9
2. The <i>Times</i> . It is impossible, and <i>can't be got</i>	10
3. A Scotch D.D. believes we are so verdant as to reap <i>green corn!</i> ..	11
4. The <i>Weekly Journal</i> on the 'slow march' policy	12
5. The cry of 'Coercion.' Significance of 'Total and immediate'..	13
6. The <i>Morning Post</i> has 'no faith in repressive measures'.....	14
7. Asserts that Crime cannot be <i>permanently</i> repressed.....	14
8. Prof. Laycock discovers a 'desire' that is its own parent.....	15
9. Truth divorced from Practice—and named 'Moral-Suasion'....	15
10. The <i>Morning Post</i> advises 'Counteraction' and 'Substitution'..	16
11. Crabbe's picture of the Traffic sixty years ago	17
12. The Maine Law not a Sumptuary Law	20
13. Mr Hume's parallel between Drink and Pewter-pot Prohibition..	20
14. Suppression interferes with the <i>convenience</i> of purchase	22
15. Mr W. J. Fox's parallel between Machinery and Drink.....	22
16. Vindex thinks <i>Opinion</i> is all we have to alter.....	24
17. Prohibition would 'deliver us from all temptation'.....	25
18. The true parallel. <i>Licensed Lotteries</i> and <i>Licensed Drunkeries</i> ..	26
19. That Prohibition is demanded because Teetotalism is a failure ..	27

CHAPTER II.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PRINCIPLE AND PROCEDURE OF PROHIBITION.

I. *That a Prohibitory Law is an undesirable means to the end proposed.*

1. Because it limits personal Liberty	32
2. Because it infringes 'British' Liberty.....	32
3. Because it substitutes Legal for Moral Agency	33
4. Because it is dangerous to 'sentiments' of Liberty.....	34
5. Because it transgresses Conscience and appeals to Fear.....	35
6. Because it conflicts with the principles of Free Trade	37
7. Because it is destructive of property	37
8. Because it interferes with vested interests	38
9. Because it is a species of Class-Legislation.....	38
10. Because it will injure the public Revenue	39
11. Because it enforces a needless privation	40
12. Because Beer is a necessity to the Working Man.....	40
13. Because Alcohol is Food and Force!	41

	Page
14. Because strong-drink is needful to counteract bad ventilation ..	41
15. Because prohibitive law leads to 'secret' methods of supply....	42
16. Because it would render the sale of a glass of beer criminal!	43
17. Because it increases Crime! (<i>Saturday Review</i>).....	46
18. Because it occasions deception	47
II. <i>Prohibition ineffectual as a means to the end proposed.</i>	
1. Because it allows private manufacture or import	47
2. Because there is (or will be) a general combination to violate it..	48
3. Because there is secret evasion of the Law.....	48
4. Because it will induce smuggling and illicit distillation	49
5. Because men <i>will</i> make themselves drunk <i>somehow</i>	52
6. Because we cannot suppress Fictitious-gift and Club-evasion	52
7. Because we cannot enforce it upon the Lower-orders	53
8. Because it has been pronounced 'Unconstitutional'.....	55
9. Because it has been repealed by the People of Maine themselves..	55
10. Because a Maine Law has been tried in <i>England</i> , and failed..	56
11. Because the results of Prohibition are ambiguous.....	58
12. Because it is founded on a false conception of the Evil.....	61
III. <i>Prohibition a superfluous and inferior remedy for drunkenness.</i>	
1. Because it will be needless when public opinion can carry it	68
2. Because the evil is dying out under existing Agencies	72
3. Because Persuasion excels Coercion—Temperance, Prohibition..	78
4. Because Regulation, <i>with oversight</i> , would answer better.....	79
5. Because attractive <i>Substitution</i> is surer, safer, and wiser	83
i. Diversions, Recreations, and Parks for alcoholic-excitement	85
ii. Libraries, Museums, and Crystal Palaces for the Gin-palace..	89
iii. 'Light wines' in the place of 'heavy wet' and 'vitriol-gin'..	90
6. Because it is better to <i>remove the real causes</i> of Drunkenness	94
Physical degradation, and unhealthy workshops and homes..	94
ii. Deficient food, absence of comfort, etc.....	95
iii. Want of political liberty and social equality.....	96
7. Because Education will most effectually cure Intemperance....	96
8. Because Religious Instruction alone goes to <i>the root</i> of the Evil..	99
9. Because a <i>combination</i> of agencies is best.....	100

CHAPTER III.

MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTIONS.

1. False impressions and false inferences	102
2. Criticisms of the Press on the <i>Argument</i> , etc.....	106
3. Examples of the Intellect and Morality of the Press	113
4. Manifesto of the Scottish Temperance League	117
5. Opinions of Mr J. B. GOUGH	122
6. INDEX to <i>Argument</i> , and <i>Sequel</i>	125

THE ALLIANCE: ITS PRINCIPLE & POLICY.

Currency having been given, through several channels which it is unnecessary to particularize, to very gross misrepresentations of the Alliance, it becomes our duty to neutralize them. We cannot, however, enter into controversy, but leave the misrepresentations to be corrected by a plain statement of the truth.

I.—THE PRINCIPLE OF THE ALLIANCE IS PROHIBITION OF THE TRAFFIC IN STRONG DRINK, ON THE GROUND OF SOCIAL RIGHT AND NECESSITY.

The *causes* of the evil of intemperance are twofold, or direct and remote, viz. (1) the use of the drink which generates the intemperate appetite; and (2) the outward temptations to *that use*. The causes of the use, and the temptations to the use, are resolvable into ignorance, fashion, private custom, and *the Traffic*; the last being the public fountain which supplies and sustains in chief part the private custom. While temperance societies find their first, chief, and permanent work in antagonizing the former, the Traffic, as a public and licensed system, is plainly amenable to *social law*, being the proved source of three-fourths of our pauperism, crime, and public burdens. The Alliance, therefore, not seeking legal interference with private life, habit, and custom, asserts the right to protection, *total and immediate*, from the public evils of a public system, and, in the discharge of a present duty, *now* demands total protection from a present and pressing wrong.

The term 'IMMEDIATE' is significant of rightful claim and duty, as when applied to the demand of the slave for *immediate* freedom, or to that of the people for the *immediate* removal of the tax upon bread; and no quirks and quibbles will hold good against the well-understood and historic sense of this word, which do not equally apply to the demand for '*entire prohibition*.' The claim is made immediate, and immediately made, because the wrong is immediate; and no other words can express, so fully and forcibly, the *real* truth and the *whole* truth. Seeking no disguise, and believing in no reticence, but simply in the truth and right, the Alliance announces the claims and principles in which alone it believes, and only with the granting of which it will dissolve its organization. Believing in prohibition, and *not* in license, it honestly asks for what it wants, and will accept in discharge of its claim nothing less and nothing different.

The Alliance demands prohibition of the traffic, *TOTAL* as well as immediate. Right and duty cannot be postponed, nor halved. Bit-by-bit prohibition, is *not* the Prohibition of the TRAFFIC—it is only *limitation* of it, which creates a monopoly. The traffic comprehends the cider-house, the beer-shop, the tavern, as well as the dram-shop, and to put down a *part*, is not to set up Prohibition at all. The Alliance assails the Traffic, 'one and indivisible,' and while rejoicing in every limitation to a machinery of mischief, still agitates persistently for its *total* and *immediate* destruction.

II.—THE POLICY OF THE ALLIANCE MAY BE EXPRESSED IN TWO WORDS—TRUTH AND AGITATION.

The Alliance believes that when the people suffer a great wrong, the best policy is to proclaim that wrong entire, and not a part of it;—that the definiteness of the claim will give incisiveness to agitation, and the greatness of the evil stir up sympathy to action. Nothing is so fatal to political agitation as a suspicion of more being designed than is affirmed. A clear assertion of the ultimate object of agitation may startle at first, but must eventually conciliate public confidence

and consolidate power. By demanding less than the ultimate object, a temporary but hollow success may be achieved, by adding to the list of adherents those who, not convinced of the broad principle, will, at the first pressure of disaster, or moment of partial victory, fall back into the obstruction of hopelessness or of apathy.

The Alliance, while devoting its energies to its *own* principle, and the working of its own policy, sincerely hails every effort of other societies tending to weaken a common enemy. Indirectly it will render aid to every wise and honest attempt to limit the traffic, but cannot forsake its own special mission. It will rejoice in every parliamentary concession—believing that its own agitation for complete protection is the surest means of obtaining large and early concessions—but it will accept nothing in the way of *settlement*, save that which is really such—Prohibition, entire and final. To the Alliance, it is a matter of perfect indifference what party or institution, in or out of parliament, conducts and crowns an agitation *on this principle*—provided the work be done.

III. AMONGST THE PRINCIPLES IMPUTED TO THE ALLIANCE WHICH IT HAS NEVER AFFIRMED, AND THE PROCEEDINGS WHICH IT HAS NEVER RECOMMENDED, THE FOLLOWING MAY BE NAMED:—

- 1.—The Alliance has never recommended ‘home-brewing’ or ‘domestic use,’ but on the contrary, in its Prize Essay, its Reports, its OFFICIAL organ the *Alliance*, and the *Alliance Weekly News*, has both directly and indirectly taught thorough teetotalism. Prohibition, as contradistinguished from restriction, is essentially based upon the *evil of the article sold*.
- 2.—The Alliance has never sought to supplant or to do the work of temperance societies, but on the contrary, has done very much to promote their efficiency and success, and has at all times acknowledged their necessity and usefulness.
- 3.—The Alliance has never assailed any other organization save that of the Licensed Victuallers; has never opposed any organization or policy having a friendly object; and has never dictated what should be the policy of the *Abstainer* towards the Legislature, but simply declared its own views of the duty of the Citizen.
- 4.—The Alliance has never claimed that Prohibition is the *adequate* and radical remedy for intemperance, but only for that large amount of intemperance which flows from the *Traffic*; it is not therefore ‘radically defective.’
- 5.—The Alliance has never sought to anticipate public opinion by parliamentary enactment; but, on the contrary, aims at legislative measures as the *expression* of the public opinion which it seeks to create and embody. It is therefore, neither ‘coercive’ nor ‘premature,’ and does not ignore the ‘active consent’ of the People.
- 6.—The Alliance does not, indeed, go to Parliament to attempt the impossibility of ‘putting down’ the ‘domestic use’; because it believes the domestic use ought to be counteracted by the moral suasion of Temperance Societies, the special work of which it does not pretend to accomplish; but it does recommend *the people* to go to Parliament for a measure that would vastly *diminish* the facilities for domestic use.
- 7.—The Alliance does not sacrifice a ‘possible’ present benefit to an impossible or distant ‘ideal.’ On the contrary, it brings nearer and embraces the possible, hastens and enlarges the concession; and the asking for all to which we are entitled, hinders no one from asking something less, if he prefers it. The Alliance takes everything—opposes nothing, save the *Traffic*—and goes on for ALL that it desiderates, believing that the national heart will respond to the claims of Justice and Truth.

SEQUEL TO THE ARGUMENT.

CHAPTER I.

OBJECTIONS TO THE 'ALLIANCE,' SPRINGING CHIEFLY FROM MISAPPREHENSION OF ITS REAL AIMS, METHODS, CONSTITUTION, AND POLICY.

FRANK and earnest in the expression of our own opinions, we invited a corresponding frankness on the part of opponents. Every candid criticism which our 'Argument' has elicited, we shall duly consider, reproducing the most important objections that have crossed our path, and giving, so far as space permits, the literal words of the Objector, and sometimes the source and name, where these may be supposed either to involve public interest, or to indicate any important class opinion. Caring supremely for our argument, we care nothing whatever for carping, pettifogging book-criticism; what we wanted reviewing was, not an array of phrases, but of facts—what we want testing, is not the style of our composition, but the *strength* of our *position*.

Morning Post: "As regards a Maine Liquor Law, good or bad, it might be summarily dismissed with the passing remark, that 'JOHN BULL will not have it'; and, so, practically, there is an end of it, whatever the amount of its intrinsic merits may be."

A. Mr Post has a faith in the characteristics of our National parent, Mr BULL, which is more definite than complimentary! What is there, however, in BULL's past history, to authorize the imputation of such extreme brutishness and unreason to the old gentleman? Is Mr BULL really bent on a fixed course, because it is his course, irrespective of its merits, and reckless of its goodness or evil? Are his decisions like the decrees of the Medes and Persians? Is he swayed by no reason save that so often imputed to *Mistress BULL*—whereof the formula is not even syllogistic?

If she *will*, she will—you may depend on't—

And if she *won't*, she won't—and there's an end on't

Nay, is Mrs BULL herself displeased with her cheap tea and sugar when presiding at the social tray? Or, does she, on baking days, quarrel with the reign of untaxed flour? Besides, did not the venerable Mr BULL ungrudgingly give up his slave system, hoary with age, and pay twenty million of bullion to get rid of it? And did not Mrs BULL applaud his generosity? Assuredly, then, he has a sound heart and head—though he may, we grant, be a *leetle* too conservative and prejudiced on points. To that heart and head the ‘Alliance’ appeals.

Moreover, Mr Post somewhat mis-states the issue. We here advance *an argument* for the prohibition of the Liquor Traffic—nothing more now. Is Mr BULL too intolerant to listen? Is he not, on the contrary, notoriously fond of an argument for its own sake; and fond, too, of boasting of his past sacrifices in asserting and obtaining the liberty to argue and to speak freely? We do not ask Mr BULL what he *will* do—or what the oracular Post prophesies that he will do. We desire, simply, to discuss, first of all, what he OUGHT to do. We have greater faith in JOHN BULL’s final allegiance to his convictions of what he *should* do—than in any Post’s foresight as to what he actually will do. At any rate, we are content to stake our money and our time on the issue—and to lose our labor for our pains—if we miscalculate the old gentleman’s character. Practically, therefore, there is not an end of it—nor will be, till the end comes.

II.

Birmingham Mercury: “A Maine-Law in this country is simply “*impracticable*.”

The Times: “An utter impossibility; and no use wasting words “about it.”*

PROFESSOR ECHO:—“No hope that a Maine Law *will ever* be enacted in this country.”

A. A Maine Law does not exist in this country, and is, therefore, *not* impracticable. In Connecticut, New Hampshire, Vermont, etc., where such a law does exist, it is executed; and therefore a Maine Law, regarded in the abstract, is *practicable*, since it is a FACT. But the question of the actuality of a British Maine Law is not now before the nation. The present æra is one of *agitation*, and agitation only—it is the putting the Traffic on its trial at the bar of the country, and the issue required is—‘Guilty,’ or ‘Not guilty’? If guilty—then, as Repression and Regulation have failed to *prevent* the Crime libelled in the verdict, the trial of prohibition remains as the alternative. If the nation shall be *convinced* that this traffic is an incubus and a curse—and to create this conviction is our present object—then the embodiment of that conviction in law will be anything but impracticable: so that, first, the preparatory agitation is practicable: and if eventually successful, the Law will be equally so—the law being desired *only* on that proviso.

(* Nevertheless, the *Times* writes a column, and inserts fully the Pope-Stanley correspondence. The *Times* is—the *Times*—and indicates which way the wind blows.

History has given a distinct refutation of these 'impossible' and 'impracticable' Vaticinators. An American book now before us,* of the date of 1833, has this passage:—"The People, *if they choose*, by the arm of Legislation can undertake the holy, righteous, and indispensable work of *self-defence*. And as all political power is in their hands, *it will be found to be a work which is practicable*. How perfectly easy, and how perfectly just, whenever the people generally shall desire it, to indict at common law the keeping of a grog-shop as a public nuisance; or *to provide by statute that those who MAKE paupers shall SUPPORT them; and those who EXCITE others to commit crimes, shall THEMSELVES BE TREATED as criminals*. And in the necessary, the magnanimous, the glorious work of self-defence from an evil which, *in defiance of public sentiment*, of reason, religion, humanity, and of God, would roll over earth a deluge of fire, and annihilate the hopes of the world, Legislators may expect, *in proportion as the subject is understood*, the united and cordial support of all good men." The new England prophet, who thus predicted out of the inspiration of faith in truth and in right, lived to see the Maine Law executed in a dozen States of America. Our worst wish to the Old England prophets who vaticinate for *want* of faith, is, that they may live to realize the 'impracticable.' DAVY deemed it as 'impossible' to light London with gas as with concentrated moonshine—but with what is London illuminated?

III.

A SCOTTISH DIVINE.—"I cannot join the Alliance, for it proposes to *reap the corn before it is ripe*."

This is a mistake. The Alliance proposes, first of all, to *ripen* the corn by the heat and sunlight of agitation:

*And in its season bring the Law,
That from Discussion's lips may fall
With Life, that, working strongly, binds—
Set in all lights by many minds,
To close the interests of all.*

Where would have been our noble inheritance from the Past, had not some one, divinely scorning pain and discarding calculations of seasons, scattered the seeds of Truth in the most wintry days? Sunshine reformers are not wanted: there are always plenty of mean persons willing to share in the 'harvest home' which they had no hand in bringing about,—who, holding back from the plough and the furrow, are ready for the 'sheaves' and the 'shouting.' The objection savors more of Scotch caution than generous Faith—which is defined as the "substance of things hoped for;" and, moreover, it has no application to the Alliance, which, by the *maturing* of opinion, would avoid all prematurity of action. The Poet says—

*To-morrow yet would reap to-day,
As we bear blossom of the dead;
Earn well the thrifty months, nor wed
Raw haste, half-sister of delay.*

True, but the Alliance falls into no such fallacy of feeling; clinging

neither to the past, nor vaulting into the future, it would To-day perform the *duty* of To-day, which is the mould of To-morrow. Altering the language of the Poet to realize his hope, we say—

Who sows To-day shall reap To-morrow,
Surely as dawns to-night do follow.
Use well the thrifty months, and wed
A living purpose to a fruitful bed.
“For all the past of Time reveals,
“A bridal dawn of thunder peals
“Wherever *Thought* hath wedded Fact.”

IV.

Weekly Journal: “*Hasten slowly* was a good proverb of the “ancient Romans. By demanding too much at once, we may get “nothing at all. We shall succeed best if we first attack the most “vulnerable parts of our adversary’s position.”*

A. *Festina lente* is a good maxim here strangely misread, and still more curiously misapplied. Does the Scottish Temperance League *not* ask and advocate *entire* teetotalism? Does its work end with the inculcation of the ‘little-drop’ as the *slowly-hastening* method to ‘no-drop’ at all? The best method of gaining an instalment of a debt, either in a court or a parliament, is to ask for the *whole* of that which is due? Lift up the claim of the Law as high as the Truth—men will *fall short* of it by natural gravity; there is no need of clipping the law to suit human infirmity on set purpose. The Alliance, however, *demand*s nothing of Parliament—it is simply in that stage of progress—hastening, alas, all *too slowly*!—when it would ventilate the entire question of the Traffic, leaving the *People* to demand protection from the people’s Parliament. It cannot be too strongly urged, that only a great, broad TRUTH can create and sustain a National Movement. Pettifogging and imperfect measures but bring a large principle into contempt. ‘Raw-haste’ is haste *unmatured by the fulness and heat of Truth*—but this is the ‘haste’ of those who *hold back* the Truth, in the timid fear of a false policy, not the slow haste of the ‘Alliance,’ which rays the truth *in advance* of its action—and which, *because* it has first proved all things, can firmly hold fast to that which is practically good.

Deliver not the tasks of might
To weakness, *neither hide the ray*
From those, not blind, who wait for day,
Though sitting girt with doubtful light,
Make knowledge circle with the winds:
Not clinging to some ancient saw,
Not master’d by some modern term:
Not swift nor slow to change, but FIRM.

* This Journal is getting famous for fogginess. In a Dialogue between a Farmer and Traveller, in the number for March 14th, 1857, the *Liquor Traffic* is compared to a *totally* bad Farm, to be *improved*, acre-by-acre. This idea is at least unique and original: still the Farmer must be lost in Scotch mist. How can one improve what is *totally*, i.e. *only* bad? Can we change evil into good? Can we convert rum into milk? or beer into bread? It is the COUNTRY that is in the state of a BAD FARM, full of filth and corruption, and swamp, and scattered over with the slag, the cinders, and the dross of the burning, *licensed furnaces*. The country, however, is *not* bad by nature—in itself—it is only badly Farmed by Quacks, men without capital, and without capacity to see what is wrong, and to remove it—at ONCE and WHOLLY.

“Things are in the saddle and ride Mankind.”

Our critic has forgotten his OVID : who rightly warns against both unwise-haste and unwise *delay*. There is a time to speak, and a time to act: *and they are the wise who do everything in its proper time.*

Festinare nocet, nocet et cunctatio sæpe;
Tempore quæque suo qui facit, ille sapit.

v.

O. "The Alliance is coercive, runs to extremes, and repudiates moderate measures. Like O'CONNOR and the Chartists, it will have the whole animal, bristles and all, or no bacon. It goes for *"total and immediate suppression."*

A. This objection is a total and terrific blunder. The second article of the constitution consists of two clauses, viz. (1) The object of the Alliance shall be to *create an enlightened public opinion.* (2) With a view to *total and immediate suppression.*

Where is the coercion of forming opinions by evidence presented through the press and from the platform? In the nature of things, opinion cannot be coerced; and for a Nation to legislate according to its opinion, when formed, seems quite foreign to anything like coercion—except in the sense in which *Thou shalt not steal*, is coercive to the professor of petty larceny.

The conviction sought to be established is of course special. The Alliance believes that the Traffic, one and indivisible, is a *total evil*: can it do less than desire its entire removal? Do we, when indicting a nuisance, even think of requesting the removal of a *moiety* or a *third* part of it? Or, when we have diminished crimes of a certain kind in a town, say from 20 to 30 annually, do we sit down contented with the causes of other ten in operation known to be removable, and say—"That will do—ten are gone, for they were bad—but these ten may remain"? Or, supposing that the ten still left are deemed as injurious as the ten now prevented were once judged to be objectionable, do we ever dream of *deferring* prevention to the *next* year, if it can be accomplished in *this*? Do we not in all such cases, vote for 'total and immediate'? What we desire, then, is a total removal of the *whole* evil of the Traffic, and *so soon* as the Public is convinced that the Traffic is an evil *in toto*.

The Alliance hoists its own ensign, and proclaims its own policy—but it does *not repudiate* any approximate measure involving a true principle, or a practical benefit. It would be glad to taste the fruits of prohibition, first, in regard to Beershops, and second, in regard to the Sunday-trading of Publicans—but Jerry-shops suppressed will not alter for the better the *character* of the Gin-shops and Taverns that remain. On the contrary, by increased custom, they will become worse.

Those, again, who go but part of our road as yet in theory—are in practical policy bound to aid us. *As agitators*, we go a certain way over common ground; and, in contending against Beershops and Sunday-trading, the patriot and Christian should remember, that they will need the help of the Alliance to combat a powerful and unscrupulous faction, who will make as stout and desperate a stand

against partial, as against total measures of repression; yielding nothing of those privileges which turn to profit, save upon compulsion. The boldest policy is always the best.*

VI.

Morning Post: "No one denies that the vice of drunkenness has risen to *frightful prevalence* amongst us: but we have no faith whatever in *repressive measures* applied to *such a case*."

A. Wherefore, Mr Post? What is there in *this case* that places it out of comparison with measures for repressing Lotteries, Gaming-houses, Betting-dens, Stews, and the traffic in Opium or poisons? We only know of *one* great difference—namely, the greater magnitude of the evil. But, surely, the immensity of the *mischief*, and the number of those concerned in its perpetuation, only illustrate the greatness of the reasons, and the imperiousness of the necessity, for immediate measures of repression. If the evil were small, and the perpetrators of it few, the appeal would lose much of its force. It is a great danger that excites our patriotism to ready action.

VII.

Morning Post: "Abrupt and violently repressive measures frequently defeat their object. *Crime*, when it pervades communities, involving man in the aggregate, and flowing from his instincts, his tendencies, or his passions—cannot be *permanently fettered* by stringent ordinances of repression."

A. It is a pity Mr Post did not cite a case. The histories of England and Ireland are full of examples of *rapidly repressed crime*—as of Highway robbery and Agrarian outrage. But, supposing law to be weak, and corruption strong—does Mr Post mean that crime is to be *compromized*? That we are not to repress?—or what is the same thing, not to *begin* to repress? The objection so far proves too much. But there are two other fundamental errors in the *Post's* four lines. The Alliance proposes no 'measures' at all. It has drawn up no 'Bill' (save a Bill of Indictment): it only proposes *propositions* for discussion, with an ultimate view to 'measures.' Much less do we propose *abrupt* measures. The Maine Law in America is the end of a long popular agitation—and so it must be here. The *Post* forgets, or ignores, the fact that *we* also desiderate it as the expression of the *People's Will*—and on no other terms. Such a law, with such a history, can be exposed neither to the charge of abruptness nor to that of violence: it will be a decree promulgated at the right time and in the right way. The objection, therefore, is impertinent on this head; as it is further irrelevant.

For, thirdly, Intemperance is *not* a "crime flowing from men's instincts"—but from drink and drinking usages. As both are of

* A temperance Magistrate, for example, might spend a *lifetime* in trying to prevent new Public Houses arising in his neighborhood, yet not succeed in reducing them after all. He passes away—and has no coadjutor to take up his (almost useless) work. What is to be done in this direction, must be done by *general agitation*, which has far more weight than local isolated effort.

human creation, both *can* be suppressed by stringent "ordinances of repression"—if Society shall will it. If the drink appetite be not fed, it will die out as infallibly as the flame of a lamp which is not supplied with oil.

VIII.

PROFESSOR LAYCOCK: "You argue that the source of the vice is 'in the thing (drink), and not in the desire for it.'"

A. We argue no such absurdity. But how can the *source* of the vice be in the *desire* for the drink? That desire is the essence of the vice itself—the vicious appetite. What *creates* the desire? The Alliance answers—the use of the drink: and the Professor, so far from denying the fact, actually suggests the propriety of *diluting Spirits* sold by retail! We assert, first, that by physical law the desire is generated for the stimulant, and, second, that the *Sale of the thing* is that which makes the Public-house a temptation and a trap to multitudes. The first is the proximate universal cause of *all* alcoholic intemperance—whether the love of a little, or the passion for a large quantity,—the second, is the actual temptation to the *general use*—a temptation opposed to the best resolves and sober wishes of the people, for, as the objector allows, men who know the right, will yet pursue the wrong to which they are solicited. The Traffic is a system for making men intemperate, vicious, and criminal by Act of Parliament, and what we contend for, is, the withdrawal of the sanction, and the proclamation of outlawry to this machinery of mischief.

VIII.

PROF. LAYCOCK: "The advocates of moral suasion rely upon 'applied truth, the enlightened schoolmaster and the minister.'"

A. So do we—and on something else *besides*. So does the objector. As a physician, he relies on a theory of medicine for the cure of diseases—but he *applies the truth* in the shape of physical force drugs to the patient, nevertheless. 'Honesty is the best policy,' says moral suasion. What then? Shall we have no magistrates to look after those who do not believe in moral suasion, or do not practise that belief? No doubt it would be *best* if we had no dishonest men, but having them, are we to have no police? When people contrast law with moral suasion, they simply talk nonsense. Just-law is the 'expression' of truth—not its absence: and truth will never fail. Law is that crystalized Truth under which nations have risen to civilization—it is the first and last wisdom of history. The man who scorns law, and nicknames it 'coercion,' has yet to learn the first principles of social science. Law is the exponent of moral truth and divine necessity, which go before it; and if the 'coercion' of consequences were withdrawn from behind the Divine Law, the very distinction between Vice and Virtue would disappear—law would be abolished!

* Scotsman. Report of Lecture—made from M.S.

† Perhaps he meant, "relied upon the truth *being applied*"? If so, he is doomed to disappointment. The Minister and Schoolmaster *teach* truth—the taught only can *apply* it.

IX.

Morning Post: "It is beyond the power of Government to 'felonize a whole community; to hang, imprison, or transport its members. A different mode of action must be followed. The 'latent tendencies of the crimes must be discovered, and counter 'tendencies brought to bear upon them.'"

A. Dr POST is holding in his hand a glass of light wine, while JOHN BULL is supposed to be inebriated with heavy wet. 'Here, my good fellow,' says the doctor, 'drink off this, and you'll be cured by counter irritation!' This reminds one of the old recipe—'How to Cook a Hare. *First catch it.*' Now, passing over other objections, we do not think that JOHN *will* give up his Brandy and Beer in order to swallow *such* 'cheap and nasty' wines as alone can be provided for his somewhat large family;* but supposing he did, we deny that large daily doses of weak alcoholics is at all a principle of *counter irritation* to the use of frequent doses of strong alcoholics. Apple-wine, or cider, and 'Wine-of-Malt,' as CRABBE† calls Beer, have never *counteracted*, but have *invariably created*, social intemperance where it did not prevail before: and it is consequently a monstrous absurdity to expect that it will *cure* it where it already reigns and riots. In Lower Austria, there are 145 breweries, brewing 9½ millions of pailfuls, and paying a tax of 9½ millions of florins. In Strasbourg, the beer consumed has *doubled* within a few years. (See *Galignani*, Sep. 23, 1856.) Heavy-wet increases even in *light wine* countries. The only direct and proper *causes* of Drinking propensities (for the normal man has no 'latent tendencies' that way) are—*first*, social temptations to drink; *second*, the physical tendencies of the drink.

Ye, in the floods of limpid Poison nurst,
Where bowl the second charms like bowl the first;
Say how, and why, the sparkling ill is shed,
The heart which hardens, and which rules the head.

CRABBE truly perceived that the evil was not in the man, but in the *place* and the *potion*; in the 'customs' of the one, and the essential 'quality' of the other.

What the first clause of the objection means, we cannot even con-

* The above objection was in July, 1856. In September the *Morning Post* comes round a little. It says:—"Let us glance at the alcoholic drinks now commonly used, and see how, and to what extent, the enlarged importation of weak wines would be likely to affect them. The great consumers of beer in all countries are *manual laborers*. In countries where beer and wine are both good, and almost equally cheap, the manual laborer always takes to beer. To suppose that the English blacksmith or navigator would adopt the lighter wines, is contrary to experience and reason; nor would it be desirable for him to do so. We think, then, that the beer interest, far from obstructing Mr OLIVEIRA in his agreeable task, may shake hands with him, and bid him God speed! Still less probable is it that individuals who have been accustomed to Port, Sherry, or Madeira, would set aside their favorite cordial wines in behalf of others less strong and generous. Finally, there remains the dram-drinker. He has climbed already to the very summit of alcoholic stimulation, and he is as little likely to adopt Moselle or Chablis, or even, if he could get it, the princely Johannisberg, or gentle Liebfraumilch, as the tiger to be allured from his gory feast by the smell of a Strasbourg paté.

† The Borough. 'Benbow.'

jecture. We know of nobody who is anxious that the *Government* should 'felonize' everybody. How Mr Post came to haul so romantic a sentence into the discussion, we can't tell. The Alliance proposes to the Nation, that the *Nation* should, if it think fit, enact a certain law for the prevention of so much pauperism and crime, by the removal of their proved source:—but how is that a proposal either that 'Government' should felonize 'the Nation,' or that the Nation should felonize itself? If the *Post* merely means, that *to enforce laws in cases where large numbers in the community are disposed to break them* is impossible, we admit the difficulty, but deny the impossibility. Let us gain the convictions and suffrages of the *best and highest* men of all classes—and a distinct popular majority—and we believe our Law will be observed as fully, and enforced as easily, as most others. *The influence that carries it will ensure its observance.*

Let us add, however, that the *Post* assumes that there is something in a Maine Law popularly obnoxious. It is hugely mistaken. No measure is so popular with the multitude: a vote for the Law, of 99 against 1, in any large popular assembly, can be carried even now. The difficulty will not be with the Working Classes, who *feel* the evils of the system, but with the less patriotic and more conventional orders of society.

If God made man upright—and *himself* only has wrought out abnormal and pernicious inventions—the doctrine of *Counter tendencies* is a very supererogatory recommendation. No one has a born tendency for alcohol—which is not even supplied by nature. It, and the desire for it, are equally generated by art—and that the desire should cease, it is only needful that it should not be *fed*. True philosophy teaches to remove a cause of evil—and the effect is *not*. If good seed is killed, and manure wasted, on swampy land—let not the Farmer talk 'bosh' about 'substitution' and 'counteraction'—but let him *drain away the wet*. The theory of 'latent tendencies' to crimes *known to result solely from drinking*, is worse than a fiction—it is a libel on man and his Author. If, says inspired Wisdom, you would not that your heart should speak perverse things, and lust after strange women—*look not upon the wine*.

What, then, is the *Post's* objection?

A wind to puff your *Idol-fires*,
And heap their ashes on your head;
To share the boast so often made,
That we are wiser than our Sires.

x.

O. "You are indiscriminate in your censures, and confound
"together all branches of the Traffic, the high with the low; which
"is both unjust and impolitic."

A. The Alliance does no such thing: it only ascribes *evil to all*, admits the fact of varying degrees of mischief and of *disrespectability*, and proposes, by one simple prohibition, to make *all* respectable. Respectability is equivocal though; for it not

unseldom designates *gilded* seduction, where Capital is purveyor to pollution—

‘And Paints the Gates of Hell with Paradise.’

The function of the Alliance, however, is not that of Painter of Public-houses : that has been done by CRABBE, in his *Borough*.

Much do I need, and therefore will I ask
A Muse to aid me in my present task ;
For then with special cause we beg for aid,
When of our subject we are most afraid :
INNS are this subject—’tis an *ill-drawn lot*,
So, thou who gravely triflest, fail me not :
Fail not, but haste, and to my memory bring
Scenes yet unsung, which few would choose to sing.
Who sings of Inns much danger has to dread,
And needs assistance from the fountain-head.

You may recollect that the Poet-painter of Common-life commences with the Head Inn—the most costly, aristocratic, and respectable. Why ? Precisely because it is least a *drinking-house*, or resort of tipplers, and most a House of Call—a temporary, Traveller’s Home—and such would remain, therefore, least changed under a Prohibitory *regimé*.

High in the street, o’erlooking all the place,
The rampant ‘Lion’ shows his kingly face—
Yet nothing dreadful to his friends the sight,
But sign and pledge of welcome and delight ;
To him the noblest guest the town detains
Flies for repast, and in his court remains.
Here not a comfort shall to them be lost,
Who never ask or never feel the cost.

Next comes the ‘Bear.’ Here meet a social kind,
Our various clubs for various cause combined.
[But somewhat curious, is it not, to think,
Such varied courses tending all—to *drink* ?]

Third in our Borough’s list appears the sign
Of a fair queen—the gracious ‘Caroline’ ;
But in decay—each feature in the face
Has stain of Time, and token of disgrace.
Few years have passed, since brightly ’cross the way
Lights from each window shot their lengthen’d ray,
And busy looks in every face were seen,
Through the warm precincts of the reigning Queen.
Rosy and round, adorn’d in crimson vest,
And flaming ribands in her ample vest :
She, skilled like Circè, tried her guests to move
With *looks* of welcome and with *words* of love :
And such her potent charms, that men unwise
Were soon transform’d and fitted for the styes.

Inferior Houses now our notice claim ;
But who shall deal them their appropriate fame ?

Shall I pass by the 'Boar'? There are who cry
 'Beware the Boar! and pass determin'd by :'
 There dwells a *kind* old Aunt, and there you see
 Some *kind young Nieces* in her company.

What, though it should some cool observer strike
 That such fair sisters should be so unlike :
 That still another and another comes,
 And at the matron's table smiles and blooms :
 That all appear as if they meant to stay
 Time undefined, nor name a parting day ;
 And yet, though all are valued, all are dear,
 Causeless they go, and seldom more appear !

Next are a lower kind, yet not so low
 But they, among them, their distinctions know.
 Pleased with his power, the poor man loves to say
 What favorite Inn shall share his evening's pay ;
 Where he shall sit the social hour, *and lose*
His past day's labors and his next day's views.

The Reverend Poet, it is clear, painted from life, and thus distinguished the various kinds of Inns sufficiently. He paints not only the *places* where the 'Rosy-god' is worshipt with living sacrifices of soul and body, but the very *persons* of the worshippers.

See Inebriety ! her wand she waves,
 And lo ! her pale, and lo ! her purple slaves !
 Sots in embroidery, and sots in crape,
Of every order, station, rank, and shape.
 Lo ! proud Flaminius at the board,
 Quaffs the bright juice, with all the gust of sense,
 And clouds his brain in torpid elegance ;
 In China vases, see ! the sparkling ill,
 From gay decanters view the rosy rill.
 O, happy priest ! whose God, like Egypt's lies,
 At once the deity and sacrifice. . .
 The Vicar at the Table's front presides,
 Whose presence a monastic life derides.
 Mark him, the Pastor of a jovial fold,
 Whose various texts excite a loud applause,
 Favoring the Bottle, and the good old cause !
 Lo ! the poor toper, whose untutor'd sense,
 Sees bliss in ale, and can with wine dispense ;
 Whose head proud fancy never taught to steer
 Beyond the muddy ecstasies of beer.

Next comes a touch that would suit a modern *Westminster Reviewer* !

Timon, long practised in the school of art,
 Has lost each finer feeling of the heart,
 Triumphs o'er shame, and, with delusive wiles,
 Laughs at the idiots he himself beguiles.
 Learn'd, but not wise, and without virtue brave,
 A gay, deluding, philosophic knave !

When Bacchus' joys his airy fancy fire,
 They stir a new, yet still a false desire ;
 And to the comfort of each untaught fool
 HORACE, in English, vindicates the bowl.

The objector is perfectly welcome to the distinctions ; and we only desire to remind him, that since CRABBE'S time other elements of mischief have been introduced into the witch's caldron of the Traffic, such as Gin-temples and Beershops ; and that no Law can, without creating a feeling of injustice, and displaying a real *partiality*, prohibit the Sale of Drink in the Poor Man's Inn, while allowing it in the splendid Hotel of the Rich. We take the Trade as a whole—one and indivisible.

XI.

O. "But this Law is the revival of the Sumptuary Laws of old—
 "laws worthy only of the dark ages."

A. It is the very converse of such a law in every particular—in its reasons as in its results. It does not touch the *private life* of man at all—it does not enter the sanctuary of home—and it neither dictates what he shall eat and drink, nor wherewith he shall be clothed. On the contrary, the very considerations that condemn sumptuary laws justify the Prohibition of the Traffic. When law attacks mere luxuries, and dictates limits to private taste and adornment—it touches the springs of human development, and arrests the progress of art, science, and discovery. But when it simply suppresses *Public temptations to drunkenness*, as to Gambling or Betting, it does not oppose social development, but only *human degradation*—it diverts physical and mental power into the channels of art and science, and augments, to an immeasurable extent, the resources of a nation. It is, therefore, a law worthy of the *most* enlightened age.

XII.

JOSEPH HUME, M.P.* "I demur to the 5th Article of the
 "Declaration, and object to *any* law that shall prohibit *me* from
 "the rational *use* of any article BECAUSE there are other persons
 "who will not use it in moderation. Such a proposition is not new.
 "I heard it proposed in the House by a member of long standing—
 "that the use of *pewter-pots* in which beer is sent out from public-
 "houses in London should be prohibited, because many of them
 "were stolen. I ventured to object, as it would have established a
 "principle productive of results far more injurious to society than
 "the stealing of pewter-pots, that as gold and silver were often
 "stolen, it would be *equally wise* and just to prohibit the use of
 "gold and silver spoons, and other utensils in common use that are
 "exposed hourly to depredation. If you follow out this reasoning,
 "I think you must agree that No. 5 is erroneous."

* The late lamented member for Montrose. This veteran economist and reformer did the Alliance the honor to expound his views at length, in a letter to be found in the 4th number of the *Alliance*, July, 1854, to which is appended our full rejoinder.

A. Let us see. First, then, the Alliance does *not* seek to interfere with the *private use* of anything, and does *not* assign the 'BECAUSE' attributed to it. It has no judgment to enunciate on the matter of the *private rational use*; not being a Teetotal Society, but a *political association*. It concerns itself with a *TRADE*, producing anti-social effects; and would leave all at liberty to *brew* their own beer, or *drink* their own wine. It is the brewing of *mischief* to which it objects—not home-brewing. A Maine Law no more prohibits the private use of spirit, than the existing law against *Private distillation* prohibits the *use* of grog. If the former limits the convenience of *getting* the spirit, so does the latter—and so it *ought*, unless it is right to introduce into Britain a Swedish Pandæmonium. Secondly, we don't *see* that the prohibition of pewter mugs would establish any 'principle' at all—much less one productive of the frightful injury conjured up. *All law is a compromise* between the absolute good, and necessity or expediency. It is necessary to prohibit a man doing that special wrong called picking pockets—but that does not establish a *principle* that we must prohibit *all* wrong, direct and indirect, large and small. Thirdly, if anybody can show that a Maine Law would (as it is assumed the anti-pewter-pot law would) create more mischief than it removed—let it be done at once, and there's an end of *our* 'Argument.' But windy generalities cannot show this. Fourthly, even *had* the Pewter-pot law been any parallel to what the Alliance proposes in its objects, it would be quite different in its *adaptation*. The 'use' of metal spoons or pewter-pots has no causal relation to theft: and the disuse of such utensils and instruments would not destroy the propensity to steal, but simply divert it to other objects. But the *use* of the stimulant is the one sole cause, by physical law, of the growth and prevalence of drunkenness—as the temptations of the Traffic are the chief promoter of that use. In a town full of silversmiths there might be a good deal of spoon-stealing, but the thieves existed first—neither silversmiths nor spoons *made* them thieves, or tended that way. Mr HUME, therefore, was really illustrating the subject by opposites, for the 'old' proposition he so humorously imputes to us, is just the *contrary* to ours in every essential particular. Fifthly, though the reasoning is too unlike our own to offer any inducement for following it out, we will indicate how *the subject* might serve as an illustration. Suppose the Silversmiths of London were to place their gold and silver spoons in a *tempting position*—outside their shop windows—handy to the passengers—and without any covering or guard;—and supposing, as a natural consequence in the circumstances, they were to find at night, on comparing the stock with the inventory, that many spoons were *non est*,—and supposing they made complaint to the police magistrate,—what, is it likely, would that worthy say? Would he not inform these 'Spoons' that they were 'served right'—and that his business was not to protect property which the owners themselves *used as a bait to tempt the needy or professional thief*—but that it was his duty to *prohibit* such exposures of goods, as a tempt-

ing of others to evil. Following out *this* reasoning, then, article No. 5 does *not* appear to be 'erroneous.' On the contrary, the case of *inviting* to the purchase of strong drinks is much worse: for it tempts men to do that which eventuates in their stealing other people's property, by putting the drinkers in a condition in which they neither respect the property nor person of their neighbors. It would, we allow, be 'equally,' or rather, more 'wise,' to prohibit the *exposure* of drink than the exposure of spoons.

XIII.

O. "But the Maine Law would prevent the convenient *purchase* of the article which I wished to use."

A. Very true, and what then? Can you purchase a ton of gunpowder at the next Ironmonger's shop? Not legally: and why? Because private convenience is no sufficient set-off to risk of public calamity. *Already* that convenience of drink-manufacture and purchase is abridged, and has been for centuries. You cannot distill, you cannot legally buy beer and brandy on some part of the Sabbath, nor after eleven o'clock on Saturday night, nor of anybody whatever who would like to sell it. Conveniences inconsistent with the ends of Society—a wise Society *will* resolutely suppress.

How easily the Publicist can see the truth on some subjects. The *Lancet* writes:—"Is there no limit to free trade? Why should such a virulent poison as strychnine, for example, be an article of ordinary commerce at all? *What are its uses? Is it indispensable to any legitimate art or trade?* We know of no such case. Its great use is undoubtedly as a poison for vermin, and other inferior animals. But vermin can be destroyed *by other means*, as effectual, and less dangerous to human beings. Familiarity with the modes of destroying inferior animals by poison, is, as we know too well, *apt to lead to the most frightful accidents, and even crimes.* We would lose no opportunity of insisting upon *the necessity of placing the sale of poisons under the most rigorous restrictions.*" But the Drink-Traffic *does* lead to murders, and outrages, and miseries for its perpetual attendants, a thousand times greater than the trade in Strychnine. If *necessary* to some, let them brew, as they often bake, for themselves. If the useful *Public Bakeries* were attended by a hundredth part of the horrors of the *Public Drunkeries*, the good sense of the Nation would in a single month declare:—"These Nuisances must be put down. It may be needful to have bread, *but not on these conditions*; let Families fall back upon the Home-made bread." The numbers concerned in the sensuality of the Traffic can make no difference in the reason and justice of the questions.

XIV.

W. J. Fox, M.P. "You ask me to support a Maine Law. "You might *just as wisely* ask me to sanction a law which would "prohibit the Sale of Machinery, on the ground that machinery "sometimes kills."

A. Mr Fox is entrapt by a 'false analogy'—and hence misstates our case. *De minimis non curat lex.* It is only the great evils that

Society cares to correct by law; the little ones can be endured, or better dealt with in other ways. This first condition of all law, then—the *extent and magnitude of the evil to be remedied*—is absolutely overlooked by this criticizing legislator! The lives accidentally destroyed by machinery count by scores—those *systematically* and inevitably destroyed by the Traffic, are reckoned by tens of thousands. For this reason, therefore, if for no other, we might *not* just as wisely suppress the sale of passive machinery as the sale of maddening liquor. The law already insists that machinery shall be duly boxed off and guarded, so as to reduce accidents, mainly to those occurring from neglect, or wilfulness, or the stupidity induced by drink—but we certainly do not propose that *the vast and world-wide benefits of machinery* shall be abolished on account of a few evils to which its working is liable in the case of careless or besotted persons. To make disease impossible by administering a drug which takes away *life*, is to sacrifice the major to the minor, the end to the means, and the good of society to the incident of individual evil. Will Mr Fox seriously try to make out that the Maine Law is in this absurd predicament? Will he show, first, that the Sale of Gin is Society's great good and social-necessity?—and, second, that the evils flowing from the Traffic are 'few and far between,' inconsiderable and incidental? Will he then show that Licence and Police have really *boxed-off* its dangerous parts, and reduced its 'accidents' to a minimum? Until he has done this, he has established no comparison, but rather suggested a contrast.

Moreover, such Anti-Sale-of-Machinery legislation would be no 'remedy' at all; not simply because it stopt the good with the bad, and health with disease—(in other words, cut off the head on account of the head-ache!)—but because it had no relation to *the cause* of accident—or to the essence of the disease itself. If a man is caught and crushed in a threshing machine, the fault is not in *it*, but in *him*. The machine does not 'solicit' him to put his arm or foot into its mouth. Indeed, it does not operate on his *subjective nature* at all. There is nothing in the machine which inspires the man with an impulsive longing to have his limb torn off by the revolution of its terrible teeth—but the very reverse. Prohibition, in *this* case, would *not* touch the *CAUSE* of accidents; and prohibition would, therefore, be equally unphilosophical and inexpedient. But can the same be said of Prohibition of the 'Traffic'? Is *it* a passive thing? Does it not appeal, in every nefarious variety of seduction and allurement, to the passions and desires of the ignorant, the weak, and the wicked? Does it not, like a Syren, flatter and deceive, and destroy its millions? Does it not dispense a *material* which is active upon both the sentient and moral nature of men, *tending to the creation of excess by physical law*, and, by necessary sequence, draining away the moral controlling power, while it excites and depraves all the sensual passions and savage impulses? The facts of every day are our fearful witnesses! Prohibition, in *this* case, *does* touch the *CAUSE* of Intemperance, Accident, and Crime—and prohibition, consequently, is equally philosophical and efficient.

xv.

VINDEX: "*Administered* by saints and angels, the drinking system could not be saved from being the occasion of deplorable evils to mankind. It becomes terrible when worked by men for the most part devoid of culture—coarse, and given up to a calling which corrupts the moral nature of all in contact with it,—of men who, as a class, openly discard all pretensions to high moral principle. Look at it, and ask whether it ought not *to be hurled out of existence* as you would hunt out wild beasts—annihilated as you would a race of *untameable cannibals* suddenly let loose in our midst, by all weapons *proper* to such a warfare? This system, tending in itself to mischief, and *worked by a class low in intellect and morals*, intersects our hamlets, towns, and cities like a canal of moral pollution, and *out of its midst there arises* our National Intemperance."

A. Admirably stated, Vindex! Exactly the view of the Alliance. The Traffic, we say, is the lake in which the mass of intemperance is engendered—is the *fons malorum*—is evil in essence, tendency, and act—in its material, its machinery, and its men;—is conducted by those who entrap and devour the weak, the young, the simple, and degrade still lower the degraded,—is a system which, because it cannot be *tamed*, should be, if not hunted, at least *quietly annihilated* by the Great Extinguisher of a Righteous, Prohibitory Law.

VINDEX: "Law, interfering to limit its extent and regulate its influence, has served to fasten the festering evil in our midst. It has given to it the *prestige* of a thing *sanctioned* by law—and so sanctioned, it is tolerated by the Church. To let property for, and to get gain by, this vile system, is not esteemed inconsistent with *Christian fellowship*. Could I say a bitterer thing?"

A. Certainly not: let us ask the law to *withdraw* its sanction, so *influential* as you admit it to be in moral *prestige*—and to PROHIBIT the intolerable Thing. We think the Law *a very proper weapon* with such a class, against such a system. Why not prohibit a canal of moral pollution as well as an open sewer?

VINDEX: "Our conflict is of knowledge, truth, reason, against "*opinion*. Why doubt the final issue, with these *alone*?"

A. A fair question, which shall be fairly answered. Knowledge, Truth, Reason, are but abstractions—are strong only *when put into act*. Law is Truth's weapon against the person who won't honor Truth empty-handed; just as Physic is Truth's instrument in rectifying diseased states. Truth *alone* does nothing—it is like Faith *without works*—dead. The Traffic pollutes and depresses—puts society into an abnormal state—*creates the necessity of Police in the end*—therefore indicates the superior wisdom of employing Prohibition at the beginning. No reason for moral suasion, *solus*, exists in this case that does not exist for it as to other social evils: *in degree*, less reason. The Traffic antagonizes conviction in the Drinker, and makes *him* the thrall of Appetite.

"No greater mistake," says the *Athenæum*, in reviewing *The Alpha*, "can be committed, than to place all our actions under the

impulse of the Intellect, and to suppose that our *knowledge* of what is right will compel us to *do* right. Social experience has *educated* social feelings: the Intellect has, of course, guided this education—but it has not been its *motive force*. In most cases, the wrong we do is owing to our instincts and passions disregarding the Intelligence, and acting in *defiance* of it. JONES is fond of Port: a pint does him no great injury; a bottle makes him quarrelsome, reckless, and profligate. He *knows* well enough that, if he drinks a bottle, he will thump his wife, destroy the furniture, pass the night in a round-house, and suffer terrible head-ache on the morrow. He knows this as well as he knows most things; he *foresees* the consequences—and drinks the bottle."

THE ALPHA, in answer, says:—"Apart from the influences to which man may be either *animally* or *conventionally* subject, his Errors are always in the exact ratio of his Ignorance. Mankind have the power to rid themselves of these influences—all such influences SHOULD BE REMOVED."

Precisely so! Knowledge waits to be applied. Theoretical science may direct the Farmer how to drain his fields and manure his soil aright—but it will not do the *work*. As a knowledge of the evil of swampy soils, without *removing* the wet, will not allow the Agricultural Truth to be illustrated, and secure the rich harvest,—so Truth and Ideas will not realize Sobriety, Virtue, and Happiness, until we *remove the killing and corrupting influences* around us connected with the Traffic.

Wisely counsels Professor NEWMAN:—"Instead of ordering men to rise above their circumstances, which few can or will do, political philosophy seeks to alter the circumstances, and through them affect the men, by preventing any from being exposed to temptations beyond their strength. Virtue must come *from within*; to this problem Religion and Morality must direct themselves. But Vice may come *from without*: TO HINDER THIS IS THE CARE OF THE POLITICIAN."

The first duty of Truth-holding is to act it out—to bring the *Circumstances* into harmony with the Theory of Life—so that the Truth may have free and fair play. Then, and then alone, can it fructify, feed, and save the Nations.

XVI.

O. "A Prohibitory Law diminishes virtue by destroying Temptation; it reduces the moral resisting power to a torpid and "diseased state."

A. We don't stop to dispute this theory of virtue, in which, assuredly, we do not believe; but we observe (1), that the removal of a public-house leaves behind quite sufficient temptation, both objective and subjective, for the most transcendental Puritan on earth!* As an apple is not the only fruit, neither is the Traffic the

* "Millions of occasions will come, varying every hour, in which you may restrain your passions, and subdue your hearts to gentleness and patience."—ORVILLE DREWY, D.D.

only temptation. We wish it were ! But (2), the objector strangely overlooks the fact, that if we take one trial of his virtue away, we leave another in its place. Before, he had the temptation of the Licensed house ; now, he has the Prohibitive Law itself, which, he says, the people are *tempted* to break, and which, at any rate, they may, if they like. And (3), it must be observed, that so far from removing temptation—for those who want to be tempted,—and to whose peculiar moral genius temptations are the steps in the ladder to heaven,—we actually *increase* their number and variety ! They can—if they want to—not only incur and resist the temptation to private drinking, but also the temptation to *violate the fresh law*. Grant, theoretically, that *their* private virtue (or vice ?) might be more specially developed by the Traffic, all we can say is—that it ought not to be, and shall not be, promoted *at our cost*. To permit private vice, or purchase private virtue, at the risk and cost of the public weal, is to sacrifice the many to the few—the basis of the pyramid to the apex—the apple to the apple tree—the end to the means ! Private virtue is very well in its sphere, but we would sacrifice the public virtue to private whims and egoisms of no sort. We may pay much too dear for the Voluntary Whistle of these Deliver-us-into-temptation men.

XVII.

O. “A Maine Law contravenes the *tendencies* of modern Legislation. The principles of Government, illustrated by the bent of History, show that we have the most morality where we have the most freedom. Prohibition belongs to an exploded system.”

A. We deny the allegations *in toto*. The decalogue is not exploded. *Thou shalt not kill*, has yet a potency, both in ethics and politics. If history, moreover, has proved one thing more clearly than another, it is this—that under absolute Freedom from the *Controlling Power of Government*, Society rapidly reverts to *anarchy*, which finally results in Despotism. There is less morality in France and America than in Britain—there is more of *Constitutional Law* (the great safeguard of rational Liberty) in England than on the Continent—and there is, with all her faults, more valuable freedom, more elevated morality, more attachment to *law*, than exists elsewhere.

The history of modern legislation furnishes another answer to this question. Parallels crowd upon us, in laws against lotteries, gambling-houses, and the sale of dead meat and poisons ; in sanitary laws and factory regulations. Compare, for example, the principles and arguments adopted by the House of Commons in 1819, on the Hon. Mr LYTTLETON’S motion for the abolition of Lotteries, with those of the Alliance for the abolition of Licensed Drink-houses :—

Resolutions of the Commons.

“1. That by the establishment of State Lotteries, a spirit of *gambling*, injurious in the highest degree to the morals of the people, is encouraged and provoked.

Resolutions of the Alliance.

1. That by the establishment of *State-licensed Drunkeries*, a habit of *intemperance*, injurious in the highest degree to the morals of the people, is encouraged.

- "2. That such a spirit, manifestly weakening habits of industry, must diminish the sources of the public revenue.
- "3. That the said lotteries have given 'rise' to other systems of *gambling*, which have been but partially repressed by laws whose provisions are extremely arbitrary, and their enforcement liable to the greatest abuse.
- "4. That this House, therefore, will no longer authorize the establishment of *State Lotteries*, under any system of regulation."
2. That such a spirit, manifestly weakening habits of industry, must diminish the permanent sources of the public revenue.
3. That the said *Drunkeries* have given rise to other systems of evil—to gambling and prostitution—which have been but partially repressed by laws whose provisions are arbitrary, and their enforcement liable to the greatest abuse.
4. That the House, therefore, should no longer authorize the establishment of *State Drunkeries*, under any system of regulation.

If possible, the speeches were still closer in their parallels. Mr LYTTLETON said:—"The power of the laws to compel men to do good 'is only small—but the power of the laws to restrain them from doing 'evil is great and important. In the one case, it was all compulsion—in the other, merely *prohibition*.'" FOWELL BUXTON said, in reference to a certain locality familiar to himself:—"The Lottery 'had destroyed the very principle of industry in the village. This 'fact disproved the assertion about there being everywhere a given 'portion of the spirit of gambling; for until the village had heard 'of the Lottery, it had *not* existed. The direct tendency of the 'Lottery was to produce Paupers and to make Rogues.' So of the Traffic—it creates the propensity for drink—and *its direct tendency is to produce paupers and to make rogues*. While the best and oldest philosophy of legislation is that which teaches *prevention*, instead of palliation, the 'tendencies' of Modern Legislation are in favor of a Maine Law, not against it. It is a predestined result of the progress of the age—of deeper enquiry and insight into the *true* causes of social disorder;—it is A WORLD'S LAW, which, had it not originated from the seeming accidents of a remote State, *must* in due time have manifested itself elsewhere. A Maine Law does not belong to the exploded systems of the past, but to that which must precede the better time which the Poet shadowed forth, who

Dipt into the Future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the World and all the wonder that would be,
When the Common Sense of Most shall hold a fretful world in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.

XVIII.

O. "Teetotalism and the Pledge having proved a *failure*, the "Alliance would now resort to the arm of the Law, to make the "people sober by Act of Parliament."

A. This is a misrepresentation, either from mistake or wilfulness. If the former, it is stupidity—if the latter, mendacity. The objector has his choice. The Maine Law, as adopted by the State of New York, was entitled—"An act to *prevent* Drunkenness, Pauperism, and Crime"—not to infuse positive moral principles into the heart.* We

* It's to be hoped, says the P. D. at our elbow, that when they're sober, they will look out for these of themselves. Very good!

object to the License System that it is virtually a frightful and successful engine for creating crime, and debauchery, and irreligion, by Act and authority of Parliament : and he who evades this issue is—not to mince matters—either knave or fool.

But the notion that Teetotalism and the Pledge are failures, is a fallacy. Even our opponents know better than that—and now that the Prohibitory æra has come, they can raise pæans over the achievements of Teetotalism ! Hear the *Birmingham Journal*, of Nov. 8, 1856 :—“ When the ‘ future historian ’ shall chronicle the growth of the Anglo-Saxon race, he will write a long chapter on the Temperance movement ; he will probably quote it as *one of the most remarkable characteristics of the phænomena* he has to deal with.” But this Vates of Birmingham goes on to say that the historian will have to record its temporary ‘ decline and fall ’ (only three years !) when “ from want of faith in the power of moral suasion, they dreamed of carrying forward by force *that which was so well begun* ”—until, in 1857, led back, by the Genius of the *Journal*, “ to the good old path so *firmly* though roughly hewn out by the pioneers of the movement, and *once more* restored to common sense and practical *efficiency*, they repented their idle dream of Parliamentary sobriety.” Poor prophet ! No man more earnestly or plainly preached prohibition in 1834 and 1836,—than the very Patriarch of Teetotalism—JOSEPH LIVESEY. We ourselves pressed it upon the attention of the Magistrates and the Nation in 1838-39. The mistake was, that we did not *organize* for that distinct, political work, as we are now doing. The Americans were more fortunate, and *therefore* more successful. The *Journal of the Union*, in 1848, strikes the right key when it says :—“ In the Halls of Legislation, “ and the Courts of Justice, we should never be known as Temperance men—but as *Citizens demanding their rights*—protection, “ security, liberty, life.” It is to be hoped the ‘ future historian ’ will know more about the *real history* of the movement than the *Birmingham Journal*, else he will certainly make as great a mess of the ‘ remarkable phænomena,’ as the Editor does of reasoning and philosophy, when he compares the prohibition of exciting drink with the prohibition of *passive* razors, thereby simply proving that childish capacities should not meddle with sharp tools, for they will inevitably cut themselves. This journalist, however, while scouting the notion of ‘ Parliamentary sobriety,’ is a vehement pleader for Lamp Post and *Police Morality* ! He shows, in the issue cited, that the present system is a ‘ mockery ’—he speaks of “ 50 or 60 miles of streets where it is as much as a man’s head is worth to be alone after nightfall ”—of “ an amount of daring crime, highway robberies, burglaries, and outrages, such as never before issued in a winter, *occurring every night*, and rendering no man’s life or property safe ”—“ outrages that evince in the criminals [NOT FEAR, but] a *perfect security* in the prosecution of their offences—the sure precursor of a winter of crime and terror.” Is there not some mistake here ? Has the editor not Professor LAYCOCK’s assurance, and the *Westminster’s* assertion, that fear promotes crime, while ‘ secu-

rity' prevents it? Why will he not confide in his own pretty pet of 'Moral suasion'? Will a Lamp light let moral principle into the human heart? Trust to moral suasion! If good for the Teetotalers why not for the Tipplers? But no!—he leans upon the *Police staff*! "If an argument is wanted for *increasing*, rather than *diminishing this* protection, now, we point to the record of crime—" the mere money losses of which, saying nothing of personal outrage, would pay twenty times over the cost of a proper system of "Lighting and of an efficient Police." Not a word about the failure of law!—but a plea for its better enforcement. The moral suasion argument, we fear, was like many other Birmingham wares—logical lacquer made to—sell.

The *Journal* some weeks afterwards records the proceedings of the meeting to uphold the 'Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society,' when Lord CALTHORPE, as Chairman, directed attention to drinking as the chief cause of crime in *this* country. The Recorder of Birmingham, Mr M. D. HILL, addressed himself specially to the *artizans*, and their cheers evince how they felt the truth of his observations:—

"You have no doubt been exposed to temptations of which the noble lords and right honorable gentlemen present know nothing. You have triumphed over those temptations, and you will bear me out when I say, that among the most fearful and irresistible by which you were beset, were the 1500 public-houses—(*cheers*)—the 308 taverns, the 321 gin-shops, the 871 beer-houses—THE AUTHORIZED TEMPTATIONS OFFERED BY THE LEGISLATURE TO CRIME. (*Renewed cheers.*) I speak in the presence of members of both Houses of Parliament, and I affirm that these 1500 dens which these great men suffer to be opened, lest, as it were, the criminal who perseveres in his reformation should retire to some quarter of the town to be out of reach of temptation, are the *main sources* of crime in this country. (*Cheers.*) WHATEVER DOOR IS SHUT AGAINST THE CRIMINAL, THE DOOR OF THE PUBLIC-HOUSE IS ALWAYS OPEN; whatever may be his guilt, so long as he has the smallest of her Majesty's coins in his pocket, *that* door will not be closed against him."

The *Journal* admits the 'mockery and delusion' of the Law's pretence of protection; but it will not protest against the iniquitous institution which creates three crimes out of every four; nay, it has the hardihood to ridicule and misrepresent those who have the sense and honesty to protest, and, by way of crowning folly, it defends the *snare*.

To return to our starting point. Teetotalers never at any period, "dreamed of carrying forward by *force* that which was so well begun." Nor did they ever believe that *preaching* teetotalism would get rid of all our social evils, or exhaust 'the whole duty of man.' They have, therefore, *not* been disappointed, and they by no means believe that the proclamation of Temperance truth has fallen to the ground fruitless. Even the Edinburgh Professor of Physic confesses *his* indebtedness to teetotal science, and it is not our fault that he should mingle with the pure doctrine, *incongruous* compounds and *incompatible* elements. Teetotalism is only one science—and moral

suasion its sole instrument. (Opinion cannot be enforced by law, and the objector who represents the Alliance as entering upon a crusade preposterous and impossible in character, must be destitute either of reflection or of truth.) But moral suasion is only one aspect of life and humanity; and teetotalism therefore must be subject to the same relationships as other *isms*. True, all are not convinced, or if convinced, converted—by Teetotalism. Nor are they all converted by Moralism, or Judaism, or Romanism, or Protestantism, or Christianity, or Carlylism, or *Journalism*. Our formula, we think, is wiser than any political, or philosophical, or fanatical, or radical *Panacea* falsely imputed to us, or really clung to by others. WE WANT ALL GOOD THINGS TO PUT DOWN ALL BAD THINGS. Hence, while morally inaugurating the truth of Teetotalism, we would not be legally instituting the Snare of the Traffic. We would not poison the soil with the left hand, while sowing good seed with the right. We would not license brothels at our street corners, while we taught purity and virtue in our private dwellings. We would not, as Christians, pray God to deliver *us* FROM temptation, while, as citizens, we *planted* temptations amidst our *neighbors*. If Teetotalism has not prevailed more—if, in the course of years, 3 out of 4 of our pledged intentions have not been realized (true of many *other* pledges, virtuous gentlemen!)—what is the reason? Has the *truth* failed to do all that truth can do; reach the intellect? Nay, *it has* done that—but the truth was not obeyed. Why? Because custom—your custom—has *corrupted* the moral nature, and enslaved the Will. The *failure* is not with Teetotalism—but with the Victim over whose fall you gloat, and in the guilt of whose failure *you* are partakers. *Nothing* fails, if it accomplishes the end for which it is designed. But, as *one* thing is not adapted for *all* things, so teetotalism is not prohibition. MORAL SUASION is adapted to the INTELLECT wanting information—LEGAL SUASION to the POCKET wanting profits, and to the morbid APPETITE of the victim craving gin. The License system—so ardently supported by the objectors, yet the most miserable of failures!—had no adaptedness for success.

The Hon. HORACE MANN, Secretary of the American Board of Education, stated the case admirably in 1852, in these words:—“Human law has no direct power to control a diseased appetite. We may punish the retailer for selling, and imprison the drunkard for drinking; but as soon as the victim is released from his confinement, *the retailer kindles his appetite anew*. We have tried this method of reform for more than two centuries, and yet we are not at all advanced beyond the starting point—probably we are behind it. Now we have found, that though we cannot knock a human passion on the head, yet *we can knock whisky barrels on the head, and thus baulk the passion, and save the victim.*”

Archbishop WHATELY, in his Lectures on Political Economy, grants too much when he usefully remarks that “every instance of the infliction of a punishment, is an instance of the *failure* of the Legislator’s design—an instance, *pro tanto*, of the inefficiency, i.e.

want of *complete* efficacy, of the law." No wise Legislator expects law to be universally obeyed—for that would imply a state of human perfection in which Legislation would be superfluous. The fallacy is akin to the Sciolistic statement which alleges that a certain truth is a failure, because it has failed to convince *somebody*! Laws and Evidence depend for effect on the *mental nature* of the subject to which they are addressed—and that may be, morally or intellectually, either above or beneath the appeal. The *fault* may be in the 'subject' as well as the 'object.' Light is neither a failure nor a nonentity, because blind-men cannot see. Hence the old proverb—

A man convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still.

As it is sufficient to justify the wisdom of any Law, that it represses a sum of evil and promotes a measure of good, so the fact that the Temperance Society has convinced millions, has vastly modified the drinking customs of classes amenable to moral considerations, reclaimed and blessed tens of thousands of the once victims of the Drunkard's appetite,—is an ample and noble vindication of Teetotal success. It has another proud claim—the merit of permeating the people with that conviction of the intense and ramified curse of Intemperance, and of its prodigious cost and burden to the nation, which, now manifested by internal heavings, shall ere long become an articulate and persistent demand for Protection.

CHAPTER II.

OBJECTIONS TO A PROHIBITORY LIQUOR-LAW FOUNDED ON FALSE ASSUMPTIONS, EITHER AS TO THE PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT, THE NATURE AND NEEDS OF MAN, THE CAUSES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF INTEMPERANCE, OR THE ACTUAL WORKINGS OF PROHIBITION.

OBJECTIONS to a Prohibitory Law are mostly reducible to three allegations—either, 1st, that it is *injurious* (unprofitable); or, 2nd, *inefficient* (not adapted); or 3rd, *superfluous* (needless, or inferior, as a remedy).

I. A PROHIBITORY LAW IS AN UNDESIRABLE MEANS TO THE END.

1. *Because it limits Personal liberty.*

All laws do that. As BLACKSTONE well says, “Every man, when he enters into society, gives up a part of his natural ability as the price of so valuable a purchase.” A man in a natural state, might have a right to go naked—but not in a social. A man might dress as he pleased, if he lived in a wood—in pants or in petticoats—but not so in a town. To borrow poor HARTLEY COLERIDGE’S fine language—himself a victim of the Traffic—true liberty is *not*

A lawless rule, an anarchy of ill—
But what is Freedom? Rightly understood,
A universal *Licence to be Good*.

Now the Maine Law does not compel personal acts—it only *restrains* or prohibits a public mischievous *trade*. It entrenches on no private habits, and invades no domestic sanctuary. The personal liberty to poison oneself is left as intact and sacred—as ever. Inasmuch as this objection applies to *all* laws, it *proves too much*—that is, nothing. As to this special law, it demands a *minimum* of sacrifice for a *maximum* of good.

2. *Because it infringes British Liberty.*

This was the cuckoo cry of our mobility in 1730, against the introduction of Police to suppress the prevalence of highway robbery and assassination—“as if,” says SMOLLETT, “*that freedom was desirable, in the enjoyment of which people find no security for their lives and effects.*” So we are to sacrifice untold millions of property, and expose ourselves to the perpetual danger and disgrace of pauperism and crime—of three-parts of it out of four, at the very lowest computation—lest, in refusing to make drinking *free*

and easy by Act of Parliament, we should trench on 'British Liberty' to make drunkenness and desperadoes, and then cast the burden of them upon wise and honest men!

"When," says CARLYLE, "shall we have done with all this cant of British liberty, voluntary principle, and the like? It is really getting *too* bad. For British liberty, it seems, the people cannot be taught to read....British liberty, shuddering to interfere with the rights of Capital, takes six or eight millions of money annually to feed the idle laborer whom it dares not employ [and has *made* a pauper of]. For British liberty, we live over poisonous cess-pools, gully-drains, and detestable abominations; and omnipotent London cannot sweep the dirt out of itself. British liberty produces—what? Floods of Hansard debates every year, and apparently little else. We have achieved British liberty hundreds of years ago; and are fast growing, on the strength of it, one of the most absurd populations the Sun, among his great Museum of Absurdities, looks down upon at present."

Another eloquent writer says:—

"There is a tendency, fatal in its consequences, and decried by earnest men, to confound true freedom with *laissez-faire*; as if Liberty meant no rule at all; instead of Government, *effective and indefinitely extended, by the best, with consent of all*....The idea is too common, that in a free state, the Government ought to exercise little or no control over private affairs. It is forgotten that the essence of tyranny consists, not in the fact that men obey, but that they do so without knowing and comprehending the reason of their action....The one characteristic of real freedom is, that a nation acts with consent and intelligence. The man is as free who commands himself to be bound, with express directions that no attention be paid to any subsequent shrieks or implorings, that he may undergo an excruciating operation, as he who sweeps the moorland on his own steed...The nation is ever free when *itself* wills the restraints which on itself it imposes."*

3. *Because it substitutes legal for moral agency.*

This is a misconception, or a perversion. Law is moral agency—the declaration of society's moral conviction—and it is none the worse for having a police staff behind it. Schoolmasters do *not* vanish because policemen appear. The decalogue is still read in churches, long after the legal decree has gone forth against perjury and murder. The declaration in the Statutes at Large, that sheep stealing is felony, does *not* repeal the 7th commandment. A Law is *not* a 'substitute' for, but a supplement to, moral agency—in fine, a moral record, backed by a material rod for those who need it. The objection again proves fatal to all law—or none—and is a puerile confusion of a *Rod-made law*, with a *Law-made rod*! To call Law by the name of 'Morality-of-the-stick,' is little better than performing an intellectual summersault—and makes nothing ridiculous but the *saltationist* himself. It is easy to nickname the

* *The Christian Life* by P. BAYNE M.A.

prescription of a physician, as the 'Morality of the Bolus'—but, after all, is the bolus the wisdom? We know that it is sometimes entitled to the *virtue* of the cure. Police Law has not a moral, but a restraining object: it is not a normal food for a normal man; but rather an 'astringent' medicine for 'lax' customers.

4. *Because it is dangerous to sentiments of liberty.**

Professor LAYCOCK has the gift of second, or double sight. Owing to the Maine Law "our Transatlantic brethren are already on the verge of a fearful social catastrophe—an *ominous warning to every* "lover of civil and religious liberty."

What are the forces in conflict? Rum and Slavery, on the one hand—Abolition and Prohibition on the other. We regard such a divarication rather as an augury for good, than an omen of evil. But there is no accounting for tastes! We wonder what the coming *bugbear* is? For the professor's prediction an historical parallel is readily suggested—but who stands for the royal dupe?

Old King Cole was a credulous soul,
So he sent for his secretary:
And he told him to look
In his fortune-telling book,
And to read him his destiny.
Then his secretary said,
When his fate he had read,
And cast his nativity—
That a mole on the face
Boded *something* would take place,
But not what that *SOMETHING* would be!

The *Times* is in labor, and we must wait patiently, with the 'venerable gowns,' for the revelation of the coming—'mouse.'

One's historical reading would have led ordinary *un-profes-*sorial minds to anticipate convulsions from a very different quarter than the prohibition of the sources of blackguardism, indolence, beggary, disorder, and crime. *Sans Culottism, Hyde Park Mobs, and New York Rowdyism*—the sewerage of the Traffic—are more apparent causes of dread.

The following, taken from the *Evening Star* of December 4th, 1856, indicates 'something rotten in the State,' and tends to show that the protection we pay for, is hardly what we get. "The

* A pertinent illustration of this 'danger,' has just been supplied by Dr LAYCOCK Professor of Physic, in Edinburgh, and his medical students. A large band of students *rioted*, and on the impudent plea of objecting to the word *dissected*, used on a placard announcing a Lecture by Dr M'CULLOCH, of Dumfries, and which word *they used* on their own bills, inviting the riot, deprived that gentleman of his right to free speech, prevented sober citizens from hearing, broke the furniture of the hall, destroyed property, and robbed other citizens of their money by subjecting them to large consequent expenses. After a week of rioting, a second meeting was held, notwithstanding the unparalleled meanness of some *professed* Friends of Temperance, who called upon Dr M'CULLOCH to sacrifice the dearest and most valuable of social rights to threats of juvenile Rowdyism and the vanity of senility,—the Magistrates firmly did their duty, and *suppressed* further outrage. These genteel *gamins*, who would not even listen to Moral suasion, were after all brought to Reason by despised Legal suasion. 'Better late than never'—but *one dose* of it applied heroically to the Banditti on the first night, would have saved the city a week's disgraceful uproar.

number of crimes of violence—garotte robberies, burglaries, and murderous assaults, etc.,—which it has been our painful duty to record of late, *has given rise to a general feeling of insecurity. The state of things is certainly alarming enough.* Men of nervous temperaments, or weak *physique*, begin to look anxiously about them in passing through any but the most frequented thoroughfares after ten o'clock. *Fathers of families look somewhat closely to the fastenings of doors and windows, and meditate attaching alarm-bells to shutters, and providing their toilet drawers with loaded pistols, as an almost necessary appurtenance of the dressing-room.* The moral suasion stage of writing to the papers has long since passed. That universal specific was vigorously applied, but the application failed to render the criminal less active, or the police more so. The matter grows serious."

5. *Because it transgresses Conscience, and appeals to Fear.*

"The Maine Law," says the *Westminster Review*, "stands in our opinion, condemned by the VERY PURPOSE it pretends to fulfil. It makes man the subject of state policy, *not* of individual conviction.... Virtue lies in the heart of the Individual.... There is no feeling against which we ought more sedulously to guard, than that which prompts us, when *we* become virtuous, to *stop other people's* cakes [cates?] and ale." "Let them," says Professor LAYCOCK, "appeal to men's reason and sense of justice, *rather than their fear.*"

This is a false alternative—for we appeal to *the three*—and find the triad of motives all too weak. To quarrel with fear, is to dispute with Providence, who has, for wise and necessary purposes, implanted the feeling in our constitution. *Indignation* at inhumanity and wrong, is a great conservative principle of society—and the fear of exciting it, is a bar to outrage and tyranny where higher motives fail. To remove *fear* from the guilty Few, would be to spread terror over the guiltless Many. It is a striking proof of the want of thought in those who study fine-writing, and weave glittering word-theories, that they should fail to perceive so patent a fact—that to cease to suspend the *Sword-of-Law* over the criminal class, would virtually extend the *Dread of Crime* over the innocent community. All arguments of this kind, however, really enforce the expediency of prohibition—since the greater the evil of fear to the criminal and to society, the greater the necessity that we should adopt a *preventive* system, going to the root of three crimes out of four, and lessening the need of applying fear so frequently. One right law of *that* kind is worth a thousand of the common description. The Reviewer is as wide of the mark as the Professor. The 'purpose' of the Law is not to make other people 'virtuous,' or to stop their delicacies and drink, and therefore the Westminster judge has condemned the law under the influence of a prejudice and a blunder. The law pretends not to make men internally virtuous; it simply says, that while the citizen may cater for his cates and his can, at his *own* risk and responsibility, he shall not

SELL AND BUY THEM IN SUCH A WAY as to burden the community by necessary consequence with three-fourths of the whole pauperism, crime, and mischief of the country.

That "virtue lies in *the heart* of the Individual," is an ambiguous maxim. It lies there when it is there—no doubt—but Laws are needed for those in whose heart *something else* lies. If the reviewer means that the *opinion* of the Individual is the test of 'virtue'—then we denounce the maxim as a pernicious sophism. The *Thugs* are not virtuous, nor the slave-holder either—even though they may *think* they are. Perdition is paved with 'good intentions'—hypocrisy—and delusion. Nay, amongst the very worst things on earth we must sometimes place the mistaken actions of *good men*. The problem of Government is the reconciliation of *conflicting* 'individual convictions.' It is our conviction that the *responsibility* of the Traffic should be sustained by its supporters—not by its opponents: and if this is impossible, then Prohibition is just and expedient.

Laissez-faire, 'let-alone,' is all very well if reciprocal: but were it so, England would be Paradise regained, which it certainly is not. Even the theorist, theoretically, applies it only to the normal man—not to the idiot, the minor, the madman, and the murderer. Were he to carry out the insane abstraction to its inexorable conclusion, he would deny redress to the sufferer of wrong and outrage, and proclaim exemption and impunity to the abandoned and cruel. Under the pretence of philosophy, the disciple of this mischievous maxim would coolly contemplate the murder of nations as of men. Common sense, however, as well as the highest philosophy, recognizes the *necessity* and *philanthropy* of supplying deficiencies to the weak, and motives of restraint to the wilful and wicked. To abandon law and police, in the present state of the world, would be the same absurdity as to tear away the bandage and discard the crutch of a wounded soldier, before he is restored to something like a sanitary and standing condition. Release the weak and wicked from the fear of punishment, and you virtually increase the motives to wrong doing. We have seen much of the world, at home and abroad,—have visited many countries, and examined the social life of many cities,—and our experience is, that *where the arm of the law is weakest*, where moral suasion is most alone, licentiousness, outrage, and crime are most rampant. Fear, or legal restraint, low as the motive may be, and vehemently as sciolists and libertines may depreciate it—is the breakwater which civilization has wisely constructed to prevent the surges of anarchy and barbarism from sweeping away the Social conquests of the Past.

What, indeed, would men generally care for virtue, if *vice* had no disagreeable consequences of which they were afraid? To quarrel with such motives, is to quarrel not only with the constitution of man, but with the Providence of God. For our part, we are not ashamed of introducing into our jurisprudence, an element that is essential to the laws of Supreme Wisdom. True human law should be a copy of true Divine Law, let a shallow and pretentious philosophy deride it as it may.

The objection reminds us of what SCHILLER has somewhere said, with exquisite irony, to this purport :—

Quite *ex cathedra*, our critic teaches.
 Yet since, what our professor preaches,
 The crowd may be excused from knowing—
 Nature proceeds in her old train,
 To oil the wheels or *check* the chain,
 And keep the clock-work going.
 Some day, Philosophers, no doubt,
 A better world will bring about,
 Till then—the old a little longer
 Must blunder on ; each *free-mason*
 Submit to check from Law that's stronger,
 And from the Prison Chaplain get his moral suasion.

6. *Because it conflicts with the principles of Free Trade.*

It is none the worse for that, unless it also interferes with *fair-trade*. Fairness is higher than Freedom, and ought not to wait upon her. When some one proposed to take Mr COBDEN'S printing patterns, he answered pithily : "I am for free trade, not *free booty*." Freedom must stop somewhere : and it fairly stops at public innocence or utility. What is injurious, should not be free, but bound : otherwise free trade in 'one's own niggers'—in the consoler opium,—in '*quietness*,'* or in strychnine,—must be proclaimed, as well as free trade in corn. Says Mr J. DEACON HUME, in his evidence before Parliament :—"They have in Cuba the slave trade. As the laws of this country have deprived the planter in Jamaica of that means of raising his produce, I conceive that *that* is a question, like several others, taken entirely out of the category of Free Trade."

7. *Because it is destructive of property.*

"The law of Humanity must *needs* interfere with the right of Property." So says the *Examiner* the other day, against the King of Naples : why not against the Knights of the Tap ? The mischiefs of his vile use of property is as much smaller than the evils accruing from theirs, as the Malvern Hills are less than the mighty Himalayas. In truth, however, the Maine Law destroys no property but that which is first used to the injury of Society—and not even *that* property, until the owner attempts to employ it in contraband methods. The objection again proves too much—for it claims, with equal logic, respect for the die of the coiner, the plates of the forger, the house of the bordeller, the doors and the dice of the gambling 'Hell,' the apparatus of the burglar, and the magazines of the enemy !

* On the Bolton case, where the woman *effectually* 'quietened' her husband with antimony mixture, the *Times* says (August, 1856):—"It is a great reproach against our public regulations that such a thing is *possible* as the purchase of drugs which can destroy life, even when administered in serial doses." The old story of the gnat and the camel.

8. *Because it interferes with 'vested' interests!*

So did the law which declared slave-trading to be piracy! A gallant defender of those vested interests argued in the House, against *that* Prohibitory law, that it would interfere with £14,000,000 of annual trading capital, ensure the decay of Britain, and leave London a heap of ruins! A Maine Law really interferes with no interests save those that first interfere with the higher interests of the community. Again, therefore, the objection proves too much—for *loss* is the righteous retribution of reckless and immoral barter—and therein the sophism virtually appeals against Providence.

Mr Sergeant ADAMS gave a sufficient answer to this objection in a Letter delivered to the Select Committee on Public Houses: 1st Report, p. 648. "The expenditure of capital for the encouragement of immorality appears to me to give no claim to the continuance of a licence to encourage it; and if the mere existence of these houses, independently of the mode in which they are conducted, is *contra bonus mores*, they ought to be suppressed altogether." Now we have demonstrated that the Traffic is 'contrary to good morals.' We need but add, that the Traffic might be *compensated*—if the country thought proper—though such a proposition would be very impolitic, by inducing many persons to rush into the Trade for the sake of a slice of the prospective loaf—and would be impracticable in at the bargain, since no one could assess or estimate the real loss. The Traffickers, like other traders, must mark 'the signs of the times,' and prepare for the change. 'Coming laws cast their shadows before.' Let the Traffickers be warned in time, and no longer obstruct the sunshine of the people's prosperity. They are—as the words of their licence will tell them—but *yearly tenants*—and more than half of them have broken the *conditions* of their licence. Nay, is there *one* public-house in a hundred, that, in the course of a year, has sent out, or produced, *no* case of drunkenness? The 'respectable houses' will still be required as sober *Inns*, and their legitimate trade as Innkeepers—then *unLicensed Victuallers*—will flourish with the increased produce, trade, and travelling of the country.

9. *Because it is a species of Class Legislation.*

How? Where alone it yet exists, it is the expression of *the will of large majorities of the whole people*; and it knows no distinction of class—either in its prohibitions or its penalties. No landmark of legal 'equality,' any more than of liberty, is overthrown to make way for it. It is the 'equality' of prohibition, dictated by an enlightened 'fraternity,' in the exercise of the prescriptive 'liberty' of franchise.

"But, after all, will not the Law press with *unequal incidence*?
 "Cannot the wealthy, for instance, *import* their foreign wines, and
 "get drink in ways impossible to the poor man?"

Probably so: but that circumstance is owing to the power of wealth; not to any partiality or favor in the law. A long purse has its privileges;—will enable its owner either to *resist*, or conduct,

attempts at legal or social injury, where a short purse would fail. What then? Is the law to make all men equally rich? You might as well ask it to make all men physically strong, or wise, or handsome—qualities which will have their privileges, just as surely as riches. But there is no *necessity* that the law should press unequally. The Poor man, for instance, can have his home-brewed—or his Joint-Stock Brewery—the methods, by the way, which can alone secure him cheap and unadulterated beer—if beer he *must* have.

Again, a sober man, other things being the same, has more power than a drunkard: shall I, *therefore*, give up my sobriety to level myself with his weakness?

An apt illustration of the absurdity of the objection, is given in Mr FREDERIC HILL's book on *National Education*, 1836:—Many in the lower ranks of American citizens once argued in this wise:—"Knowledge is power: by our Constitution, all men are to have equal power: *therefore* the rich must be allowed to acquire no more knowledge than the poor" (ii. p. 20). On this principle, says Mr HILL, a man who bids fair to surpass his neighbor in stature and strength, ought to be clapt into an iron-case, that Nature may be punished for violating the laws of equality.

Lastly, is not the objection equally good—or bad—against the existing system? Cannot the Man-of-crowns get oftener drunk than the Man-of-coppers? Cannot the Patrician drink himself ill with champagne, where the Plebian can simply sip his small-beer? Thus the objection proves too much; and pleads for a privilege by no means desirable. It would be deemed a strange manifestation of 'interest' in the Working Classes, to propose that they should be tempted and corrupted by Licensed Gambling Shops, so as to place them on a level with that wealthy and depraved Aristocracy which *seeks* indulgence in play, alike in prohibited London Hells and tolerated Tattersalls!

10. *Because it will injure the public Revenue.*

Speaking historically, however, such a law never *did* result in financial difficulties; nor is it likely to do so now. By augmenting production and national power immeasurably, it will bring more to the coffers of the state through one channel, than it takes away by another; and it will not only enable the Taxpayer to pay with more ease, but it will lessen the cost and promote the efficiency of government, thereby dispensing with much taxation. Amongst the 'deductions' there is one item not often thought of. 30,000 lives of Taxpayers (dead men pay no taxes) will be saved by the suppression of the Trade, each paying for ten years at least £3 per head. As those slain by the Traffic are each year a different set, who would generally have gone on paying with the next set, the sum total, divided by ten, will show each year a loss of *several millions* to the Exchequer. Taxes, however, are but a means; an orderly society is the *end* to which they should be subservient,*

* PUBLIC-HOUSES.—"There are such multitudes of these, in town and country, perpetually holding out allurements to those classes of the community who are the

whether less or more : and after all, as the *Dispatch* says, in its article on the Light-wine delusion, "If not a drop of gin were drunk throughout the country, from this day, its wealth and means would soon compensate to the Exchequer, the tax on the vice of drunkenness." The objection, however, is really theoretical; because the *real* desire is to pay as little as possible, in every way; and to achieve this, we must promote industry and lessen crime.

Experiment further demonstrates the fallacy of the objection. In IRELAND, when the consumption sank from 12 to 7 million gallons of spirit, the *total* revenue rose above its former level: in one year, more than £80,000. In SWEDEN repressive measures have considerably diminished the manufacture of brandy, and at the same time augmented the revenue 5 millions of francs. In NORWAY, in addition to severe restrictions and heavy imposts on the manufacture and sale of drink, the law secures an absolute prohibition of all sale from an early hour on Saturday evening until an advanced hour on Monday morning. The result of these measures has been such as amply to confirm the doctrine promulgated by the 'Alliance.'

11. *Because it enforces a painful and needless privation.*

The privation can only be transient and trifling; putting the determined drinker to some extra trouble to make, or procure his liquor; nor is it needless, since it is the only effectual means of averting vast risk and injury from thousands, and preventing the imposition of serious burdens upon millions. Shall a great SOCIAL PEST be perpetuated, rather than refer private persons to their own resources for procuring a sensual gratification? Looking not only at the numbers injured by the Traffic in 'a dangerous article,' but at the *nature* of the injury and the low character of the set-off, we can, for our part, only regard a society that *willingly* permits the continuance of such a system, as hopelessly corrupt and inveterately depraved.

12. *Because 'Beer is a necessity' to the Working-man.*

So says the *Dispatch* newspaper. If so, then our previous assertion that drinking is at best a luxury, falls. Happily, however, the

least able to resist them, that they can be regarded in no other light than as *seminaries of iniquity*, of which no principle of political economy that we are aware of can justify the continuance... It is *in them* that time and money, which tradesmen and laborers can ill spare, are spent; domestic unhappiness created and increased; bad connections formed; familiarity with crime established, and consent too often given to become participators in its perpetration. We entreat those of our readers who are in possession of the *Report of the Committee on Gaols*, to turn to the evidence of Dr LUSHINGTON, printed at page 162, and they will find proof of the encouragement and assistance which public-houses lend to delinquents, of which, till then, they probably had no conception. *The scenes of depravity there disclosed reflect disgrace on the licence system, on the whole police of London, and excite wonder and astonishment that such deeds could be acted, night after night, without color or concealment, in any country where criminal law exists and social order is established. To connive at dissolute or desperate habits, because they may afford a temporary supply to an exhausted treasury, will be thought but a miserable shift for any minister, as long as any sense of right and wrong is left among us. It has not even the merit of a word at all expedient; for private vices, when traced through all their consequences, will never prove to be public benefits; and we believe no prodigal being ever disposed of his expectations so improvidently as a finance minister who, for any sum of ready money, virtually assigns the expectant virtue of his country.*"—*Quarterly Review*, 1820.

Dispatch has since (July 20, 1856) effectually despatched itself: "Does any man *believe* that beer ever gives a greater quantity of useful service? It is an offence against God and Divine Providence to *mortgage strength*, and to use up in a few years the physical stamina which, if doled out in the proportion dictated by the capability of the human frame, might last uninjured to a good old age." There is a blue-book of 100 pages containing a general and special report, from the pen of Dr ROBERT D. LYONS, on the pathology of the diseases of the army in the East, addressed to the Secretary of War, March, 1856. Dr LYONS says, "that as a general rule, low forms of diseased action attended the graver surgical cases, and the Russian prisoners exhibited a *tolerance of the effects of injury*, and surgical operations, far superior to that of the allied soldiers, except, perhaps, the Sardinians. The frames of the Russians were in fine working order, *the muscular tissues being well developed and firm*, while the adipose tissues were at a minimum. The unhealthy excess of adipose tissue observable among our own troops may be due to the use of porter and spirituous liquors during the latter part of the campaign. It was with regret that I observed subsequently to the month of May, *that the increased facilities for procuring malt and other intoxicating liquors became a means of great and general abuse*." The report condemns the issue of porter as a ration, *even in moderate quantities*, and states that the consequence was "an inflation of the system, and a plethoric state, *not consistent with firm and vigorous health*."

It is a well-known fact that the working-men of England do *most* of their drinking *after work*—really working upon the teetotal principles, and with great advantage.

13. But 'Alcohol is 'food' and 'force.'

So says the Westminster Reviewer, which has been thrice elaborately confuted—beyond the possibility of reply.* Against Mr G. H. LEWES' verbal conjuring, we place that of the highest professional authorities, including those quoted by himself. LEHMANN, the great physiological chemist, says:—"We cannot believe that alcohol belongs to that class of substances *capable* of contributing towards the maintenance of the vital functions." MOLESCHOTT says:—"Alcohol does NOT merit the name of an *alimentary principle*." Alcohol is not food—but stimulus: or, as LIEBIG teaches, it *borrow*s of the future.

14. Because alcohol is necessary to counteract, amongst the poor, the effects of bad ventilation, etc.

So argues the *Times*, and so re-echoes Dr LAYCOCK, Professor of Physic in the University of Edinburgh! Does alcohol, then, enable us to do with less fresh air, or impart more of it to the living-house? The very reverse is the fact. Alcohol, as we have taught since 1842, by necessary chemical affinity, *robs the blood of oxygen*.

The last experimenter on this subject—Dr HAMMOND—confirms

* For a paragraph dissection, see *Works of Dr Lees*, vol. iii.

the preceding experiments of PROUT, DAVY, BÖCKER, VIERORDT, and LEHMANN. He found that half an ounce of alcohol (diluted), taken with each meal, diminished the amount of carbonic acid expired, from 11,674 grains per day, to 10,344—a *tenth of the whole*. The amount of vapor also lessened, as well as other excreta, indicating that less vital action and oxygenic change were going on.

"The Pulse was increased from 81 to 90. Head-ache. *Mental faculties not so clear* as on days when no alcohol was taken. *Lassitude*," etc.* Professor MOLESCHOTT even explains, on physiological grounds, the intellectual character of the opposition. "True," says he (*Theory of Food*, § 77), "Alcohol passes into the blood; but the oxygen we inhale is abstracted by it from the albumen and oil of the blood—and both special experiment and daily experience demonstrate, that alcoholic beverages diminish the quantity of carbonic acid breathed out." In other words, besides its topical and stimulant effect, alcohol operates chemically like excess of food, as he further describes:—"Thus the limited size of our lungs, and the definite power of our movements, *restrict the change of matter*..... The tissues become overloaded, which endangers their activity as much as impoverished blood could do; *fat is collected, which the oxygen does not consume*, and the *albuminous substances*, with the salts, assume a *fixity* which at once enfeebles the intellect and destroys the pleasure and power of thinking." Nevertheless, here we have an Edinburgh 'Professor' recommending as a remedy for *deficient oxygen*, that which lessens the available supply still more!—the effects of which find their analogies in the results at once of bad ventilation and plethoric excess. And here we have, too, the 'leading journal,' telling the nation, that in '*fighting bad air*' our best friend is *beer*! "Now Barabbas was a robber."

The last three objections, however, even had they had any color of truth, do not meet the case of the Alliance. Beer and Dram-shops, Ale-houses and Gin-palaces, exist for *tippling* purposes—and it is rank hypocrisy to pretend that they exist in the main for any other. Not until the objectors have reduced these houses 90 per cent, and prohibited the drink from being drunk *on the premises*, will they be entitled to put in this plea of diet—worthless as it is. Even the *Morning Post* declares that "the spontaneous incitements to drunkenness are already too numerous and too powerful,—too difficult, moreover, to control. At least, then, let society be emancipated from *extraneous incentives* to that degrading vice, if legislation can accomplish the emancipation."

15. *Because it leads to secret and private methods of supply.*

We deny the 'leading.' It is a childish fallacy of phrase. The social law which says you shall not openly corrupt and seduce—does not 'lead' to private seduction. The public decree against felony, does not 'lead' to secret theft. These laws simply *limit* the methods available—they do not foster the crime, or participate in

the 'causation.' They may 'determine' the direction of the *pre-existing* force of evil, but they neither *create*, nor *increase*, nor *conduct* that force. On the contrary, these laws control and contract the actual vice and crime. The objection conflicts with that which preceded it. Just before, the law was wrong because it interfered too much, and now it is wrong because it interferes too little! The very language of the objector betrays his weakness. Do we call the introduction of a pack of flour, or a basket of groceries, into our houses, by the suspicious name of '*secret supplies*'? Why should *not* people have '*private supplies*' of drink? *That* is no business of ours, either to prevent or promote—as we now do—by Law. The objector, it seems, supports the present Laws in order to keep people out of '*private*' mischief by Act of Parliament! The whole system betrays hypocrisy on every hand; every objection is either suicidal or insane.

16. *Because it would make that which is innocent into a crime.*

"Shall we," asks the *Times*, with uplifted metaphorical eyebrows, "render it *criminal* to sell a glass of ale?" Simpletons, taken in by the affectation, re-echo the wonderment.

Silly sheep! The *Times* has simply taken up an old cast-off sophism out of HANSARD for 1819—or perhaps from its own leaders of the period—when the subject of State Lotteries was on the tapis of St Stephen's. The Licensed Lottery had its Demos and Aristos—its '*Little-go*' and its '*Great-go*'—both big with corruption. CANNING then pleaded for the Great Evil, because the Little one was *so small*! What, said he, make it *criminal* to set up a '*Little-go*'—*such* a '*Little-go*'! CANT now takes up the discarded dodge—thinking perhaps, that after the national Brain has been so long steeped in Beer—so that, as the *Times* says, "Church and State may be said to float"—there is some chance that the forgotten fallacy may float too! It is a *ruse* to divert attention from the mountain to the molehill; it is asking JOHN BULL to look through an inverted telescope!

It is an ingenious attempt to cast the burden of *proof*—as well as to keep the burden of taxation—upon the wrong shoulders. Let the *Times* and the Tipplers solve their own problem. We have established the fact of a giant evil—of a prodigious wrong—and we claim that the evil be removed and the wrong redressed. Let the *Times* show that this *can* be done, and single glasses of beer at the same time be publicly sold for his '*convenience*,' and we *will not* make the sale of '*a little drop*'—just '*one glass*'—criminal. That, however, is *his* business, not ours—and will form an agreeable and arduous puzzle for the learned and ingenious gentlemen in his pay! *That feat* accomplished, his *litterateurs* can then try their hand at the Little-go question in other directions. A betting-shop for *small sums*—a gambling-counter for *coppers*—surely, we are not to render such *trifles* criminal? However, we leave all this to be determined by the Casuists whom it may concern.

One fact is worth bearing in mind, however. The most ultra

declaimers against a Maine Law admit that it may be regarded as criminal to sell a single glass in certain circumstances. The *Times* supports the existing prohibitions of the sale of drink on certain days and hours; and *has* advocated the extension of prohibition to the *whole* of the Sabbath, save to travellers. The *Times*, therefore, is affecting surprize at its own sentiments.

PROFESSOR LAYCOCK:—"Was it reasonable or just that a man should take advantage of the weakness of another, and *help* to make him drunk? No publican should *permit* drunkenness in his house, and no one should be allowed to turn a drunken man out of his house into the streets, without incurring the responsibility of his (the drunkard's) acts."

A publican, we presume, must stop somewhere in dealing out his drink. Well, then, *the glass* which he refuses to fill, lest he should incur responsibility, is after all a measure of crime. He is licensed to prime and load—but he must stop at *this* glass under FEAR of a discharge! Or, not to press too hardly on the Professor for abandoning his moral-suasion, we may look at the case in another and practical light. First, we object that *excitement* is worse than absolute drunkenness: and that he who 'helps' to excite, also 'helps' to make drunk. But this project may be effected by the joint-agency of a dozen Tapsters. The law grants the licence to sell drink on the very condition that *tippling* and *drunkenness* are not allowed. *In fact*, however, they *are* allowed, and cannot be prevented by either publicans or police. Tapster A. sells one dram (or glass), which commences the excitement of the Tippler. Tapster B. sells dram the second, which carries on the excitement. C. vends the third glass, which makes the patient comfortable, elevated, or refreshed—according to habit or constitution. D. sells the fourth, which lands him on the *neutral-ground*. ("Neither drunk nor sober," said the witness on the Portsmouth Court-Martial.) E. vends the fifth, when he *crosses the line*, and—it may be—commits rape or murder. Or, F. sells the last, which makes him 'dead-drunk,' but not dangerous.* Now apply the doctrine of 'help' here. As far as the *Public-safety* is concerned, F. did that which was least mischievous—if he did not indeed contribute to public protection by making his 'strong-drink' knock down the dangerous customer. But who *made* the artificial and dangerous madman? Each of the preceding publicans. A. B. C. and D. contributed their share—and, in our judgment, are equally criminal. For how are C. and D. to *know* that their Customer is brain-and-blood-drunk, though not *visibly* drunk? How are *they* to tell of the perverted functions of the nervous ganglia,—of the delicate equilibrium within,—of the reeling reason and excited passion suspended in a balance which the smallest 'drop' will upset? Has the professor invented some *Toxicometer* which the Publican can apply to the

* Capt. BODLEY, in his latin *Itineris*, or account of a journey into Ulster in 1603 stoutly defends 'deep potations,' on the ground that "we may avoid, *when drunk enough*, those vices we but endeavor to avoid when sober."

pulse, or the person, of his customer, indicating when, under the influence of the dram, he is *becoming* mad—or dangerous? At present, he only knows it when it is too late, and when the mischief is done. The scheme is worse than a folly—it is a farce obtruded in mockery of a great misery. Prohibition is practicable, but nothing short of it: for while we know where the mischief *begins*, and can stop it, no one knows where it will end. To have it on the premises—and to allow its sale even in fixed quantities—would be to open the folding doors of evasion. As Governor WELLS, of Maine, said in his message last year, prior to the temporary repeal of the Maine Law by himself and friends, in favor of a *sham* Prohibitory law—“*The public good requires that no intoxicating liquors should be allowed to be drank in the shops where they are sold.*” In a country where all the round of expedients have been tried in turn, the very enemies of Prohibition admit its *necessity*, while conspiring to retard its realization.

SOUTER QUIRKO. “A Maine Law allows the *private-manufacture* of intoxicating drink, which would introduce a Swedish pandæmonium.”

A. Who says that a Maine Law does this? It is a weak invention, or hasty inference, of the enemy. It neither allows nor disallows the private manufacture, any more than it allows felony; it simply PROHIBITS THE SALE, and leaves other matters to be dealt with on their own merits. In other words, it minds its *own* business, and leaves the private-making of Drink *just as it is*. A man who makes a tun of beer, but *sells* not a glass, will not do much public mischief. It is not proposed that the law should *prevent* home-brewing, and the present law *already forbids* private-distilling, which is the evil of Sweden. To allow *one-kind*, is surely not to allow *all kinds*, of manufacture.

SOUTER QUIRKO. “Dr Lees said the law didn’t prevent *intoxicating drink* being made. Now spirits are intoxicating drink; *therefore*, as he didn’t specify a particular kind, he logically implied EVERY KIND—spirits included.”*

A. That is to say, if it be predicated that an alleged solitary island is really inhabited by some mortals of the genus *homo*—and the fact be adduced in proof, that the speaker actually breakfasted at the homes of the MEN, partaking plentifully of a repast consisting of BREAD, FOWL, FISH, and EGGS—what will QUIRKO say is ‘logically implied’ therein? The mouse is in logical labor, and will bring forth—a mountain!

“This,” quoth QUIRKO, “is equivalent to asserting, that the Island is *colonized by men of every color and complexion*, by white-men, red-men, olive-men, black-men,—by *men of every name and nation*, from Bechuans to British, from Patagonians to Pats, from

* This amusing objection against facilities for home-made spirits, as the path to Pandæmonium, was actually urged by the owner of a *Dram-Shop* in Dunfermline; who is therefore running his public *stage-coach* on the same road. If not the driver—he is the proprietor: and the Scotsman is his patron.

Gauls to Greenlanders,—is equivalent to asserting that these men consumed *bread of every possible composition*, white and brown, rye and oats, barley, wheat, and maize,—that they fed upon *every kind of fish*, from whale to whiting, from cod to carp, from pike to perch, from turbot to trout;—that they fattened upon *every kind of fowl*, from turkey to ptarmigan, from pullet to partridge, from pheasant to flamingo, from bustard to black-cock,—and that they actually feasted upon *every kind of eggs*, from chaffinch to cheeper's, from linnet to lark's, from ostrich to owl's, and from plover and peacock's to duck and geese's! FOR, as general terms were used—'men'—'bread'—'fowl'—'fish'—'eggs'—and no *particular* kinds exempted, THEREFORE, by logical necessity, *every kind* was implied and included. Q. E. D."—which being interpreted signifies, Q. Quirko, E. evidently, D. a Dunce. Here we leave our Souter at the summit of his mountain of absurdity—leave him to hatch addled eggs for Greenlanders, and stuff larks and logic into Geese.

'The force of folly can no farther go.'

17. *Because it increases Crime.*—(*Saturday Review.*)

This objection might well astonish one, had we not become accustomed to absurdity in its plethora. What does the *Saturday Review* mean, when it affirms that *we* naïvely admit the increase of crime? Simply, that the crime of 'drinkselling' had increased! Now we meet the despicable quibbler with his own 'trick of fence,' and demand which is the 'crime'—the *action*, or the *new name* with which the law labels the action? Which is the crime? If the true 'labels' have increased, and been fixed upon the right parties, that is a very harmless increase of a very harmless crime. If the *evil* 'action' be the crime—then the Reviewer knows perfectly well that the crime has *not* increased—though he says it has. Real-crime (drink-selling included) has diminished 80 per cent in the New England States. An illustration will make plain the ingenious quirking-talent of the *Saturday Review*. A law is passed to prevent druggists from filling bottles with Poison, without *labelling* them with the word Poison! Poison-labels have increased; *ergo*, Bottles of Poison and poisoned Bodies have increased! To stop Sheep-stealing, sheep-stealing was made 'Felony': *cases* called 'Felony' of course increased; *ergo*, more sheep were stolen!! A certain tribe of Indians are used to *killing* their old men at a certain age—"to put them out of their sons' way and their own misery;" a law is proposed at length to prohibit this as *murder*. No, says the *Saturday Review*, if you make 'killing murder,' you *increase crime by calling it murder!!!*

If the fool *must* be answered according to his folly, then we say:—"Young sir, we have a very simple remedy for your sage and virtuous scruples. *Call* drink-selling a VIRTUE in the Act of Parliament; and then, your sageship, you will at once decrease the virtual-vice and increase the verbal-virtue!" Let him try it on in St Stephens, and he will realize the highest honors of Legal quackery and quackery.

18. *Because it occasions deception and concealment.*

Mr HOLYOAKE has objected,* that in a northern village, where the proprietor has refused to allow his house property to be converted into temptations for tipplers, he saw a little girl carrying a bottle of whisky concealed under her apron! Is concealment necessarily 'deception'? Does a honest woman who returns from shopping, 'expose' her goods?—or if she covers them in a basket, does she then deceive? But granting the hidden motive to be 'desire to hide,' what then? This arose either from shame or fear. If from shame, why should it be removed? Suppose a lady addicted to her 'drops.' Will she openly display her bottle, whether of brandy or *eau de Cologne*? Is it desirable that society should encourage her to throw her own opinion—which gives rise to shame—away? Its existence simply proves that she has yet some good remaining. Or does the concealment arise from fear of others' opinion merely, or fear of certain consequences? Is society, then, to have no opinion—that it may have no power? Or, is it to cease to visit evil actions with its reprobation? Is it to look upon the low sot or publican with approval, lest they should seek to do something under the rose? The objection is equally an objection to law of every kind, and to all moral-instruction. The logic is—To prevent fear, prohibit all Prohibitions!—to prevent shame, shun all Teaching that will show what is shameful!

Our answer further is—that though parishes illustrate the benefits of Prohibition, they can by no means adequately represent a State-law. In the case just cited, we have not an example of communal or municipal prohibition—sustained by the sense and good feeling of society—but of Proprietorial only—the merits of which are rather negative than positive. The thing most in fault, however, was not too much prohibition in *this* village, but TOO LITTLE prohibition in the villages and parishes *beyond*. Temptation should neither be *in* nor *near*. Hence a County law is better than a Parish-one, as it leaves less margin for evasion.† But a State-Law is best of all.

II. PROHIBITION AN INEFFECTUAL MEANS TO THE END PROPOSED.

1. *Because it allows private manufacture or import.*

Like the last objection, this is exposed to the charge of inconsistency. It quarrels with one provision, because it is not another!—with prohibition in *posse* but not in *facto*. The law, even now, prohibits private spirit-manufacture, and chiefly for the sake of revenue—a less vital consideration than the great interests of humanity imperilled by the Traffic. Now, if the Objectors think it needful, or practicable, they can propose that the law should like-

* See Discussion between Dr LEES and Mr HOLYOAKE. (6d. post-free)

† We know many proprietors who desire to prohibit the Traffic on their estates, but dare not, lest worse-houses, under no-control, be licensed on the borders of their estates. Of two evils, they choose the least—and anxiously wait for the general law.

wise prohibit malting and domestic brewing. The 'Alliance,' however, seeks no fresh interference with household habits. We know, of course, that *all* human expedients are imperfect; but we also know the other part of the Truth, that they are *to some extent* efficient. We advocate a measure that *will* accomplish a portion of good—or, more precisely, prevent *that portion* of evil, less or more, which springs from the *public sale* of strong-drink—a measure that is none the worse because it does not also do something else—viz. stop *private* drinking. It is a *fact*, however, that there is more illicit home drinking where public-houses are *many*, than where they are few—where the trade is open than where it is restrained. Moreover, this objection proves far too much: since it would show that we might license a public *bordello*, because we could'nt prevent private profligacy.

2. *Because there is (or will be) a combined general violation of it.*

This is either prophecy, without inspiration—or fact. If people could generally combine and violate such a law, they would never generally combine to pass it, and therefore COULD NOT violate it. Or, taking the other horn of the dilemma, if they did combine to pass it, they WOULD NOT combine to break it. The objection is a bug-bear, having no bearing on the conditions of the law under discussion. Like most other objections, it proves too much; for it is quite as applicable to law in general as to this in particular.

3. *Because there is secret evasion of the law.*

So said in-consequential Mr BAXTER, of Dundee, at the same time perverting our own testimony. "Well," we replied, in his presence—"what then? Here are your Dundee Police Statistics for 1853. They show, in the face of the social and moral law, a considerable amount of *evasion*. £509 worth of property stolen—besides much not reported. £203 worth *never* recovered (how inefficient the law!); 734 informations of thefts—431 cases of detection only! (Again, how inefficient the law!) Are theft and forgery openly perpetrated? No, the law is *secretly* evaded, the criminal is put to 'trouble and inconvenience.' In America, we saw in two months hundreds of forged notes, presented in payment. At the Delavan Hotel, in Albany, we saw a gentleman who had accepted a *roll* of such notes as good. Now for the inference? Is the law against forgery to be abrogated?—or is it to be more stringently executed? Are you prepared to propose to your town council that the police shall be disbanded, because law is secretly evaded, or openly flouted?"†

The objection of inefficiency founded on evasion, proves too much; and is just as wise, or unwise, as a reason for repealing the laws

† The 1st Report of the Constabulary Force Commission (1837) says 8,339 forged notes were presented at the Bank of England, but there were only 50 cases of conviction for forging, *annually*; being one conviction to every 166 crimes. Of 100 felonies in the Sleaford Union in one year, 19 only were prosecuted. Not a fifth of the crime perpetrated is made public. One prisoner states that 22 years had elapsed from his first offence to his first apprehension. *Ergo*, are we to have No Law?

against Forgery, or the Ten Commandments, as for repealing, or not enacting, a Maine Law.

4. *Because it will induce Smuggling and Illicit distillation.*

This is an imaginary fear, not justified either by results of actual experiment, or by the nature of the case. For, while those parishes, counties, and States where Prohibition reigns, are *far freer* from these evils than their neighbors,—places where the licensed Traffic most flourishes (where it flourishes, drinking most abounds) are also the hot-beds of *illicit trade*. The objection assumes that drinking is a *chronic vice*, of a certain fixed measure, whereas the *bulk* of it arises from TEMPTATIONS which multitudes of the tempted would rejoice to have abolished: hence the removal of a public-house from the next corner to a mile's distance, would actually save whole families from the curse of drinking.

Sir WALTER SCOTT, referring to the question of rural pauperism, in 1817, remarks most justly, "There is a very natural desire to trust to one or two *empirical remedies*, such as general systems of Education, and so forth. But a man with a broken constitution might as well put faith in SPILSBURY or GODBOLD [two noted quacks]. It is not the knowledge, *but the use which is made of it*, that is productive of real benefit...There is a terrible evil in England...to wit, *tippling-houses*. In [rural districts of] Scotland there are few. A man, therefore, cannot easily spend much money on liquor, *since he must walk three or four miles to the place of suction and back again*, which infers a sort of *malice prepense* of which few are capable, and the *habitual opportunity* of indulgence not being at hand, the *habits of intemperance, and of waste connected with it, are not acquired*. If financiers would admit a general limitation of Alehouses over England to one-fourth of the number, *the money spent in that manner would remain with the peasant as a source of self-support and independence.*"*

When the signs and suggestions to drink are *once* removed—when the solicitations are prohibited—when the sanction of Law is withdrawn from the 'Traps of Temptation,' as the people rightly call them—the desire for drink generally lessens, and the abnormal appetite finally dies out. Then come the renewed happiness of home—the *natural* pleasures of existence—improved health, temper, and circumstances—as the *reward* of the new course, to bulwark the initial virtue of the altered life, and sustain with the moral-force of opinion founded on realized blessings, the wisdom and power of the Law. On the other hand, where the Traffic riots in freedom—where competition prevails—there every species of meretricious attraction is added to the essential one of the drink, the moral-tone is depraved, respect for law is lost, and while an appetite for drink is created in the customer, a craving for *profit* is equally fostered in the seller, which conspire for illicit-gratification. The almost uni-

* *Life*. Chap. xxxix. (*Works*: Abbotsford Ed. Vol. xvii. p. 353.)

versal adulteration of what is essentially a *drug* (alcoholic liquor),* with other drugs, is no longer capable of denial. Mr DRUMMOND, the M.P. who pronounces the Maine Law to be 'detestable'—says there is *only one* Inn in the whole county of Surrey where he can get a glass of *genuine* beer! The motive which impels to adulteration, urges to illicit distillation. Facts confirm this view.

Begin, with a city renowned for its plentiful supply of Dram-shops—GLASGOW. In 1815, when the drink-shops were as 1 to every 14 families, 550 unlicensed persons were prosecuted for selling drink *privately*. In 1855, under the prohibition of Sunday-dram selling, and with a lesser proportion of licensed houses, there were only 149 persons charged with illicit sale, and only 126 convicted—a palpable proof that the decrease of Public-houses is *not* balanced by an increase of Shebeen-shops. The Forbes Mackenzie Act in Scotland has undoubtedly served to *reveal* the extent of the Shebeen system, by arming the Police with summary powers for its punishment. The *Glasgow Herald* has the following paragraphs:—

"On Saturday (January 24th, 1857), at the Central Police Court, a woman named Cassidy, residing in High Street, was convicted of selling spirits, and fined £7.—M'Phillips, keeper of an oyster store in Trongate, was convicted of a similar offence, and amerced in a like penalty.—The third charge was against a female named Edwards, who keeps a house in Old Wynd, and whose husband is at present in prison for illicit-selling. Her second offence. On being convicted, the court mitigated the penalty to £7. 10s.—It is a difficult task to ferret-out these illicit-traders, or rather, to make cases against them. *The Central District is swarming with them*; and during the three weeks which have elapsed of the present month, penalties amounting to about £170 have been imposed upon illicit-traders. Under Lieutenant Dewar, the cases have been very carefully and ably got up; *but fine and imprisonment seem to have no effect in suppressing this abominable traffic*.—On Saturday, at the Calton Police Court, J. Wilson, spirit-dealer, Sidney-street, was fined in the sum of £7, *for selling liquor in his unlicensed dwelling-house, after prescribed hours*."

What is wanted, truly, is a Maine Law *machinery*—the seizure and destruction of the liquor. Fines are paid out of profits.

"On Saturday, at the Calton Police Court, Isabella Burgess, better known in the district as 'Bonny Bell,' was convicted of the

* The *Alliance Weekly News* of this day (March 14, 1857), records 34 CASES OF PREMATURE DEATH from drink. Amongst them are the following:—

815. Isabella Heaton, four years old, killed by a little whisky given *for medicine*, by her mother.

819. John Bamford, died suddenly, from excessive-drinking.

822. James Bennett and Joseph Gardner found senseless on the road from sipping proof-spirit out of a cask committed to their care. Bennett died, and Gardner was only saved by the application of the stomach pump.

840. A three gallon cask of pale-brandy falls from a wagon in Warrington lane, and spills the contents. One Bryant drunk of the liquor from a hole in the road, is taken up insensible, and dies.

845. At Tredegar, one Franklin drinks half a pint of rum. Two minutes after, another half-pint. Reels, falls, and in a few minutes is dead!

old offence of *selling spirits without a licence*, and fined in the sum of £30. Bella, as usual, paid the fine, making a total of £199 *which she has paid from time to time for illicit selling since the 9th June, 1853*. Perhaps no case could be adduced which could better illustrate the enormous profits derived from illicit selling. 'Bonny Bell' has been through the hands of the police and the Excise, but still she fears not—goes to the bank, and lifts the necessary funds—pays her fines—and the trade goes merrily on.”*

It is the same in Liverpool, London, and elsewhere. The Licence-law is extensively evaded in all its provisions—and often with the sanction and even aid of the Magistrates. If the 'Evasion' argument is of any weight against a proposed law, it will absolutely crush the present system. Take from the *Morning Star* of November 4th, 1856, another sample:—

“SOUTHWARK.—John Cole, described as a laborer, residing at No. 1, London-street, Dockhead, was charged *with unlawfully selling spirits without a licence, in a house not licensed by the Excise authorities*.—Inspector Moore said, he went with Inspector Reed on Sunday-noon, shortly before eleven o'clock, to the prisoner's house. The doors were closed, but they heard the voices of several persons inside. Witness knocked, when the prisoner put his head out of a window, and asked them what they wanted. Witness desired him to open the door. The door was shortly opened, and *on entering, they saw several men and women in the kitchen, who had evidently been drinking*. Witness searched the house, and found *ten empty jars, which had recently contained beer; an empty barrel, another containing beer; five and a half quarts of gin; rather more than a quart of rum; several drinking glasses and tumblers which had recently contained beer and spirits*. He then took the prisoner into custody. The prisoner said *he had the beer and spirits only for his friends*. That's all he had to say. Mr Coombe told him that *he had carried on an extensive illicit trade in a very barefaced manner*. He must pay a penalty of £20, or in default of payment be committed to prison for six months.”

In South Wales, the Government commissioner says:—“In one part of my district alone, there are 80 private houses where spirit is sold without a license”—yet “Public-houses swarm.” (See *Argument*, § 106.) With men of intellect—and principle—there must be an end to this objection.

Moreover, against Smuggling there will be the present remedy, and more efficient checks to illicit manufacture than now, with a narrowed demand. After all, the evasion is really very small, when we look at the facts; and the good resulting from prohibition enormous. In some forty Scottish and English Parishes where the Magistrates and Landowners have suppressed tippling-shops (see *Argument*, § 33, § 36, § 97), Distilling and Smuggling are *not* found to prevail, nay, are unknown.

* Bonny Bell can sell illegally, because she can buy legally. Licence is evasion made easy.

5. *Because men determined on drinking, will find SOME-WAY of getting drink.*

A. This is the argument of the *Times*, re-echoed by Professor LAYCOCK, who says—"Put away drink by law, and men *will* make themselves drunk *somehow*." To which our reply is, that when the experiment is made, not of putting away *drink*, but only *drink-selling*, the people don't get drunk ANYHOW. This objection, however, is another example of evasion and false issue. The question is not of drinking and drunkenness, absolutely, but of that vice as associated with pauperism and crime. A Maine Law parish, or county, has not above *one-fourth* of the ordinary amount of those evils—a complete demonstration of the falsity of the objector's theory. Men do not generally *intend* to get drunk—they do not go to drink of set-purpose. They are entrapt into drinking, which, *unawares*, leads them on to drunkenness, violence, and crime. Hence the folly of the *Times*' brutal recommendation to amend the 'brutes' who beat their wives. Take a case from the newspaper.* A Merchant Captain, named THOMPSON, is charged with beating his wife at Pallion. 'The wife gave her statement with great reluctance—declared that the Prisoner was [not a *brute*, but] a good 'husband—that there was *not a quieter man living* than he—*when he was sober*.' Just so! The God-made creature was a quiet man and a good husband. What made him a demon? *Drinking*. What tempted him to drink? The Publican. What *licensed* the 'chartered libertine' to do so? THE LAW. What upholds the Law and casts the guilt of the transaction upon the Creator of sober men? The *Times* and the venal portion of the Press. Common sense hits the right nail on the head when it says of a man's actions done in liquor—'He was *not himself*.'

6. *Because we cannot suppress Fictitious-gift and Club-evasion.*

The evasion of the law by pretending to 'give,' while you expect to 'sell,' would rapidly cure itself. No system of trade can be long carried on where debts can be incurred by anybody—especially by the vagabondism of society—without legal remedy. The risk is itself a severe check; to which is to be added the fear of detection, as at present. What *now* prevents 'the fictitious gift'? Yet, reader, how many persons have you met with in your whole lifetime, who *lived* by 'giving' drink *without a licence*?—who offered you 'a glass' for nothing, and demanded 4d. for a straw? A plain-law and common sense would soon put a stop to such evasions. There is evasion now—there might be evasion under a Maine-law—but what is the chaff to the wheat?

The *Club-Evasion* can be put down with equal ease. Some parties tried it on awhile at Glasgow—took Boniface in—who sued for his siller, a handsome sum—but sued in vain. The bubble burst, of course, for it is altogether too transparent and insubstantial to last.†

* *Sunderland News*. Nov. 5, 1856.

† "GRAND FINALE OF THE NEW CLUB.—Rather more than a year ago 'the tumbler men' of Glasgow and several of our newspaper brethren were jubilant on the

Let us be liberal, however, and suppose that people *will*, reason or none, meet together simply to *drink*—and that they will do this, not at their own houses, but at a public-house. Cannot the law which says to the publican, ‘You shall not *sell* drink to a club;’ also say, ‘You shall not *suffer* your house to be made into a cellar for club-drink.’ If Travellers choose to carry their home-brewed with them—as an Englishman in many parts of France would carry his tea—that is a *bona fide* and private affair: but a Tippling Club is a different matter, which can be very summarily dealt with.

7. *Because we cannot enforce it upon our Lower orders.*

Have we tried? One thing is certain—it succeeded admirably in reference to the Crimean troops. (See *Argument*, § 25.)

O. “But can we compare an Army with a Population?”

A. Why not? Is not the army drawn *from* the lowest of the people? Are not the lower-orders who are left *unenlisted*, quite as amenable to good influences as those who live in barracks? During the Crimean war, we heard much laudation of our ‘heroes’; *then*, their self-sacrificing and patriotic-spirit shed glory on us; is the change of tone in deference to the Tap? Did not the conduct of the soldiery, *when sober*, do honor to them and to us? Were they not thrifty, orderly, and cheerful? All these—so long as the temptation was excluded. In proportion as our population is greater than an army, the reasons for prohibition are so much the stronger.

O. “What is *practicable* in the organization of an Army, is *not* so “in Society.”

A. Why? Is Society worse than an army in character—more inclined to insubordination and lawlessness? If not, a law enacted by Society will surely be as well obeyed through the conjoint agency of moral, legal, and police-suasion, as a barrack law imposed from without, and backed *only* by force. What is there so insurmountable in *this* case? Our first-class political papers *can* talk common sense when it suits them. Hear how the *Spectator* discoursed:—

“The British army in the East is settling down into its winter positions, and its national vice is habitual and prevalent. Is not the simple fact a disgrace both to army and nation? Why is it suf-

prospect of successfully evading. Forbes Mackenzie’s Act, by the organization of a club, which should enjoy the high privilege of drinking as long and as deep as they pleased. An eligible rendezvous was conveyniant to a pawnbroking establishment, the quantity of drink consumed ‘exceeded the most sanguine expectations’ of its supporters, and the members of the Club might have been joyfully celebrating their first anniversary—but for one drawback. Unfortunately, though the drink was extensive, *the paying was not in proportion*; the most regular customers were the most irregular in their settlements, and the growing length of uncleared scores brought matters to a crisis. Out of 100 members, *almost a half have failed to cash up*, and the Committee-of-management have deemed it necessary to make a call upon the fifty members or so who are, in a commercial sense, ‘good,’ to contribute £7 each to make up deficiencies. The solvent members naturally thought it hard that, in addition to their *own* bills, they should be asked to pay such heavy reckonings for their boon companions, and resisted the demand. What a beautiful illustration of the kind of *liberty and morality* destroyed by Forbes Mackenzie’s Act! Liberty for individuals to drink in a night as much as would support a decent family for a week: and a kind of morality which does not prevent fifty out of a hundred persons repudiating their debts! In what club, except one formed upon a common passion for intemperate indulgence, would a half of the members be found defaulters?”—*Scottish Guardian*.

ferred to continue? *Why are the means left, nay placed within his reach?* We know it has been possible to prevent drunkenness among the same class. One of the exploits which have rendered the names of COOK, PARRY, FRANKLIN, and other voyagers immortal, is, that they brought back their men without the ordinary loss by deaths; an exploit they could not have achieved, if they had permitted drunkenness. It would seem that the vice *can* be arrested, nay extirpated, if the officers do their duty."

COOK did not set up a grog-shop in his ship: PARRY, ROSS, and FRANKLIN did not even issue grog-rations; *thus* they prevented drunkenness. So the vice *can* be suppressed to a large extent at home; and it constitutes an accusation against press and parliament, that they do not *endeavor*, in like manner, to bring it about.

Thus, too, the correspondent of the *Times* wrote concerning *gambling temptations* at Constantinople, which, in spite of the 'counter-irritation' nostrum of light-wines and beautiful climate, attracted educated men *into* the midst of material and moral filth:—

"Some sharpers of the lowest kind, whose very breath is contagious, have set up a gambling table at the *Jardin des Fleurs*, called so because the people assemble there in a hot wooden building, surrounded by mud, to dance, eat, and drink. *Yet they attract officers of the allied armies, who are not ashamed to defile themselves by coming in contact with such people.* Lately, a new gambling table has been opened for the *special benefit* of English officers, by one MORRIS, of London notoriety. This latter is in a private room, and *surrounded with every kind of precaution* used in such establishments in England. If there was *martial law* in Pera, as in Scutari, the evil could be easily checked. *Anything to abate such a crying evil.*"

What is gambling compared to drinking? Yet prohibition is instantly recommended for the one—*disrecommended* for the other—with the additional absurdity, that, with the *Times*, the numbers of the tipplers and the extent of the vice, make it an 'inalienable birthright of Britons' which must not be touched with our little finger—much less with the policeman's staff!

O. "Nothing less than 'martial-law' would suffice to accomplish the object: and we cannot permit that."

A. Why not "*anything to abate such a crying evil*"? The Civil-law, however, will answer well enough—if it is demanded by the people, and firmly executed by the magistracy.

So, again, the *Daily News*, which pandered to the London Publicans, and opposed an hour or two's night restriction on their Traffic, can, in June 1855, advocate a Maine Law for the Ladies at Scutari. While bidding for the patronage of the Hog's-heads at home—it rates most severely the rogues who vend raki abroad!

"There is not a man of sense in England who will believe that the sellers of *raki* may not be kept out of the way of the Convalescents and Nurses of the hospital. If the officials concerned had any of the spirit of FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE in them, they would prevent the bringing of raki within vendible distance, or would see it poured out upon the sand...The raki is pushed under the soldiers' noses by Greek scoundrels...Are we expected to believe that the officers of our camps and hospitals cannot exclude these wretches from the

British boundaries? We will not believe it till the authorities have tried, *and tried properly*. Meantime, when it is once known *what it is* which most weighs down that kindly spirit, every man who has a heart will make haste to see that she is relieved. Other pests have been got rid of, at Balaclava and *elsewhere*, when we at home have insisted that it should be so. *Let us insist that our soldiers and their wives shall SEE and SMELL no more raki, and the thing will be done.*"

Is not the home work of charity and instruction, in every form, contravened by the Licensed traffic?

8. *Because in the Empire State it has been put aside as 'Unconstitutional.'*

'It' has *not* been put aside as un-con-sti-tu-tion-al. The objector is a chronic victim of his own vocabulary. Prohibition was admitted to be constitutional by the Supreme Court at Washington—it was only some *executive clause* of the special law of the New York State (*which clause was not agreed on*)—not Prohibition itself—that was pronounced unconstitutional by a divided Court. The people are now amending the wording of the Law, so as to get rid of legal quirk and quibble. This constitutional question, however, is a purely 'American-difficulty,' with which the objector had better not meddle—till he understands what he is talking about. The peculiar Constitution of America has no relation whatever to a *British* Prohibitory measure; we being free from difficulties with which the Yankees have to contend. The *Federal-law* has imposed certain *shackles* upon the State-law-making-power (creating difficulties both as to Slavery-and-Drink-Prohibition). For example, no single State can prevent the *import* of liquor. In Britain, our Act of Parliament is *supreme*; the Judges cannot defeat or reject a law—they can only interpret and apply it.

9. *Because it has been repealed by the People of Maine themselves, where it was first tried.*

'It'—prohibition—was NOT first tried there. Express Prohibition was tried in the Arabian Wilderness, and amongst the Priests of Israel, thousands of years ago—by Him whose wisdom is infinite (Lev. x. 9). And it was "a *Statute for ever throughout their generations*,"—guarded by the penalty of death—the highest form of FEAR addressed to the highest class—as early as the delivery of the Decalogue, whereof Moses declared "God is come to prove you, and that his *fear* may be before your faces *that ye sin not*" (Exod. xx. 20).* Even in America, Prohibition has existed, and continually extended since, 1832.

Nor has 'prohibition' been repealed by the *People* of Maine, or repealed at *all*. NEAL Dow's genuine measure was repealed, but not by the 'people.' The issue of repeal, or no-repeal, was never

* Dr LAYCOCK condescends to refer to Scripture *Sanatory-Laws* with approbation—though they were sustained by tremendous penalties. What a pity for the Jews—and Moses—that they had not with them a PROFESSOR OF PERSUASION—from whom to receive, not a catalogue of Prohibitions, but *Cant ad libitum, ex Cathedra*.

mooted to the 'people.' (See *Arg.* ch. vii.) It was displaced by the Politicians under Governor WELLS, in favor of what they called 'a suitable Prohibitory-law.' Even he was compelled to confess—"The public good requires that no *intoxicating liquors* should be allowed to be *drank in the shops* where they are sold." In England this would be regarded as a Maine Law, to all intents and purposes. Its fault is not in its prohibitive principle, but in its limitation and apparatus, which last was designedly made inefficient by the professional-politicians who were turned out by the People at the late election for their treachery. That the battle should be carried on with varying success, however, argues nothing against the *cause*. A measure, for example, if passed only by a *bare* majority, would be likely to be evaded to some considerable extent, and thus to furnish for a time plausible reasons to the weak and short-sighted for its repeal. Such reverses are to be expected. It is a weighty argument in favor of the Law, therefore, that the New England States have steadily, and in succession, enacted the measure, THE POPULAR VOTE NEVER ONCE GOING BACK. This fact is of itself enough to shatter the entire circle of sophisms.

10. *Because a Maine Law has been tried in England, and failed.*

We were not aware of the fact. That in *Scotland*, very long ago,—just 17 centuries—*Taverners* were justly exiled as criminals, we *did* know.* So far, however, from that law having failed, we find CONSTANTINE the Second, 700 years later, re-enacting the measure, in order to reap anew the benefit. For the last *thousand* years, no Maine Law has been passed in Great Britain, that we know of; and if it has not existed, it cannot have failed: and it cannot be passed until society has recovered its sanity.

Who, then, has hatched this Mare's nest?

Prof. LAYCOCK! "The Maine-law is no new thing in this country; it has been tried before. *The PROHIBITION of the traffic (!)* "was decided upon, by requiring every retailer to pay £50 a year "for his LICENSE TO SELL spirits, and 20s. duty was laid on *every* "gallon SOLD."

'*Prohibition of traffic*'—'*spirits only*'—'*Licence to sell*'—'*every gallon sold*'—stultification worthy of a Cockatoo!—or of the *Times*, which just now announces as a *New Maine Law*, a proposal (made by the enemies of the law) that the *buyer* shall be licensed to *buy*, instead of the seller to *sell*! Either these writers' wits have gone a wool-gathering—or they regard the public as a huge parrot that will repeat and reiterate any senseless assertion which it suits them to make.

* The following will be found in a celebrated Scottish Law Book—*Balfour's Practice*, p. 678. The original is in *Boetius*:—

"*Item.* All persounis havand ony office or authoritie of the King, sall abstene fra sic thingis as may mak thame inebriat or drunken, to the effect they may have sum preheminance, wisdom and authoritie above the commounis.

"*Item.* That all scudlaris, taverneris, drunkardis, and utheris sicklike persounis, devisit mair for vile lust than for the sustenance of men, be exylit and banisht within ane certane day; the quhilk being bypast, that thair gudis be confiscat, quheir ever they shall be apprehendit.—ARGADUS, Governour." [A.D. 160].

The reference is to the abortion of 1736, noticed in our 'Argument' (§ 51), which we had characterized as being only prohibitory in effect, not in principle, and as *wanting* the machinery and moral power of a Maine-law. The spirit and essence of a law, we presume, will be found in its parentage, its principle, and its apparatus.

The Maine-law of 1851—

Originated with the *People* of a *Democratic State*, and was carried by *them* against the strongest opposition of Politicians and Publicans, after a long, preparatory agitation.

Attached the *THING SOLD*—*prohibited* 'the dangerous article'—the disturbing agent;—under *whatever name* vended, by whatever person, and at whatever day, hour, or place.

Prohibits the manufacture for Traffic, as well as the Sale.

Had the *most efficient* of all penalties to sustain its action and prevent evasion; not an apparatus of fines to be paid out of the profits of perpetual convictions—but a provision for the *confiscation of all the liquor itself*, whether found on premises open to the public, or in private buildings where sales have been effected.

Was a law *expressing* the wishes of the people, and therefore zealously upheld by their moral sense and sober vigilance.

While this peerless parallel was being drawn (it is now quartered), Mr DELAVAN'S annual address to the New York State Temperance Society (Jan. 21st, 1857), was crossing the Atlantic, actually denouncing as the *opposite* of a Maine Law, got up by the *enemies* of the law, what the Edinburgh professor tells us *is* a Maine Law!

"The excise laws are fundamentally unsound in principle. It is wrong to licence any man to do an *injury* to the public. It is *absurd* to attempt to diminish a public mischief by *expressly licensing* a part of those who perpetuate it. It is idle to expect courts and juries willingly to punish an individual for an act which his next door neighbor is *licensed* to commit. And should the plan recently proposed be adopted—that of demanding *so high a price for a license*, and such an amount of bail for good behavior, as to be beyond the reach of men of humble means, *such a moneyed aristocracy in public mischief would not be long endured in this democratic community.*"†

* "Gin, by any other name, will taste as sweet!"

† If the quibble should arise—"It was a *Prohibitory duty*!"—we answer, So are *all* duties to somebody who cannot purchase at the price: nevertheless, Taxation is *not* Prohibition. Further, who *can* deny that the late doubling of the duty on spirits in Ireland, has immensely lessened the consumption—and crime? (See *Arg.* § 120.) But was not the suppression of *Distillation* at various periods in Great Britain *far more* like a Maine Law than high duties and license? And did it fail? (See *Arg.* § 69, 70.) How oblivious of the plainest facts men will appear—shamming forgetfulness as the spider shams death when the Strong-hand is over him.

The British Law of 1736—

Originated with an *aristocratic*, unreformed *Parliament*, and was carried by *them* against the protests and habits of People and Publicans combined, without *any* preparation for its reception.

Licensed the sale of the thing sold—laid a heavy duty only upon *one species* of the thing, and only upon it when called 'spirits'*—in short, did *NOTHING* but *tax* the article.

Permits both the manufacture and the sale.

Had none but the *loose penalties* of the License System to uphold it; had a hundred loop-holes of evasion; allowed the open sale of *wine* and *beer*; of colored or 'Parliament' *gin*, re-christened as '*Professor Tom-Row*,' '*Can't's Cordial*,' '*Auld Reekie*,' or any other title that might catch the popular taste or ear.

Was a law *antagonizing* the whole habits of the people, and actively opposed by depraved interests and appetites.

11. *Because the results of Prohibition are ambiguous and disappointing.*

So says the *Westminster*, but those who dwell in the midst of these results, and know most about them, say quite differently. It is but the other day we read this public declaration of Professor AMOS M'COY, of Albany:—"All experience under Prohibitory Laws, only strengthens *our* faith in them." Go back some years for a special illustration; we cannot print our 7th chapter over again. The American Report for 1846, gives the case of one town in Massachusetts as a sample of scores. With a population of 7,000, it had four years before 400 paupers: *No-licence* had gradually reduced them down to 11. The Wyndham gaol, Connecticut, which used to average 21 prisoners, has, under prohibition, been let for a Boarding House. Is there anything 'ambiguous' here? In our Essay, 40 home-cases are cited equally unequivocal. In the history of the PITCAIRN ISLANDERS, the reader will find a charming example of 'the possibilities' of human nature under a prohibitory rule.*

One of the Foreign Correspondents of the *New York Tribune*, in autumn 1856, describes the happy village-town of KORNTHALL, Wurtemberg. Out of its population of 1100 souls, hundreds are communicants. Since 1818, public and private property has greatly increased in value; agricultural produce has multiplied tenfold. *No inhabitant is known to have committed a single crime, or the slightest legal offence, for 36 years.* What is the key? "*Drunkenness is unknown—there is not a liquor shop in the place—the Hotel is frequented by strangers only.*"

GLOVERSVILLE, Fulton Co., New York, is another sunny spot, beaming with luminous encouragement amidst the darkness of a drink-cursed State, like that 'bright particular star'—Kornthall—in the firmament of cloudy, schnapp-consuming Germany. No rum is sold there, nor has been for several years: and it is one of the most quiet and prosperous villages in the Empire State. At a large assembly held in the Methodist Episcopal Church, December 22, 1856, we observe that 157 yearly copies of the *Prohibitionist* were subscribed for. Do men wilfully *subscribe* for 'disappointment'?

An important petition, lately presented to the Senate and House of Assembly of New York State, praying for the *re-establishment* of Prohibition, contains these clauses:—

"The undersigned petitioners can put your honorable body in possession of official reports by jail keepers and police magistrates, which show that in *nine* counties there were 4,960 commitments for crime, under the Licence Law, *in six months*; and also that, in the same time, under the late Prohibitory Law, there were but 2,062 commitments,—showing an absolute decrease of two-fifths of commitments for every species of crime.

"In startling contrast with this, they call the attention of your honorable body to the *frightful and universal increase of selling and drinking, and consequent pauperism, crime, and premature death,*

* See our PARADISE OF THE PACIFIC. Works, vol. i. p. 57.

since the decision of the Court of Appeals on the 25th of March last; and which practically annulled the law for the Prevention of Intemperance, Pauperism, and Crime."

Now do sane men *petition* for 'legal disappointment'? But where is most reason for regret—in their second case, or their first? * What can be more deplorably disappointing than the Licence System?

A late report from New Hampshire announces that "for several weeks past the Strafford County Gaol has been empty." The Rev. E. W. JACKSON writes: "The Law works like a charm." It is obviously 'disappointing' only to those who want to tipple or to sell. At a convention in December last, at Boston, the Hon. A. HUNTINGTON, of Salem, said—

"The existing law was a good one, though in some respects cumbersome. It was an improvement on every other law yet enacted. *It took time to get any law through the Courts.* Various decisions had been given sustaining provisions. Rum-sellers are now receiving sentences all over the Commonwealth. There is only one sentence they receive—the House of Correction. The Law should not be tampered with. It is working well, and Rumsellers are beginning to feel that there is no hope for them."

Our opponents ignore the commercial and legal difficulties in the path, as if we expected them to give way at once, by the magic of a word! They do more—instead of deploring the difficulty, or helping to avert disappointment, they express an incomprehensible delight at the anticipation of defeat and disaster.† One of the

* If, like the sun, prohibition is not without its spots, repeal is *quite black*. Here are a few facts copied from our last files of Transatlantic papers:—

NEW BRUNSWICK.—"The re-enactment of the License-law has thrown wide open the floodgates of intemperance."

NEW YORK STATE.—*Canajoharie*. "Rum is doing a fearful work in this village."—*Cortland Co.* "The law worked well at first. The decision let loose the devil again. The people would support another prohibitory law."—*Dutchess Co.* "The decision of the Court of Appeals and the Presidential Election had left them in a worse state as to organization, than they had suffered for years."—*Cayuga Co.* "The towns were once organized; now they were at sixes and sevens. *Most of the Liquor Dealers had shut up shop when the Prohibitory Law came into operation*; others had been driven out by vigorous prosecutions. *The decision had overwhelmed them with Rum. The people were as much in favor of Prohibition as ever.*"—*Sag Harbor*. "They had not had licenses for ten years. Now [owing to the judges' decision] they had grog-shops on wheels, which sold by the quart or gallon."—*Albany*. "There was a vast amount of drunkenness on election-day, the 4th of November. We saw men drunk as early as nine o'clock in the morning. Of twenty men who voted while our agent was kept waiting at the polls in Swan-street, as many as fifteen were drunk. The breath of these men was disgustingly offensive."

MAINE.—The *Argus*, anti-prohibition paper, announces that the jail will have to be enlarged. A correspondent of the *Portland Journal* says he has seen more drunkenness the last year in *Readfield* than in five years before. Detestation of the sham-prohibitory law is gathering fast."

INDIANA.—"Since the prohibitory law (which worked wonders in the way of diminishing crime,) was made null and void by the Judges—to say nothing of intemperance, pauperism, disease, and other ills—the amount of crime has swollen enormously. Four youths were lately convicted of the murder of young Fahrenburgh. Two confessed on the gallows that they were drunk when the crime was perpetrated. Stockin, who was hung at the same time for the murder of Rose, was the keeper of a groggery."

† Failure there, would not therefore be failure here. The machinery of Law is elective in America, and subject to political influences and changes. IF THE AMERICAN

Resolutions of the Convention says, "That the Prohibitory Law is as well executed, outside of some of our larger cities, as are our criminal laws in general." The author himself can bear witness to one fact. In the Autumn of 1853, he spent above a week in Massachusetts and Maine, and, out of Boston, though he travelled several hundreds of miles, and visited a score of the chief towns, including Portland, he neither saw a glass of grog sold or drank, nor heard of a single case of riot or drunkenness. *He*, at any rate, was not 'disappointed.'

Governor FLETCHER, in his first annual Message to the Senate and House of Representatives, Vermont, Oct. 9th, 1856, says:—

"In intimate connection with Education, as the morals of a people depend to a great extent on their intelligence, stands the subject of the Prohibition of the Traffic in Intoxicating Drinks. I respectfully invite your attention to this subject, as one which concerns the vital interests of our constituents, and which is among the first to enlist the warmest sympathy of the philanthropist and the profoundest thought of the patriot and legislator.

"My confidence in the power and duty of the legislature to prohibit the traffic remains unshaken. Few, if any, of the sources of evil have been so prolific of mischief, have sent forth so vast a desolation, and produced such overwhelming misery throughout all the departments of social and domestic life, as the sale of intoxicating liquors. The people have a right to demand at the hands of their agents, *protection* from these evils, so destructive of the happiness and well-being of society.

"I conceive that the true interests of the State, and the hopes of the rising generation, require a Prohibitory Law, *with ample power effectually to enforce its provisions*, prescribing penalties commensurate with the offences it prohibits, and *adapted* to accomplish its great design, the extinguishment of the traffic. The constitutionality of several of the most important provisions of the present law of the State, has been settled by the Supreme Court, a tribunal which has the just confidence of our citizens. *Coming from all portions of the Commonwealth, you have personal knowledge of the practical operation of the law, and its adaptation to accomplish the purposes for which it was designed.*"

Is *this* the language of 'disappointment'? Or to go to remote Iowa. The Rev. A. D. FRENCH, of Eddyville, in the U. S. *Home Missionary* for December, 1856, thus writes:—

"As to the general interests of society here, I am happy to report *the most gratifying progress*, especially in the cause of temperance and education. The *people* are determined that there shall be no more liquor-selling here."

Before the objector cants about 'disappointment,' he should inform us what is expected? *He* cannot be disappointed, for he

STATES have AN ADVANTAGE IN MORE QUICKLY LEGALIZING THE POPULAR WILL, THE BRITISH ARE MORE STABLE IN EXECUTING THE DECISIONS WHICH ARE ONCE ARRIVED AT. The Legislative Arm of America is stronger than ours—the Executive weaker.

has no expectations : and *our* expectations are more than realized, in the success both of Temperance and Prohibition.

12. *Because it proceeds on a false conception of the Evil, its seat and essence.*

A false philosophy can, certainly, by virtue of its falsity, fructify to no good issue. Wisdom alone is justified of her children. 'A knowledge of the disease is one half the cure'—says the proverb—and the knowledge *and application* of the remedy must be the other half. It may be a problem, however, whether the objector comprehends our notion of the evil. The member for North Staffordshire, after getting Birmingham to find him cash to build what he calls a 'Library,' now proposes to licence it as a Liquor-shop—copying the Crystal Palace Company on a small scale. Of course we have nothing to say against any man's notions—honest and ignorant as they may be—so long as they are tolerantly put forth, and so long as he leaves other men's opinions at peace. But when, in advocating the union of philosophy and feeding, logic and liquor, books and brandy, he steps out of his path to fabricate fictitious and foolish doctrines for other people, and imputes insanity to his sober neighbors under cover of his own fiction, we are bound to rebuke him.

MR ADDERLEY, M.P. "I do not see why, if a man wishes to read, "he should not have *a book with a glass of brandy and water.*" (Loud cheers.) I cannot agree with the *insane notion of some "people, that the use of anything is necessarily its abuse."*

There are many things, probably, that people cannot see, especially after dinner and wine ; but will the orator have the goodness to inform us *where* and *when* he met with the insane-people and opinion to which he refers ? We have a pretty extensive acquaintance with Teetotalers and Prohibitionists throughout the world, but *we* never met with a single specimen of that 'notion' with which MR ADDERLEY cannot agree. If people 'believe' that the use of *anything* is its abuse, then one of two things : they do *not* use it because they *are* conscientious, in which case the philosopher's stone is at last found out—the Art of living without eating !—or they *do* use it, either because they necessarily must, whether they will or no, or because they are *not* conscientious—in which case, as nobody *does* or *can* practise the notion,—what did the 'cheers' mean ?

Yellow does for white
When what you put for yellow's simply *black.*
So any sort of meaning *looks intense*
When all beside itself, means and looks—nought.

Prohibition is *not* the "logical-sequence of Abstinence," as some of the abstainers contend : but it *is* "one of two appliances, both mutually essential to the accomplishment of the avowed object of the Temperance Society—the overthrow of Intemperance."* The question of the *public causes* of Intemperance, Pauperism, and Crime,

* Albany *Prohibitionist*, January, 1857. It mistakes in supposing there is any practical 'embarrassment.'

is no logical-inference from the teetotal doctrine of physiology and personal morals—but it is a public question affecting the interests of every citizen. It is also the political aspect of the Temperance question, and *therefore* interesting to most temperance men : but it is no less a question for *other* citizens. The Alliance, therefore, is wisely made wide-enough for all—is based, not on a personal-practice, but on *a common public interest and conviction*. The more Temperance truth prevails, the better for the principles of Prohibition—but it is manifest, that Temperance never can be paramount until Prohibition comes. The Alliance is not even a ‘development’ of teetotalism. Good men, of all sects and parties, have long since perceived and denounced the evil of Public-houses, men into whose heads the notion of doubting or discarding *the drink* never once entered. Why should we neglect the aid of this large class ? They, in their philosophy, perhaps never went beyond the fact that “Public-houses *did* bring forth evil-fruit, and therefore ought to be suppressed,”—or if they ever attempted to explain the philosophy of the fact at all, deemed that convenient phrase—“Habit of Drinking”—quite sufficient ! Even now, half the ‘abstainers’ know no better.* The English teetotalers *do*. Indeed, so far from the *doctrine* of Prohibition being a *sequel* to Teetotalism,—we ourselves learnt it, 20 years ago, from the first Temperance Apostles. They are Twin-Truths—offsprings of a common necessity and heirs of a double destiny—twins, we say—but not, what some would make them, SIAMESE TWINS ! In theory, interest, and tendency they are *identical*—in mission and work, *distinct*.†

* A suicidal and confused writer in the *Commonwealth*, under the appropriate signature of *Reekie* (Smoke-without-light), is a pertinent example. He would “write prohibition on the tablets of every young heart”—but he “rejects *very* confidently, the mere prohibition doctrine.” What he here means-to-mean we cannot even guess. Equally unintelligible is his talk of the “simultaneous education and direction of the liquor-appetite.” We thought the evil consisted in the appetite being *educed* at all : and hence, for twenty years, *we* have preached against the use of the drink, *AND* the temptations to its use, arising from custom and the traffic. He asserts that the Scottish League does not *want* the Traffic to be put-down altogether. That may be true—but for our part, we *do* desire its *UTTER* and *INSTANT* destruction by the nation, even though we fear many years may elapse before our desire is realized. On the same principle, our *Reekie* friend should never pray, “Thy kingdom come”—except with the reservation “*a long time hence*”—to save his ‘sincerity’ ! But *we* believe, that a man who does not *just now* desire the kingdom, will not *sincerely* care for its coming a hundred years after. In his haste to be philosophical, he simply becomes foolish, and ignores the fundamental fact of Teetotalism. “What,” asks he, ‘occasions the drink-appetite ?’ And answers—“Chiefly love of excitement and love of imitation.” No, these only occasion *some men* (not us, not *Reekie* himself we hope) to *drink*—it is the drink, and only that, which generates the *APPETITE*. *Reekie* is as fond of excitement as other people—indeed, evidently, writes under its disturbing influence—yet he has *not* the Drink-appetite : therefore the love of excitement is *not* its cause. The love of Bacchanalian, or ‘Tobacconalian,’ pleasure, is *bred* solely by the use of the physical agents employed, and the outward temptation *then* and *therefore* becomes dangerous by reacting upon the appetite first formed.

† Not necessarily so as to organization, but in regard to method and action. Prohibition must *at last* work with political tools, and ought *at first* to fish in the deep waters with political-tackle. Many fish will rise to no other bait. A Temperance-Society can include prohibition, if its members think proper ; but in the early years of the agitation, the merits of the Political problem will stand out with the more distinctness by being kept apart in at least *ONE* great Organization, around the banner of which *all* can rally as *citizens*, for political action. In a country like the United States, where the general community is divaricated into two classes—Foreign and Native—

What is the evil to be combated! **INTEMPERANCE IN LIQUOR.** What is this essentially? A *lust* for strong-drink—a 'craving' for excitement by means of that unnatural and fictitious medium. Such is the disease—now what are its necessary, generating *causes*, individual and social?

1st. The **USE OF THE ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR ITSELF** operating physically, and *tending*, by necessity-of-relation, to excess—the potency of which tendency, amidst counteracting agencies, is seen in the terrific development of our 'National Vice.' Every drunkard was *made* such in this way, and in no other.

2nd. The **CAUSES OF THE USE**, which are (*a*) Intellectual and Personal, as false notions of the excellence or innocence of the drink; or (*b*) Social and Moral, as Drinking-customs and Temptations.

Here, then, we have three great points: the *one*, universal, proximate, physical cause of the vice—and the *two* inducing causes of that cause. Now, the 'remedy' concerns the latter cause—means, in short, the *removal of the causes* of the use—the prevention of the vice. Teetotalism is adapted to deal chiefly with the *first* of these causes. It *has* dealt with them, considering its appliances, most effectually. DE QUINCEY has long ago recognized the fact. "The most remarkable instance of a combined movement in Society which History perhaps will be summoned to notice, is that which in our days has applied itself to the abatement of Intemperance." In America it has already become the second question of the age, and *here*, we venture to hope, it is destined to become the first. The *Report* of the New-York-State Society on the 18th December, 1856, states that "during the twenty-nine years since the Society was organized, such a reformation has been wrought in the habits of the civilized world, as has never before been witnessed in the same length of time." In Britain, the Temperance Society has not merely ventilated the evils of the 'effect' in windy generalities, like the satirists, moralists, and preachers;—but, as Professor LAYCOCK conceded the other day at Edinburgh, it has taught *Science* to the Physiologist. It has reclaimed hosts of inebriates from their bondage—it has *informed* the Public Mind—educated the Nation on the special subject of Strong-drinks, their qualities and consequences,—it has absolved the abstainer from the stigma of 'singularity,'—has shown heroic examples of moral courage—has for thousands reclaimed from Fashion that personal independence of habit without which there can be neither true dignity nor moral worth—aye, reclaimed it in the teeth of Mistress GRUNDY and "GIGADIBS, the literary man." The triumphs of Temperance, at home and abroad,

and where *eight-tenths* of all the respectability are *already* temperance men, and 8-10ths of the immigrant population opposed to prohibition,—it is sound policy to enlist the enthusiasm of Teetotalers by getting them to take part, *as such*, in the political conflict. This class, however, who are strongest there, are weakest here; and hence the policy of Britain must be different. The permanent-work of our Temperance Societies, should be, everywhere, the diffusion of *information* on the whole question, but especially in respect to 'The Great Delusion'—the drink itself. After all, the practical rule is simple—*Do good as you have opportunity, in every way.*

have been marvelous and manifest. In 'furthest Ind' it has its earnest advocates—its press and preachers ;—in Europe, it sits at least on one Throne of Power, and has been subscribed by six of the Rulers of the New World. Side-by-side with the Stars and Stripes, its flag floats proudly on the peaks of Vermont, and waves upon the snow-capt summit of Shasta.*

O. "If teetotalism is not a *failure*, why plead for prohibition?"

A. Because Prohibition is the *complement* of the Remedy—the other ingredients in the prescription which shall abate the disorder. It might as well be asked, If good seed is not a failure, why drain the land? Here is a passage from a late newspaper:

"A Physician in Albany, who has practised for thirty years, says he never saw *so much drunkenness in one day*, as on *last Christmas-day*,"—the 1856th anniversary of the birth of the Saviour—

Whose sad face on the Cross, sees only this
After the passion of a thousand years.

Does the objector fail to perceive that, on *his* principles, both Temperance and Christianity are failures?

O. "But Christianity was not embraced by *these* men!"

A. Neither was Temperance; or if either or both, they were not held fast. And why *do* men fall-away from religion? Because of temptation—external and internal. (Indeed, there can be no static temptation save when both concur. The inward susceptibility cannot be drawn out into lust where there is no outward attraction; and, contrariwise, the *objective* temptation cannot operate save upon a *subjective* susceptibility responsive to it.) And what is our course in moral temptation? Do we not *pray* to be delivered from it? And, putting our own shoulders to the wheel-of-Providence, do we not *flee* from evil? Why should we act with less prudence and piety in our social matters?

* Mount Shasta, California, is 16,500 feet high. In 1855, the Rev. I. S. DIEHL, a successful Missionary, planted a temperance banner on the very top, in the region of perpetual snow. He writes:—

"In the Fall of 1852, I left the mines for the lower country. Then scarce a man but enjoyed his social glass. At almost any hour of the day or night, men lay in the streets intoxicated. Drunken fights were almost hourly occurrences. Night was made hideous by drunken shouts, blasphemy, and bacchanalian songs. *Entire camps, of from fifty to three hundred men, I have seen drunk at one time.* No movement for the public good could be started, but it must be baptized in liquor.

"But how changed the scene! Instead of the bloated drunkard, wallowing in filth, and clothed in rags, we behold the man. *Where stood the brothel, now stands the Church, or the Temperance hall.* Where we heard the shouts of drunken-blasphemy, we now hear the hum of quiet industry. In many places there, scarce a Temperance man was found; now *over half of the legal voters* are enrolled under the banner of the Sons of Temperance, or the Temple of Honor!"

The *Cayuga Chief* reports:—

"In Missouri the cause of Temperance is onward. In several counties, local laws have been passed nearly prohibitory in their character, which are effecting much good. The Order of Templars is doing a noble work. *In two years and a half, 176 Lodges have been organized, 140,000 persons initiated.*"

Mr ABBOTT LAWRENCE, late United States Minister to the Court of St James, was asked, before he died, what had occasioned the great increase in wealth and prosperity in the United States? He replied:—"Our prosperity, in my opinion, is greatly owing to the Temperance Reformation. The influence of this movement is felt in the workshop, on the farm, and in every branch of human industry."

Teetotalism, then, can convince, like truth in general : can penetrate the intellect, and get rid of false-notions ; but it cannot *change the heart*—cannot disenchant man from the influence of Comus, and Impulse, and Custom. *Institutions* are more potent than *Instruction* : they form manners and fashion usages—this only informs : they *educe*-powers, this *inducts* ideas only. They appeal to the active, this to the passive, faculties of man. “It is not the *cry*, but the *flight* of the Wild Duck, that draws the flock after him”—is a Chinese proverb of great wisdom.

Man is a social-being, moved by gregarious sympathies and example. Drinking in obedience to Fashion and Custom, that overmastering, will-abolishing appetite is formed which “grows with what it feeds-on.” Once-formed, the initial craving finds a terrible Ally in the signs, the suggestions, and the company, of the chartered Drunkenness. Now Teetotalism meets the case of opinion ; but *Prohibition* only can meet that of the Licensed-temptation : whence the maxim—Moral Suasion for the Victim ; Legal-suasion for the Vendor. Teetotalism cannot do *everything* ; it wants supplementing with the other agency that can remove *the other cause of the use* of strong-drink, so as to produce concord between the convictions and the conduct of men. The failure may be with us, to whom Prohibition is preached—but it cannot be with the Truth. If Righteousness knock at the door, and we will not open, has it therefore failed ? Nay, verily, but he who refuses to open—ignoring what he ought to acknowledge—the failure is with *him*. As, when the Spirit has ceased to strive with men, perdition is at hand—so a Nation which repudiates the sacrifices of duty, and clings to the pleasures of sense, excavates its own tomb.

O. “But is it not a mistake to deny that *habits of drinking* are “the cause of Intemperance ?”

A. We do not deny this—we only say that the phrase *envelopes* the real truth—which is, that there is a special cause for excess in alcohol (as in tobacco or opium) for which the word ‘habit’ does not account. The habit of eating bread does not make large numbers gluttons—the habit of drinking beer *does* make vast numbers intemperate.

LORD STANLEY. “The difficulty of combating *any bad habit* “increases with the length of time during which such habit is “persisted in.”

A. Just so, my lord, for it is quite true that a *confirmed* drunkard is—a confirmed drunkard : a truism that no one has the slightest disposition to deny.

LORD STANLEY. “If this be so, the phenomena indicated must be “referred, not to an exceptional case, but to a *general law*. The “parallel drawn from bread is not applicable. To prove the “(Alliance) case, it ought to be shown, that *other passions* may be “habitually gratified without becoming stronger.”

A. This is somewhat hasty logic. The fact, that the *habit* of stroking ones’ beard or twirling ones’ moustache,—of gambling,—of drinking,—or of gratifying any other passion—possesses the com-

mon attribute of *increasing with the causes of their development*—by no means compels us to abolish their *special and distinct causes*, and to refer them to a generality. An analogy may exist in two effects, and yet arise from agencies diametrically *opposite*. (The question, by the way did not concern 'Law,' which is an *effect* of power, but POWER or *tendency*; the allegation being, that the Traffic inverted an ordinary law of trade, since it *created* its own demand. In other words, instead of *satisfying* any normal demand, it *increases* and *provokes* the appetite for drink.) The problem truly is—WHAT created that craving for drink in the intemperate, which, once occasional, is now chronic? Natural 'passions' do not grow indefinitely: but if they do, it is not for the same reason that the craving for drink or opium increases.

The case is one of diet solely—an 'appetite' of the sentient man, rather than a passion. True, the desire for bread is not a parallel to the desire for drink. The design was a contrast: the doctrine being, that as *both* loaf and liquor were on the same level as material objects, going to the same receptacle, and for twin, if not identical, uses of refreshment, yet were followed by very *opposite* effects—(the Bread reducing the 'appetite' rapidly to zero, day and year *satisfying* its claims with the same efficiency in the same quantity,—the Brandy firing the appetite to excess, and year by year losing its power to gratify, yet never satisfying, the craving for excitement)—so from these opposite results we must infer a *speciality of nature* and relationship in the Liquor.

Supposing we were to find amongst the *abused* 'passions,' an exact parallel to these cases of opium and alcohol,—supposing the *objects* of the passions were the causes of the evil, as alcohol and opium are of the abnormal state of *their* victims,—supposing *natural* objects had no *satisfying tendency* for the soul, as bread for the appetite of hunger, but *tended* to a restless craving like gin,—what could it prove against the *actual fact* alleged? It would show that men had devised a factitious method of *creating* a factitious passion, *analogous* to a natural passion in the abnormal and disordered condition of abuse, and it would show no more. The actual *genesis* of the Intemperate-appetite, from the physical effects of the stimulant, would not be at all affected: nor, consequently, the doctrine of the Alliance, that a Traffic in that article which *creates* intemperance, is inconsistent with our national welfare and social prosperity.*

* "Alcohol stands high on the list of narcotic poisons in all standard treatises on poisons. Now the physiological laws of narcotic poisons are principally four in number; 1, That, after using them for a time, the quantity of the dose must be increased, in order to produce the same effect.—2, That the time betwixt the doses must also be diminished, for the same reason.—3, That the depression and exhaustion which follow, is exactly equivalent to the amount of excitement or exhilaration caused by the quantity used.—And, 3, That many of them *tend to create an artificial, persistent, and uncontrollable appetite* or craving, which renders the person so using them a slave to the habit."—J. M. MACCULLOCH, M.D.

The Rev. T. W. JENKYN, D.D., of Rochester, writes:—

"On the operations of the Maine-law, I may, perhaps, make a remark or two. In 1856 I travelled for six months through portions of fifteen states of North America. The result of my observation goes to justify your proceedings against the traffic.

The only 'passion' at all analogous in its nature and effects to the 'lust for liquor,' is *gambling*—which may be well called, the Alghoul of the Soul—and this should be abstained from as a vice, and prohibited as a public offence.

Mr HOLYOAKE. "The habit of eating does not beget the appetite for eating ;—and there is no more tendency in Alcohol to excess than to Gluttony in hot-rolls."

A. Habit is common to food and drink, whatever their quality. It is not the 'habit' of drinking that 'manufactures drunkards,' but the narcotic quality of the drink. If you take that which has no tendency to increase appetite, it cannot be the cause of any excess—for nothing comes of nothing. Now, we know hot-rolls do not generate 'gluttony'—whatever may be said of indigestion—but in the use of alcohol and opium there is generated a craving for excess, in millions. Can the peculiar effects following the habit of drinking and smoking be seriously denied? Could the same things be predicated of bread and beef? Certainly not. The *Medico-Chirurgical Review* thus lays down the law, in reference to Opium, Hashish, etc. :—"It is the effect [tendency] of all these narcotic 'poisons, in common with alcohol, to cause an ever-increasing 'desire for them...There can be no doubt whatever, that every-thing that exhausts the sensorial or motor power, conduces to 'excite this irrepressible desire for stimulants.' The objector, therefore, denies an admitted principle of science; one on which the prevalence of Opium-eating in the East, and of Drunkenness in the West, is the wholesale commentary.

since my travels have convinced me that it is not the demand for strong drink that creates the market, but it is the market that creates the demand. I was struck with the remark of a Welshman, working in a slate quarry in Vermont. I asked him how he did without his ale; his reply was—"There is no place to get it, and therefore it is of no use to think of it."

J. S. MILL, in his *Political Economy*, says :—

"Taxation should by preference attach itself to stimulants, because these are MORE LIABLE TO BE USED IN EXCESS."

The *Lancet*, which writes balderdash against the Maine law, can state the truth concerning the appetite for Tobacco. In April 1857, it thus exhorts :—

"To the young man, and more especially to the student of medicine, we would say: 'Shun the habit of smoking as you would shun self-destruction, As you value your physical and moral well-being, avoid a habit which for you can offer no advantage to compare with the dangers you incur by using it. Your manner of living must be bad indeed if you require anything further than sleep, exercise, and diet to fit you for your duties as students. Your minds must be emasculated indeed if you cannot face your present few, and comparatively small anxieties, without having recourse to the daily use of narcotics.' We speak from a large experience of medical students when we say, that the intemperate smoker is the intemperate indulger, as a general rule, in all that partakes of the nature of sensual gratification. It matters not that many may and do pass through the ordeal unscathed. Vast numbers do not. Listless minds and languid bodies, slakeless thirst and shaking hands, delirium tremens, madness, and death, we have distinctly and surely seen to follow the unhallowed indulgence in youths who began their studies with bright promise of success, with fair characters, and honest purposes."

Would the habit of smoking cabbage leaves or paper be followed by such results? The evil is in the THING, not in the habit.

III. PROHIBITION A SUPERFLUOUS AND INFERIOR REMEDY FOR DRUNKENNESS, ETC.

1. *Because it will be needless when public opinion can carry and sustain it.*

The objection is an old foe with a new face. It ignores the difference between a majority of society, including the intelligent and influential, who are law-abiders, and the minority from whom arises the dangers against which law is the avowed protection—overlooks the distinction between men as intellectual and as sympathetic beings—as knowing and doing—as percipient and impulsive.

“The Understanding is not an autocratic faculty, and its most assured conclusions are oftentimes disregarded in practice, being either overruled by passion, or neglected through carelessness; so that it is necessary, on these accounts, to supersede its dominion by one on which more certain reliance can be placed.”*

The highest truth must be crystalized into *habit*—must get ‘confirmed.’ Philip drunk is very different from Philip sober: and he knows it just as well as the appellant. So King Demos knows full well that he is better sober—nevertheless, if the temptation be thrown in his way, Demos will drink. “Custom,” said CONFUCIUS, “is the *symbol* of virtue, which tends to preserve it, which recalls it to memory, and which sometimes takes its place”—i.e. with many, custom and habit honor the law where the reason is not even known. Law ought to be the *expression* of virtue; but in fact the licensed-Traffic is the most formidable agent and fountain of vice: the *end* of general Law, and the special Licence-law, are therefore antagonistic—and it can never be needless to destroy a pernicious paradox or a practical incongruity. These are the moral utilities and justifications for other laws expressing our convictions. Is it ‘needless’ to pass a law to *guard* the opinion that honesty is the best policy? But the reasons for sustaining, by a prohibitive enactment, the Opinion that the Traffic is bad, are much stronger than in the case of theft. Comparatively few persons are set upon picking pockets. Few of the remainder of society are casually *tempted* to do so, or to steal. With the vast majority, the thing never once enters their minds. But the temptations, occasional and perpetual, to drinking, abound in all classes; and issue in our National curse and opprobrium. Opinion, then, requires to be *expressed* and *upheld* by law—and conviction to be guarded by *habit* and *circumstance*. Without this, for the control of life, knowledge is vain, and theory as flimsy as a spider’s web.†

If the objection were sound, then to *know*, as Tradesmen *do* know,

* CARTER *on the Nervous System*. “Perpetual custom,” says CICERO, “makes the mind callous, and people neither admire, nor require a reason for, those things which they constantly behold.”

† “The *tendencies* of the Stage so completely overcame my *good sentiments*, that I was for years a worthless woman. It is, I think, our duty and our wisdom to *fly temptation* whenever we can, as it is to *resist* it when we cannot escape it.”—Peg Woffington: by CHARLES READE, p. 252.

that adulteration of food is bad—would prevent adulteration without any Act of Parliament. Then, likewise, Sin, which is more than mistake,—viz., a transgression of known law, of conviction,—would be impossible : since no man *could* do what he ought not, if opinion were invincible. Further, an ‘impassible habit’ of Temperance can never be formed in a nation, so long as intoxicating drinks are articles of common sale and use. The physical, automatic law will undermine the moral nature. Habit works with means—and the use of strong drink is inconsistent with the end aimed at. The necessity of pledged abstinence and altered social habits to sustain the drunkard in his conviction, is admitted. Men are rarely reclaimed in any other way. This holds good equally of masses, and of prevention as well as of cure. There is no example in history of any Society or Nation realizing the model state so devoutly desired, in connection with the traffic in strong-drink. The plan best for the Individual, is best for the Nation.

The Physiology of the Nervous System teaches that we cannot *directly* accomplish certain mental ends, nor *directly* prevent certain psychological effects ; but that we can do both by *indirect* means. In other words—and this is the Responsibility of the Will—we can *exclude* certain factors of evil influence from our sphere of life (eschew the evil)—and we can *induct* certain improving circumstances (choose the good). Man can alter his subjective nature mediately, but not *immediately* : therefore, his duty is to become a *co-worker* with God’s methods and instruments of action, for in no other way can he rehabilitate himself in virtue. In like manner a Nation must act. To be virtuous, it must not licence corruption ; to be orderly, it must not establish nurseries of misrule ; to be pure, it must not charter dens of debauchery ; to be temperate, it must not plant temptations to tippling amongst its people. It will be useless to expect that *palaver* of any kind—from desk, platform, pulpit, or parliament—will get rid of the corruption, disorder, and crime, so long as their *CREATING-CIRCUMSTANCES*—the moulding *INSTITUTIONS*—are rife in the nation.* The politicians of half-a-principle—the Cyclops of Fogysm and Philosophy—admit that the Public-Houses *are* very much *too rank*—but they fail to see that in this admission they have also yielded up the principle that such places are *traps, temptations, and pitfalls to the people*, operating (in the manner explained) to defeat the prime ends of all civilized society.

To *know*, therefore, that the Tap is a Trap—a corrupting-circumstance—a temptation to intemperance, and a fountain of all imaginable evil—so far from making the law needless, is of all reasons in the world the very strongest why Society should protect itself by total and immediate prohibition. The parallel to this objection would be found in (1) supposing a Community *convinced* of the

* Of course, by *Creating-Circumstance* we only denote one element of the *Cause*—the Nature of man, as a sentient, automatic being, is the other. But as that is a fixed and generically uniform element, it need not be repeated when we are referring to the varying, external factor.

necessity of a Sanitary Law to abolish a certain Nuisance (sustained by the selfishness of a few, at the cost of many) which was breeding low-fevers amongst them—and (2) in supposing a philosopher to arise and proclaim “that they did not need to remove it, *because* they were numerous enough to carry a measure for that purpose, and *because* they already ‘knew’ (to their cost) that the nuisance was a—nuisance!” Now, as the man whose family had suffered from the pest would protest most vehemently against it, so those classes who have *lost and suffered most* from the Traffic—who have *felt* its power—are precisely those who most desiderate and demand Protection for themselves, their families, and their fatherland.*

The *utility* of a Law as the expression of the Moral sentiment of a people, whether of a ruling minority or of the masses, is manifest and manifold. First, it keeps the truth prominently before the mind, as a fixed fact, and confirms obedience by habit. Second, it is needful to bank out the desolating and aggressive waters of evil, or they will roll over the whole ground reclaimed. Third, it has a powerfully *educative* and *assimilative* tendency.† Fourth, it furnishes a ready *lever* for practical action, against the mischievous minority, since it may then be initiated by individuals, or small numbers, without waiting, so to speak, for the tedious process of getting up a Nation’s steam.‡ Thus the Act for Sanitary-reform gives to localities a power to act, by reason of certain general provisions, and the law is good, even if people here and there are not wise enough to act upon it. Take an illustration from a recent

* A short time since a friend of ours visited a poor man who had been tempted to break his pledge, and thus roused up the dormant appetite, spending some pounds he had saved, and selling his goods for more drink, to the degradation of himself and the misery of his family. Our friend expostulated with him, and happened to express his sense of the man’s infatuation by saying, “You ought to be put into an iron cage.” The poor fellow immediately exclaimed, with all his energy, “Would to God, sir, I was in one—then I should be safe!”

† Dr BLOMFIELD, Bishop of London, in his evidence in 1832 before the select committee of the House of Commons, on the observance of the Lord’s day, in reply to the question whether the example of the higher classes would not accomplish this end *without* legislation, says: “I am afraid not to any sufficient extent. This good would result from a legislative measure, that it would be the deliberate expression of opinion; and I think that *that* would have great weight with the people,—that it would in many cases obviate the necessity of carrying the penal part of any such enactment into execution. But there are classes of persons who are only to be dealt with by stronger measures of prevention.”

‡ The Hon G. A. DUDLEY, in the *Albany Prohibitionist* for March 1857, relates a case in point, concerning a village-town in Ulster County, New York, where an active Temperance Society had been at work for a year past:—

“In the midst of this movement, the village of NAPANOCH is startled with the cry of ‘Murder!’ And lo, a fellow-citizen was expiring in a pool of his own blood. The horrid deed was perpetrated in one of the drunkeries. The night opened with drinking; drinking led to a noisy brawl, kept up through most of the night; then there were blows—blood—death—murder! Now the community was, for a day, aroused to the evils of the liquor traffic. But all the law available, was that which touched the Sunday traffic. Until a prohibitory law is obtained, the *Napanoch Temperance Society* find they can make no further advance. Here is a community, who have just witnessed a revolting murder in a grog-shop, who are anxious and able to close it up, but, for want of a law, are comparatively helpless. For want of a prohibitory law, *seventeen hundred people have to suffer the existence of twenty-two grog-shops, which, if they had it, would be closed up to-morrow.*”

event in IOWA, related by the Rev. A. D. TRENCH, of Eddyville :—
“ In defiance of our excellent Maine Law, several grogeries had been opened and were doing their work of ruin, when an event occurred which aroused the great mass of the community. One of our citizens, under the influence of liquor, went into a physician's office, and drank a quantity of wine-of-colchicum, and died the next day, leaving a widow and three children. A public meeting was called, to take measures for the suppression of the liquor traffic. The people turned out *en masse*. No pen can describe the enthusiasm. The widowed mother and orphan children, the rum-seller and his abettors, and an indignant temperance-community, were assembled there. The liquor-dealers, doubtless, *came* to break up the meeting, but when they witnessed the enthusiasm they quailed. While one of the speakers was pouring a torrent of invective upon the heads of the rum-sellers, the widow whose husband they had slain, discovering the author of her sorrows, grew frantic with agony, sprang from her seat, and with her arms outstretched towards him, charged him with the murder of her husband ; and, begging he might be removed from the house, sank to the floor. Her children joined in the most piteous cries. Such a scene caused the tears to flow from many an eye, and wrought up the audience to the highest pitch of excitement. An efficient committee was appointed to *enforce* the liquor law, and almost the entire audience, including some rum-drinkers, pledged themselves to sustain the committee. The committee nobly discharged their duty, and in one week the town was swept clear of the liquor-traffic.”

The Objection, like many others, is contradicted by the *history* of the movement. Public-opinion in the American States—that is, opinion worth anything, morally—is now, and has long been, in favor of Temperance ; but Prohibition is nevertheless a felt necessity. Enthusiasm, in the nature of men, cannot be permanent,—and, at any rate, it cannot be transmitted to our children. After a very tempest of zeal and love had swept over the United States in 1845, Judge O'NEAL said : “ This very year has fully convinced me that moral-suasion has had its day of triumph ; some *other aids* must now be sought, to keep what we have gained and to gain still more.” The old agency failed to accomplish the suppression of the evil, though it did *not* fail to achieve service of the kind for which it was adapted. In *itself* it is no ‘failure,’ but in regard to ignorant human expectations it is. These must be revised, and then the true scope of the agency will be recognized, as well as the sphere of that second, supplementary power to which we are now calling National attention. What says the *Journal* of the American Temperance Union for February ? “ Once we had hope, but we almost begin to despair [of men]. The good men of the land seem to be yielding up the conflict, and saying, ‘ *There is no hope !* let every man walk in the imagination of his heart, to add drunkenness to thirst.’ God, in his mercy, forbid it ! This is the great crisis. Never will your eyes see what they *have* seen, and your ears hear what they *have* heard, of the

triumphs of temperance,—if you let the ball roll backward and the traffic gain uncontrolled dominion. You may save *yourselves*, for you are grounded in principle; but, alas! for your *children*—alas! for your common country! Of him who shall live half a century hence it may be asked, Shall he find temperance on the earth? And if he does not, on whom shall the responsibility rest? *It is unbelief that prevents action.* Even religion will die out without action,—as it has, from one spot after another, travelling onward from Jerusalem around the globe. The right time to feel responsibility is when we have the cause in our hands, when men are sensitive of its value, and the grasping spirit of appetite and avarice has not covered the earth.” *

But what need of crossing the ocean for evidence, with IRELAND, and the experience of the sainted MATHEW, so near and certain? Who ever used moral-suasion to larger masses of men, over wider tracts of earth, than the Irish Apostle of Temperance? The fact of eight millions of signatures to the pledge, indicates *opinion* sufficiently ripe to uphold Prohibition, if obtained. But the opportunity was not seized—the golden moment fled—and the Traffic is reviving afresh. Two years before his death, our lamented friend thus wrote to Mr T. H. BARKER, the secretary of the Alliance:—“The question of prohibiting the sale of ardent spirits, and the many other intoxicating drinks which are to be found in our country, is not new to me. The principle of Prohibition seems to me *to be the only safe and certain remedy for the evils of Intemperance.* This opinion has been strengthened and confirmed by the hard labor of more than twenty years in the Temperance cause. I rejoice in the welcome intelligence of the formation of a Maine Law Alliance, which I trust will be the means, under God, of destroying the fruitful source of Crime and Pauperism.”

2. *Because the evil is dying out under ‘existing-agencies.’*

It would be consoling to us to believe so: but where are the proofs? “We are not *so bad* as we were!” Very true, yet no proof that we shall not remain for a long period, *bad enough*. What if such twaddle were uttered in opposition to the pleadings for the

* The *Journal* and the *Prohibitionist* give the following facts and testimonies illustrative of the *adequacy* of thirty years of Moral-suasion to deal with the evil:—

In Boston, prisoners are in proportion of 1 to 16 of the inhabitants. Judge CAPRON said, at New York, on the 19th February, 1857: “There are more drunkards now, take the country through, in proportion to the population, than there were fifty years ago.”

There were 13,000 raving Maniacs in the State, made so by drinking.

On the 4th of November last, the great Election-day, *every seventh Voter was drunk*. Think of that, friends of democracy, in 1856—nearly half a million of voters reeling drunk to the ballot-box!

The Penfield *Crusader* (State of Georgia, which cast 7,000 votes for a Maine Law Governor,) knows the difference between opinion and practice:—“We make no wild, chimerical proposition, when we say that Prohibition is the only hope of this country. Everything plainly indicates that we have fallen upon evil times. Men may talk, and speak, and write about conservatism and patriotism; but as long as our Senators and Representatives stagger, senseless and stupefied, into our legislative halls, reeking with the fumes of the dram-shop, we cannot expect wise, consistent legislation.”

The Rev. JOHN D. LAWYER, Lutheran Clergyman, and Chaplain to the New York State Prison, says, under date of May 3, 1856:—“Give us the Maine Law, and in five years Auburn Prison is no more!”

abatement of a certain nuisance, known to be the nest of typhus or disease? Were an Inspector of Nuisances to answer the expressed surprize of the Magistrates that one had *not* been removed, "Sir, the health of the district is not *so bad* as it was,"—what *could* they think of the poor Inspector's head? The man who abstains from drink, not having the susceptibility to pestilential action so fully developed within his frame as the drinker has, will not be so readily attacked,—but when he challenges a special nuisance, is his self-denial or health to become a bar to his claim, and a charter for perpetual pestilence? Is there to be a *stop* put to Sanitary Reform, because we are not *so bad* as we were, in our national health? Shall fever-nests and cholera-eggs be kept warm, because we are no longer ravaged by the 'Black-death,' the 'Sweating sickness,' and the 'Plague'? Are our achievements in banishing former evils to be transmuted by some insane logic into an apology for perpetuating existing ones? Is not the success of past endeavors rather a spur to future effort, than a plea for social apathy and inaction?

Further, why not rapidly and immediately remove an acknowledged evil? The opponent cannot have two strings to his bow. To commend slow-agencies of repression, is to admit the *badness* of the influence to be repressed or counteracted; and if he does *not* concede the malady, he cannot be allowed to propose its removal, either by slow or fast process.* That the evil is an evil, and of colossal magnitude, none but the utterly brutish will deny. At the late licensing meeting of the Middlesex magistrates, the Hon. Mr BYNG, the chairman, is reported by the *Morning Advertiser* as having "complimented the victuallers of that parish (St James's) upon the very few complaints of a serious nature which had been made during the past year. He attributed *that result mainly to the houses having been SHUT UP earlier than had been the custom in former times.* There had been during the year about 1,500 charges of drunkenness in that parish, whilst in the adjoining parish of St George the number was *only* about 700. He had addressed the victuallers of the Haymarket, and they promised they would *shut* their houses earlier. Soon afterwards he met Mr BINGHAM, the police magistrate, who, in a jocular way, said, '*You have left me nothing to do;*' for drunkenness was, *for a time*, stopt to so great an extent."

Here is the distinct confession of the *peculiarity* and the *evil* of the

* One *Auld Reekie* says:—"To destroy a *bad institution*, the public-house, we should "endeavor to construct *many good ones instead*; concerts," etc. But to let weeds grow, unplucked up, along with the wheat, is not to have something '*instead*,' but something *side by side*. This is *not* to 'destroy' it—as we have shown in the Perthshire village town, where, twenty years ago, there were 10 drunkeries, and where, notwithstanding increased means of education and amusement, there are 10 yet,—it is only to *attempt* to destroy it; and if we ever succeeded, the '*bad institution*' would, after a while, spring-up again! With such opinions, *Auld Reekie* merely pretends to be a '*future*' Prohibitionist, for his doctrine antagonises prohibition *itself*, at all times and in whatever association. Moreover, he deceives himself by calling Public-houses '*on*,' and the alleged *counteractions* '*many*'—since the Traffic is '*Legion*,' and includes many amusements, as concerts, reading-rooms, games, etc.

trade—of its requiring restriction, and surveillance, and admonition—of the *great* benefits of its being SHUT UP even for a *little*. Thus men talk of the slice of good and forget the loaf! But at the Brentford division, something still more curious occurred. A Beer-house keeper applied to be admitted into the aristocracy of the Licensed Victuallers: whereupon some Chiswick brewers employed a barrister to oppose the claim for license. The learned gentleman spoke of the demoralizing effect of public-houses, of which, he was certain, there were enough at present for all reasonable purposes, in fact, too many. “*The law says public-houses are not good for society, to be too much in force. Ask the woman in rags,*” said he, “*who comes before your worships, how her crime has been committed, and ten to one but she says it was through the public-house.*” But how does the question of one more or less alter the character of those extant? The ‘woman in rags’ was made ragged by the public-house *already* licensed, not by the house wanting to be.

But is the evil really dying-out? We confess our incredulity. It cannot die while its causes remain: and all modifying and counteracting agencies, however good, can only advance a certain length, being *themselves* counteracted by this permanent institution of evil. The very best that can be said of the conflict is, that sometimes the forces are so nicely balanced as to issue in a *drawn-battle*. In 1836, the Commissioners on Factories describe in glowing colors a model Village in Perthshire, but we noted one drawback—the presence and contiguity of 10 Liquor shops in a population of 2,000. Its schools and church, its well-conducted mills, its earnest minister, its benevolent and benefit clubs, its sanitary condition, its village-library, were all hopeful elements, calculated to illustrate its capacity for large and visible improvement. It should, we thought, have been a Scottish KORNTHALL, or ‘the Paradise of Perthshire’: we will write to the parish minister, and ascertain what *progress* it has made. We have done so, and are favored with his reply. Alas! it is not *Excelsior*. It is not even a drawn-battle. Comus is winning, Christianity losing. Here are the facts. The adult village-library is broken up, indicating a *not* growing taste for higher culture. The appliances of good have largely increased; the ministers are more than doubled; while the population is lessened by one fourth, which should give greater power to the agencies of truth. A reading-room is established, and one or two additional schools. On the other hand, the forces of the foe are stationary—the same fatal 10. What is the moral result?—what the summing-up of twenty years of toil and battle? Still, we are happy to add, a respectable village, remarkable for its decorum, its health, education, and general morals. None of what the *Manchester Guardian* calls “the noisy and obtrusive evils of drunkenness;” nor, alas! any of “the silent and unobtrusive *blessings*” of the Traffic. Quite otherwise—some of its *silent* and *secret*, but certain fruits of bitterness and sin are there. The cases of *bastardy* are few, but not unknown. Then comes a most significant fact—showing how very different a thing it is, for men *not* to drink, and to drink

unobtrusively—regularly, secretly. “It is a mystery” to the minister, “how so many *are* kept up—for there is *not much drinking*” apparent. “But it is *not to be disguised* that they are chiefly supported by persons *whose means might be far more profitably spent at home.*” Yes—“that’s the way the money goes!”—and that’s the drag upon the wheels of progress in the happiest localities,—the blight and mildew which fall upon many a fair and hopeful scene. Let the reader solemnly ask himself the question—not simply how much evil those ten licensed shops have inflicted in twenty years, but how much of the highest good have they *prevented?* The good has *not* destroyed the evil, but the evil has marred the good. The result of a contrary plan may be shown here:—“ARMIN is a village pleasantly situated by the river Aire, in the midst of a rich agricultural district, the property of the Earl of Beverley. Sixty years ago, if notorious for anything, it was for ignorance and wickedness. *There were four or five public-houses* in the place, and but one religious service on the Sunday at the village church, attended by a few careless listeners. For a number of years it has now been remarkable for order and decorum. *ONLY ONE INN IS PERMITTED*, kept by a creditable family, by whom the sign is taken down at the annual feast. *Drunkenness and rioting have been long unknown*; consequently, abject poverty is unknown also. The religious history of the village is intimately associated with the life and labors of EDMUND THOMSON, an industrious and successful farmer, who for sixteen years was a member and advocate of the Total Abstinence Society, and gained the epithet of ‘The Village Pastor.’ His soul melted for heaviness, as he marked the national degradation, the family wretchedness, and injury to the Church of Christ, resulting from the drinking customs of the age.”*

If the National Evil is ‘dying out,’ it must be very slowly—by a lingering and most tenacious method. How many generations will it take, according to the ratio of present decrease, ere drunkenness, pauperism, and crime are reduced but *one-half*? The sober Millennium—or rather, half-and-half—would arrive about the year 1999—which, to use the Alliance word, is not a sliding-scale of a very ‘satisfactory’ construction, either for ourselves or our great-grandsons. It’s a pity some other things couldn’t be postponed to the same remote period—the *Licensing-day*, to wit—for in that case, the sober-Millennium would exchange ‘periods’ with it.

We do not care to quarrel with the assertion that drinking is ‘dying-out’ in the wealthier ranks and aristocratic circles; because drinking *there*, though sometimes an occasion of outrage, is little connected with the great questions of the Alliance—the Traffic as a source of Pauperism, Crime, and Taxation. We are old enough to recollect a King’s Court not famous for sobriety,—we have read, not long since, of the inebriety of a noble duke at a Royal dinner party,—we saw, the other day, the case of a noble Lord who couldn’t read

* *Memoir in Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, Jan. and Feb. 1857.*

his own MS lecture, because of 'double-sight,'—we know of the *actual* habits of some Judges, of some great Lawyers, of Literateurs, of Statesmen,—we have disclosures of College, Naval, and Military Life,—and revelations of the private life of Lord-This and my Marquess That—and, in short, we don't believe in the alleged abstemiousness of 'the higher classes' *as a class*. One thing we know—and that is the whole secret—we are ruled by a *Lady* who has the grace and virtue to insist upon better *fashions* and more decorous customs than formerly reigned—and 'fashion' rules in public where 'virtue' fails in private.*

In the ranks of Traders and Professional men, the greatest and most continual excess prevails : perpetually prompting to the words that wound, and even often giving rise to *crimes* of violence. Then these people always affect philosophical airs—are 'as sober as a judge,' when like one, they *must* sit, since they cannot stand. Here's a pretty case, at the Newcastle Assizes the other day—a case of mutual slander, in mutual—'sobriety.' Nobody seems to have been drunk—in his own opinion,—everybody in his neighbor's. C. L., manager of a brewery, was at the Steamboat Tavern, at half-past eight p.m., swears *he* was 'perfectly sober.' What was the state of things at ten o'clock? C. M., plaintiff, swears, when W. N., town councillor, surgeon, and defendant arrived, *he* was 'perfectly sober'—though defendant became 'excited.' "I never pushed anybody—or offered to fight—I was *quite* sober. Landed home at two o'clock. *Never saw Jack H. in the passage with Mr N.*" C. L. swears that "plaintiff was not *in the least* intoxicated. *I was perfectly sober. I had had a few glasses of wine, but I consider I was as capable of transacting any kind of business as ever I was in my life. Mr M. told Mr N. he lied.*" J. H., colliery owner, swore : "I was *not tipsy* at that time. I did not go home at all that night. Have been pretty often at the Seven Stars, where I went. Don't know how long I stayed there. *I have been locked up on charges of disorderly conduct.*" The barrister for the defendant said—"They were *all* very much *elated* by the liquor they had drunk." *Some belated—all elated !* "There would, unfortunately, be *conflicting* testimony as to the state of these gentlemen, their sobriety or *otherwise*. Mr M. *did* shove one man against defendant ; who would not have troubled a jury to ask their opinion about a *squabble in a public-house.*" W. N., who, as a surgeon, ought to know when a man is in an abnormal state, swore—"M. was *drunk*. About a dozen of the company remained. I left the room a second time because I thought they were *going to fight*—they were using *blasphemous and horrible language*. Jack H. brandished his stick ; *he was frantically drunk*. Plaintiff shoved J. H. [the man he *never saw* !] against me several times. *I was sober*. M. was very drunk and very much excited. L.'s head was lying on his shoulder, and he could hardly articulate :

* See in *Alliance News*, for July, 1857, two letters signed 'OBSERVER,' being the personal recollections of a gentleman, in relation to about 40 cases of confirmed Intemperance, occurring within his own circle, and including literateurs, barristers, judges, clergymen, doctors, military and naval officers, noblemen, and noble ladies.

he was *drunk—he could not speak.*” This is ‘middle-class’ sobriety—painted by themselves! The fact is, either people don’t know what sobriety is, or they ‘humbug’ themselves instead of their neighbors. Look at the notions every day ventilated on crowner’s-quests—whose verdicts are often crowning specimens of the same popular art. The *Northern Express* of the 18th of October, 1856, records an inquest, at Robin Hood’s Bay, on the body of a man who had gone out, not sober, from the New Inn, and, in that state, stumbled over a staith into the sea! Verdict—‘Accidentally fell and died’—but not a word as to the cause and the causer! A witness and friend said: “They had *each three glasses of ale before tea, and two afterwards—but were quite SOBER.*” Two pints and a half of a mixture of Narcotic hop and alcohol introduced into the blood and brain, but yet ‘quite sober’! Such are men’s ideas—or rather, want of them.

As to the masses of the population, excluding some half million who have partially entrenched themselves in the Teetotal Camp, drunkenness and demoralization are frightfully rampant: and it is from these classes that the great social danger and injury must be dreaded. It would be a waste of time to attempt re-prove the existence and vast extent of *popular* drunkenness. The partial improvement amongst the non-teetotalers in the working-classes, moreover, arises rather from the *want of means* than the power of principle; and hence every improvement in their ‘wages’ brings with it a deterioration in their sobriety. The use and abuse of strong drink in *this class* must stand or fall together. Facilities for one are, and will be, facilities for the other, and therefore causes of national poverty, ignorance, pauperism, disease, and crime.

IRELAND, at this moment, raises her voice in emphatic warning. The Rev. Dr CULLEN, the Catholic Primate, in his address to the Romish Clergy, Feb. 21, 1857, says:—

“There is one vice which has been the occasion of infinite evils in this country. *Unhappily, the gleam of returning prosperity that has shone on the country, has induced many to go back to their former wicked habits, and to indulge in excessive drinking.* God heals their wounds, relieves them from their misery, and gives them his good gifts, and they, instead of showing their gratitude by making a religious use of these gifts, turn them against their benefactor, insult His divine majesty, and trample on His holy law. How many Tradesmen have been reduced to the lowest state of destitution by indulging in drink! How often do they bring disgrace, and infamy, and ruin, on their wives and children! How many are now pining away in want, who, if they had been temperate, might have happy homes and cheerful families!

“How many other crimes have their origin in drunkenness, such as illegal combination, faction fighting, public assaults, and scandalous immoralities! *Exercise all your influence to prevent the spread of this degrading vice; caution your flocks against it; deny the sacraments to those who scandalously indulge in it, or expose themselves and others to its temptations, and denounce it from the altar with all*

the authority which you possess. To all we say, in the words of St PAUL, 'The night is past and the day is at hand. Let us, therefore, *cast off the works of darkness* and put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and impurities, not in contention and envy; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and *make not provision for the flesh* in its concupiscences.' (Rom. xiii. 12-14.)"

In the name of common sense, then, why does not the Roman Church, and every other Church, protest against the law which licenses the very Throne of Temptation?—Which legalizes the Workshops of Darkness?—Which sets up and sanctions the very places which *do* make Provision for the Flesh?

3. *Because persuasion is superior to legal coercion—Temperance to Prohibition.*

It is not the business of law to persuade, but to direct: and the excellency of persuasion by no means establishes the worthlessness of law. A pudding may be more noble than a pill, and a pie than a purge, but pill and purge are not bad *in their way*. Coercive-law is like physic—but *necessity* is its justification. Then if coercive-physic were bad, coercive disease is still worse. So, if coercive-law is bad—*Anarchy* is intolerable.*

Coercion is inferior to casuistry, in point of moral-rank—yet always (when needed) *superior* in point of efficiency. Try a Trafficker with moral-suasion—you fail. With legal-suasion in the shape of a ponderous penalty—you succeed. Idleness, says the proverb, breeds mischief. What says Dr ISAAC BARROW? "INDUSTRY† is a *fence* to innocence and virtue; a *bar* to all kinds of sin and vice, guarding the avenues of our hearts, *keeping off the temptations to vicious practice*." Doubtless, the 'fence' is inferior to the fruit—but shall we therefore have no hedge to our garden? Nay, will not a quick-set fence keep out many a rogue, where morality does not? Thorns prick where conscience is torpid. Industry is inferior to Moral-principle in dignity, but is it not often manifestly superior in power? Will the objector encourage idleness in order to multiply temptation and exalt virtue? Will he demur to industry on the ground of its being inferior to moral principle, and therefore needless where a *virtuous-opinion* already exists? One thing is worth noting—that Industry, by the order of Providence commenced in compulsion, is often continued by *habit* and *choice*. Law, indeed, should not *wait* on the sanction of the multitude, the ignorant, and depraved: for it has the bad to restrain, and the good to protect. Law that is not the expression of the Moral-Power of a Nation is not Law—but lawless force. Genuine Law must lead the van, not linger behind the masses—should lift up its banner of Truth,

* True, the mode may be invoked for evil purposes as well as good. What then? A principle may be falsely applied as well as a method, but the principle is not the less sound. The Slaveholders, for example, are now pronouncing *Freedom* to be a failure. We are not to give up the use of a thing because of its abuse. Our duty is to state the principle with its *proper* limitations, and apply it *truly*—for good and not for evil.

† *Occupation*, not amusement merely—an important distinction.

symbolizing right, and thus educating—to the dark and wandering a pillar of Light, guiding in the wilderness; to the illuminated a cloudy symbol, paled to their vision by the light of Spiritual-day, yet surely indicating a common path to a common destiny. The objection, indeed, carried to its logical extreme, would end in the recommendation of Hindoo *silence*—for suasion, and speech, and action, are after all but modes of *expression*—perfectly useless in the presence of *the higher*—yet also perfectly necessary to *the lower* ere the higher can be reached. “The *Law* was a Schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.” The time may come when no man *need* to teach his brother, saying, ‘Know the Lord’—but in the meantime are we not to teach? The distinction of the objector is superficial—for indeed Law, as the expression of Truth, and of the sense of the evil of crime—of our hatred and hostility to wrong—is essentially a form of Persuasion.* Guilt itself *expects* retribution.

Further, Temperance has *not* persuaded the majority of men to be almost teetotalers, though inculcated with unexampled persistency and zeal for thirty years. It has even convinced millions where it has not converted: they know the right, but *do* the wrong. It has altered opinions, but it has not destroyed the Traffic; and as the mass of men are, though weak, neither very good nor very bad, a too large minority corrupt—Fashion and the Traffic *determine action* on the wrong side—manifesting the wisdom of Lord BACON’s remark, that *Custom is the real Magistrate of a man’s life*. Hence, while it is also best to persuade the populace of the abstract truth, it is also best to *prevent* the publican from setting practical snares to their feet, since Legal-logic is very much superior to Moral-suasion, for achieving *this* result.

4. *Because Regulation, with oversight, would answer better.*

When, from the pages of History, which is philosophy teaching by example, a single successful experiment is adduced, we shall reconsider our opinions. At present we know of no such instance; we believe it is just as absurd to attempt to bring a people to Sobriety by licensing *the sale* of that which makes drunkenness, as it is to expect to cure a Drunkard by moderate drinking. Stringent restrictions, however, are old remedies—even before whisky-times. In the acts of Parliament of Scotland there is an act bearing on the subject, passed in “the thirteenth Parliament or General Council of King James the First, halden at Edinburgh, the twenty-twa daie of October, in the yeir of our God *ane thousand foure hundreth thirtie-six yeires*” (1436). The title of the act is—“*That nane be founden in Tavernes after nine houres:*” and as, like many of the Scotch acts of early times, it is a model of brevity, we give it *verbatim*:—

“*Item, It is ordained that na man in Burg be founden in Tavernes of wine, aill, or beir, after the straike of nine houres, and the bell, that sall be rung, in the said Burg. The quhilk [whosoever] is*

* Concerning the *fearful* fallacies, one brief reply must suffice here. “*God hath set the members, every one of them, in the BODY, as it hath pleased Him.*” Is it less true that God hath set the faculties, and passions, and susceptibilities, every one of them, in the SOUL, as it hath pleased Him? and done so with equal and supreme wisdom?

founden, the Aldermen and Bailies sall put them in the King is prison ; The quhilk [which] gif they do not, they sall pay for ilk [each] time that they be founden-culpabill before the Chamberlane, fyftie schillinges." This act is probably unrepealed to this day.

Another illustration we take from the old times in the New World. In the early History of Hartford, Connecticut, one MOSES BUTLER kept the Tavern where met the *Seven-Copper-Club*, so called because each member spent at their meeting 7 Coppers for *half-a-mug of flip*. The Club consisted of elderly men, who assembled to learn the news. "Mr BUTLER kept a very respectable Tavern. He would not suffer any of his town-customers to remain in his house *after nine o'clock at night*. If they asked for any more liquor after they had drank their half-mug, his reply was : *No, you shan't have another drop ! Go home to your families.*"

Now this, we guess, would 'rile' modern Yankee notions of 'Liberty' no less than 'British Liberty'—would be prohibition at the most offensive and dangerous point. It would, in short, be license to prime abroad and discharge at home. This scheme has merits, certainly ; the *prohibition* at the fag-end of it is good : but unfortunately we should want 100,000 *Moses Butlers* to stand at the Taps, where we have only *one*—and he died nearly 200 years ago. Like the Scottish Sunday Act, day and week *priming* and *profits* create in time the means and motives of general evasion, or of general neglect. The Connecticut case reminds us of one still more efficient ; because the *check* begins at the outside—quite a novel-idea for Tavern Signs. Lady NOEL BYRON has suppressed all drink ng-houses on her property at Kirkby-Mallory, Leicestershire—save one. That was let under stringent restrictions to a Publican, but manifest mischief still followed, and her Ladyship at last took the Inn into her own hands, appointing a respectable person to conduct it at a *fixed* salary, so that *profits* might not induce the seller to wink at drunkenness, or to drive *as near* to the precipice as may be. She had a pretty homily hoisted by way of Inscription, over the door of the 'Wentworth Arms'—which the reader who passes that way may read for himself.

*May he who has little to spend, spend nothing in drink ;
May he who has more than enough, keep it for better uses ;
May he who goes to rest, never remain to riot ;
And he who fears God elsewhere, never forget him here.*

A great and striking improvement has followed both as to property and people—yet Mr NOEL, her ladyship's steward, assures us that things are not completely 'satisfactory.' Still—as a *first* instalment—the Alliance would accept most willingly an arrangement like this, which should convert the Publican into a mere Agent, and make the State absolute Landlord—with power of instant dismissal. Then—but not before—the Seller might find conscience and courage to say to 'Thirsty Souls'—*hold, enough !*

In *Lady Una and her Queendom*, cited in our 8th chapter, a similar reform in the Public House of the Village is detailed. It was, in

fact, converted into a *Club House*, with *evening prayers*, the income of the Master entirely independent of what is consumed on the premises, the *maximum measure* of drink absolutely fixed; and having for its motto PAUL's noble rule: *Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.* "So far from the Curate or the Dean objecting to the *vicinity* of the GOOD KING, they take the greatest interest in the success of the experiment." Is it not the duty of such to object to their poor neighbors being polluted by the vicinity of the 'Pot-house'? This experiment was made *without the presence of a rival*: and the nation must be put into the same state, before the same trial can be made—in other words, the *Old public-house* must be *prohibited*. "Oh!" says the author, "think what it would be to show the possibility of a different system; so that the fact of having kept a Public-house, *which now is a reproach and degradation*, should be a mark of honor and distinction. The better landlord (now) the less custom he is likely to have—dens of drunkenness and license would arise in opposition. My housekeeper was telling me that her husband struggled hard in 'the public line' for years—endeavored to maintain order on his premises—but *he was ill supported by the Magistrates*, and by many sneered at as a little canting, stuttering Methodist (the good man had an impediment in his speech); and thus, after having been *ruined himself, in the vain endeavor to prevent the ruin of others*, he left in poverty and despair; while his successor, a man devoid of character, has just realized a fortune by *fostering* all the evil, and destroying the home-happiness of every cottage in the neighborhood."* It is evident that such a system as is recommended requires the basis of *Proprietorial power and superintendence*, and however good in itself, with those who have not wealth and power, is just on a par, as a national remedy, with the schemes of the venerable ROBERT OWEN. The young peasant addressed Sir HARRY in the following terms:—"If you are a Parliament man, sir, go and tell your great folk what you've seen; and show those who cry out for reform what really should and might be done, if reformers would only *begin at the right end.*" (p. 28.)

The other day we observed in the *Times* two letters from distinguished Clergymen—the Rev. CARUS WILSON, of the Isle of Wight, and the Rev. Mr MALAN, Vicar of Broadwindsor—confessing the inadequacy of the License-system. But this is no new thing. Many years ago Mr E. CROFT, the defender of the Beer-houses, published a Letter to Lord ALTHORPE, entitled *The Evils of the Licensing System fully developed*, in which he shows the inefficiency of the plan, and the evasion connected with it—while the interval of twenty years has very effectually evinced the evils of Beerhouses.

* Sweet Lady UNA's application of the text—"beat their *swords* into plough-shares, and their *spears* into pruning-hooks"—is unhappy (p. 250). The *same metal* that is now an instrument of destruction, is now moulded into an implement of peaceful industry. But the *same material* that is anon 'fire-water' cannot be transformed back again into food. Art can destroy grain, but art cannot turn Gin back into Corn, or even Beer into Barley.

He has nothing to say against first-rate inns, or respectable public-houses for the accommodation of poor travellers ; but hurls a vial of indignation against the dram-shop and low public-house, and is hard upon the clergy and magistrates who, winking at the evils connected with *these* places, can only perceive the enormities of the beer-houses. He hints that the obtuseness on the one side, and the sharpness on the other, are caused by the pecuniary interest many of those gentlemen have in the maintenance of the licensed houses. Of the dram-shops, he says : " Hundreds of Germans are supported in London by those shops, *by the manufacture of illicit-spirit*. The Germans, being clever in distillation, will produce three gallons of highly-rectified spirits of wine in a few hours, from a small quantity of treacle. This is why we see spirits sold for less than they can be bought for when the duty is paid." He declares what is strictly true : " There is an old law in existence, compelling innkeepers to accommodate travellers, but it is so little understood and so inadequate to the purpose, that it is never acted upon." His scheme for remedying the corruptions of the licensing system has certainly more merit than the strange notion of an 'open trade.' " There *must* be restrictions (the 'public'-house business being unlike any other) ; still, the trade must be free." *Free in what sense ?* That every one might obtain a license to sell drink *to be drunk off the premises*, though nothing is said of the abuses such a permission would engender. Excise license (without magisterial interference) to sell all liquors to be drunk *on* the premises on several conditions—a spacious clean tap, a parlor for tradesmen and others, a bar for the landlord, and at least three spare bed-chambers to hold clean beds, above those occupied by regular lodgers ; no taproom to be open before six a.m., or later than nine p.m. ; no person to be served in the taproom *with more than two glasses of spirits, or spirits and water, in the day* ; no landlord to be allowed to drink with any person in the taproom ; no drink to be allowed in the skittle ground after nine a.m., "*or the closing of the taproom will be no good.*" The adoption of such a plan would doubtless be a great improvement on the existing system, according to which, as he describes it, " while the poor sots are drunk, stupid, and half-asleep, the landlords act the 'Bristolian,' by keeping one eye always open. *In this way, pint after pint, and glass after glass, is dealt out, when in the most drunken condition.*"

If special evidence is wanted of the folly of expecting even any effectual check from the Magistrates, read the following, from a second series of papers on 'Liverpool Life,' published in the *Liverpool Mercury*.

" The papers in this and the former series descriptive of the amusements and pastimes of the people, as seen in operation daily and nightly amongst us, carry with them their own moral. Little can be expected in the way of improvement in this direction so long as we see the authorities so lax in the administration of the law. From the report of Major GREIG, recently presented to the watch committee, we find that there are in Liverpool 1,445 licensed public-houses ; of these 66 are reported, and therefore known to be, irre-

gularly conducted, and 80 of them are *licensed for gambling*. There are 896 beerhouses; 122 of these are known to be irregularly conducted, and 17 of them are *licensed for gambling*. There are 195 coffee houses, 33 of which are known to be irregularly conducted. There are 714 brothels, and 193 houses of accommodation and lodging houses for prostitutes. These houses cast on the streets a flood of iniquity, namely, 2,318 prostitutes, being an increase over the year 1855, of 123. Such is the polluted stream ever flowing and on the increase; and what is done to check its progress? As to the *Beer-houses*, it is well known that they are in many cases houses of accommodation, and in them thieves and prostitutes are harbored in consideration of the custom they bring. They are in other cases supported almost entirely by youths, who here learn to drink, smoke, and play cards, and thus qualify themselves for the higher and more fashionable schools of vice. We have counted in one room in a beerhouse 23 boys, not one of whom was above 16 years of age; they 'tossed' for quarts of ale, and sang the most indecent songs, and thus prepared themselves for the Sabbath. The police know of the most abominable scenes which frequently take place in these houses, and yet what do we see *done*, even by way of an *attempt* to abolish the iniquity?

"At a late special court, held for the removal and transfer of licenses, John Wickham applied to have the license of a house in Lime-street transferred from John Lawrie, sen., to himself. In reply to Mr Wybergh, the applicant admitted that he had previously occupied a house in the name of John Harrison, but he was then a betting man, and he had now given that up.—Mr Alderman Holme: Then the fact is, I suppose, you formerly kept a betting house in the name of Harrison, and you now want us to transfer a house to you in the name of Wickham?—The Applicant: Yes, my name is John Harrison Wickham, and I am known by that name to all my tradesmen. I have entirely given up betting now; I have lost 5,000 sovereigns by it, so I thought it was time to give it up.—*The application was then complied with.*

"Here is a man who has failed to succeed in an *illegal* pursuit, and comes before the bench and candidly declares it, and this declaration is considered a sufficient ground for granting a license for a house, and *this in a street too in which*, as declared a short time ago by the magistrate who granted the license, *the scenes nightly enacting were a disgrace to any civilized community*. Do magistrates expect that a large donation to the Town Mission, or Scripture Readers' Association, will atone for their sins of omission in the discharge of their magisterial capacity? or do they imagine that the mission can accomplish what the magistrate lacks the nerve to do? To support the mission is good, *but to lessen the necessity for its existence is better.*"—License is a wretched abortion.

5. *Because attractive 'Substitution' is a surer and wiser plan.*

"Nothing is destroyed until it is replaced," says some one, with apparent smartness, but *not* real profundity: for that which is simply unnatural and bad, demands, not 'substitution,' but *destruction*.

The water in the soil that rots the seed, or cramps its growth, wants draining-off—and that's all. It doesn't demand some other liquid in its place : and so, an *abnormal state*, like the desire for tobacco, alcohol, or opium, does not require to be *replaced* by some vicarious passion of a similar nature. Man has already the *natural* sources and susceptibilities of happiness ; and the fact that he has universally sought happiness by impulse, and through unconsidering selfishness and monstrous forms of action and life,—from Eden to Gomorrah, and from Judea to Mexico,—the fact that he has miserably ERRED and frightfully SINNED,—does not establish in the least the *naturalness* of sin, or the *rationality* of error, as *Blackwood*, Professor JOHNSTON, and others of that school, have erratically argued. The impulse to forbidden gratification is in no degree mended by its being topically universal—the extent of sin by no means alters its nature. The doctrine of 'Substitution' is *misapplied* to habits and passions in themselves bad : and is only wise when employed to diminish the excess of a natural enjoyment by bringing other natural-feelings into play.

Practically, the objector is for cooking his hare before he has caught it. He assumes that the good-attraction *will* be more potent than the bad : in fact, that it *is* an attraction ; whereas facts show, that, *while the evil-temptations exist unfitting for the good*, the pure attractions have little chance—in short, are *not* attractions. Common-sense might teach any mind not prepossessed with crotchets, that an *occasional* walk in a park, a lounge in a library, or an hour's enjoyment at a concert, cannot get rid of the *perpetual* temptations of the Traffic, ramifying every street, and operating, day and night, the year round.

But there are still other fallacies in this objection, involved in the *nature* and the *supply* of the 'attractions' generally proposed as substitutes. First, the community, as such, cannot possibly provide any kind of vicarious excitements *at all adequate* to cope with the extended system of taverns, dram-shops, and beerhouses, which corrupt and curse the land. Second, if a wide-extended and costly system of public 'counteraction' *were* set up, the antagonizing-operation of cure would be very slow, and what sound reason can be alleged for setting-up the good system, which could not hold for first knocking-down the bad ? Third, it is quite a mistake of human nature to suppose that it *needs* artificial excitements for its happiness. Happiness is best secured by simple and natural means, through our aboriginal relations to the family and social circle ; it comes not by being *sought*, but is met with in the discharge of natural duty, or drops down upon us unaware in the bye-paths of life. True happiness is not noisy and restless, but quiet and full of repose ; while one kind of *excitement* tends naturally to the production of another. No people were ever yet theatred into sobriety, danced into morality, or fiddled into practical philosophy.* The

* We have this day (April 17th, '57), received a letter from Mr ANDREW SCOTT, of Edinburgh, containing the following testimony :—" Since I saw you last, I have been

remedy of 'substitution' finds no support in experience and history. Other elements being the same, the cities and countries where amusements most prevail, are *not* the most temperate; on the contrary, they are on the whole the *most* dissipated and *intemperate*, where the temptation of drinking-facilities also abounds. Sweden, Belgium, Paris, New-York, are illustrations in point: *there*, the people have a perpetual round of amusements, and there they are at once the most dissipated, immoral, and criminal; and on the Sabbath, *worst of all*. Let us, however, examine a few of these 'substitutes'—which, in fact, are not substitutes, but either weak rivals or actual aids, if the licensed-system be left standing.

i. *Diversions and Recreations for alcoholic-excitement.*

These are at least negatively good, so far as they create a 'diversion' from the public-house, but very often they occasion an *Inncursion*. It is shorter and wiser to take away the temptation. We challenge the production of a single example of a drunken-community being *soberized* by 'sweet-bait' and diversion, while the Traffic was permitted to environ them with its temptations? *All* history and experience contradict this crotchet.

Diversions in immediate connection with drink, few of the diversionists themselves will expect to succeed. However, it has been tried in our large towns. The writer of *Liverpool Life* (2nd series), thus opens out the tendency of *Diversion and Drink*; and we fear that in competition, the two combined will be successful over *Diversion* alone.

"As to Singing Saloons for the upper, middle, and lower classes—for they are specially set apart for all these grades—they are, *where ever drink is introduced*, degrading in tendency, and productive of evil results. Even in what are called the most respectable, when the evening is far advanced, and drink has numbed the feelings and abolished shame, obscenity is introduced in the most subtle guise, the poison is very gently and for a time imperceptibly instilled, and the young gentleman leaves the saloon with a vicious thought which ere long results in a degrading action.

"But what shall we say of those places whose business only begins when other licensed houses are supposed by law to close? When the casino, the singing saloon, the prostitutes' promenade, the beer-shop, the gambling-house, the spirit vaults—when these have done their work, then the portals of the *salle de danse* are opened, and thronged with eager and drink-maddened pleasure-seekers, and this is permitted nightly to go on, whilst the police court and the prison almost weekly declare its frightful tendency. Talk of our active magistracy, of our earnest and devoted ministry! *In what direction are the former active? In what sense are the latter earnest and de-*

in Paris, and cannot say much for its being so very sober. I have been a little more among the working people, and one night, within two hours, I saw 8 or 9 *drunk-men*. How many 'the worse of drink,' I know not. Something else than light wines and cheap amusements must be had, to make a people sober. The more I think of your remarks on amusing a people, the more am I convinced that a people's morals must be trained in a sterner school than that of the dancing master and musician."

voted. Some of our magistrates are known as philanthropists, others are known as religious men of 'sound evangelical principles'; and what have these done—what effort have they ever made to carry out in these matters the true spirit of the law?"

Diversions in direct connection with drink are seen in the French and Continental cities generally; in the *cafes* and *salons* of Paris, Brussels, etc., but certainly the example is one to be shunned.

The amusements of the French as little promote either morality or true happiness as they prevent intemperance, pauperism, and crime. France has nearly 5,000,000 of actual paupers, and nearly as many more persons on the verge of that condition. Excluding political offenders, one out of every 500 adults is a criminal. In 1850, there were 66,000 prisoners confined at one time in the 394 prisons of France. Yet theatres are the *religion* of France. St. Beuve says—"When Paris recommences to *amuse itself*, it is not only a privileged class that is amused, but all classes profit and prosper. *Paris then is in good train to save herself*, and France with her." The quick-sighted author of *Parisian Sights* has given us some specimens of French salvation-by-amusement—so highly extolled by our own political and literary quacks. An extract or two must suffice. He is taking a *Sunday morning's walk* in the neighborhood of the Cemetery of Mont Parnasse, outside the barrier. "The vacant spaces between the boulevards and the gate of the city were filled with peddlers, jugglers, and a crowd. Passing through the gate, I found myself in the centre of a fair of the lowest class. Wine at six cents (3d.) a bottle, and brandy twenty (10d.). The liquor-shops abutted upon the very walls of the cemetery. *They were filled to overflowing*, and the noise that arose from the French tongues, made doubly active by the stimulus of their favorite beverages, can only be conceived by ears that have listened to it. The clear air of heaven was poisoned by the fumes of the vilest tobacco, ascending from the filthiest of pipes. The tide of debauch was evidently on the rise. Such was the spectacle allowed by French taste to exist almost over the graves of their parents: and yet the same people uncover their heads to a passing funeral" (p. 6). Pass we next to the Salle des Délices. "The entrance fee was five cents *en consommation* [with refreshments]. This I soon deciphered to mean, *something to drink*, for the chief business was done at the bar. The hall was filled by a rowdy-looking class of young men, most of whom were smoking pipes. A girl of not more than twelve, with fine features, but whose manners showed she already was familiar with vice, was persevering in smoking a cigar that made her sick. One table was filled with girls, some as young as eight, who, with a party of boys, were tossing off tumblers of abominable beer, with all the convivial forms of old toppers. The boys were also smoking. The girls, *having drunk enough to make themselves unsteady*, joined in the dance. I turned away sickened at the scene, satisfied that the devil had his infant-schools as well as the church" (p. 172). Will it be said by the British Amusing-philosophers

that in their scheme they would *exclude* the sale of liquors? Now we ask, How does that differ from Prohibition in principle? Why not exclude the sale from the *neighborhood* of the amusement? Why prohibit a temptation inside, while you license it outside? *Whence all this respect for a trade injurious to all the best interests, both moral and material, of the people?* The French, however, like ourselves, are ignorant of the *cause* of their chief miseries. In Paris, the expenditure of each inhabitant, for *wine and brandy*, sometime back, averaged twice as much as for *clothing*—equalled two-thirds of the *taxation*—and the whole of the *rent*! (viz. about £5). As the author of *Parisian Sights* justly observes, "the people feel their burdens, but are still blind both to their true causes and remedy. Unhappily there is an agent far more direct and active in the degradation of the nation than either taxation or extravagance. No one who has made a tour of curiosity around the *octroi* wall of Paris, can have failed to make the discovery. Here, for *at least three days in the week*, he will find from 20,000 to 30,000 of the most dissolute of both sexes occupied in drinking and debauchery of the worst kind, in temporary liquor shops. The increase of licensed retailers of wines and spirits throughout France has been rapid since 1830. Then there existed but 250,000; now there are upwards of 350,000—an increase of 100,000 in 20 years, and of 20,000 during the last three years, *under the Republic*. This augmentation has been among the lowest class of cabarets, of which there has been an increase of 70,000 in the 19 years, paying a license of about 6 francs (5s.) each. Were Beelzebub permitted to *select* an agent for the demoralization of humanity, he could not find one better adapted to his purpose than that which is sanctioned by the Government of France" (p. 190). Evidently amusements have failed; liberty, equality, and fraternity have failed, to stop intemperance—and for the plainest of reasons,—that its *source* was licensed and enlarged. France has been as much cursed with its cheap wine-shops, as England with its cheap beer-shops.

As regards the tendency of Diversions and Drinking, connected together more indirectly, and operating on the municipality as a whole, Sweden furnishes the most striking example in refutation of the objector. We cite from one of the latest and most intelligent of travellers. Mr SCOTT says, in contrasting once drunken but now sober Denmark with Sweden, "we do not *pretend* that the lower classes of Danes are *generally* sober, while numbers in England and Scotland are drunken, *merely because the former have amusements* and the latter none; for the difference probably depends upon a variety of causes" (p. 151)—amongst which *we* place chiefly the withdrawal of drink-facilities on the part of the government.

"The Swedes are at all times great *pleasure-seekers*, and, retaining the Bacchanalian propensities of their forefathers, *most of their amusements are attended with excess*—drinking, singing, and dancing the night through; among the more immoral, the dances at such meetings are frequently of the most obscene description" (p. 356).

The stupid fallacy that Drunkenness is a matter of *Race* or *Climate*, might as well be exploded here. The ancient Arabs and Jews, in a model climate, were a very drunken people, the modern are not. The ancient Danes, in a cold and severe climate, were very intemperate—(as intimated in *Hamlet*)—the modern Danes are remarkably sober. It is a question of habit of drinking, and drinking facilities. *With these*, all nations will become intemperate; without them, no nation will. Mr SCOTT says:—

“Neither in towns, nor in the country, did we witness any drunkenness; we never, in fact, saw a drunken individual, although we constantly came in contact, during our tour through the islands, with bodies of men collected together in the towns previously to joining the army, taking leave of their friends, or just after having done so,—yet, under these exciting circumstances, there was an absence of inebriety highly creditable to the people. This sobriety was the more striking, because *we imagined* the love of ardent spirits to be universal amongst the inhabitants of these northern climes” (p. 146).

“STOCKHOLM.—In the *Djurgard* (park gardens) there are out-of-door attractions *such as are rarely brought together in one locality*—park, garden, wood, theatres, ball-rooms, and, in Summer, pastimes” (p. 294).

GOTTENBURG.—“The consumption of porter in Sweden is great. The lower orders flock on the Sunday afternoon to places of *amusement* in the vicinity of the town. A very short time only was necessary to show the difference between Danish and Swedish character, with respect to drunkenness. *Drunkenness here stalked hand in hand with its gaunt offspring Poverty*, and there was quite sufficient to demonstrate that *finkel* (corn-brandy) does its work as effectually as gin in London or whisky in Glasgow” (p. 244)—the abundance of amusement notwithstanding.

The cry of our one-sided politicians for ‘popular recreation’ is only the modern form of that to which old Rome resounded—*Panem et Circens*’s; the English counterpart of the Spanish cry—*Pan y Toros*. The ‘bread’ may be very well, if obtained by Industry; but we must deprecate such recreations as the Roman *Circus* and the Spanish *Bull-fight*. Bear and bull-baiting, cock and prize-fighting, etc., are now happily *prohibited*—but that which is worse than all, remains under legal license and magisterial sanction. The very fact that such brutalizing amusements are illegal, is a great bar to even the thought of their revival—though doubtless there are millions of persons who would *join* in them, if once re-established. The tavern is rather a ‘degradation’ than a ‘recreation’—and, in the majority of cases, the amusement is bad, the pretence for going to the ale-house, not the real attraction. What the late HUGH MILLER said of the Musselburgh races,* may

*“A closer survey of what was going on upon the ground pleased us less. There seemed to be *but little of enjoyment* stamped on the grave and anxious faces of the men who surrounded the stand. Whatever the races might be to others, they were serious occupations to them—an occupation utterly profitless to the community at best, and

be said of all recreations connected with drink and gambling, as those necessarily are, for which the supporter of 'License' contends—there is 'little enjoyment' and much anxiety. Mr E. CROFT, the author of a *Defence of the Beerhouses*, in 1832, allows in his *Letter to Lord Althorpe*, that the drink-shop vitiates the recreation; and would *prohibit* all gambling in the tap-room, including simple dominoes. He asks—"What recreation can there be in playing with a dirty pack of cards, tossing up a half-penny, and losing what they want for next day's dinner? *After all, the sober, steady man, who seldom goes to the alehouse, sees the most recreation: even the tradesman who abstains from the smoking-room and convivial feasting, is always in the best circumstances and greatest enjoyment.*"

At Birmingham, a sober Recreation Society was started under the highest auspices, with a view to counteract the influence of a score of Drinking Saloons and Casinos, and the 1,500 licensed drunkeries. The report of its operation up to the winter of 1856, recommends the dissolution of the Society, on the ground of inadequacy to cope with its monster-rival. The conductors mention "*the difficulty of attracting the 'roughs,' who most need their efforts,*" without repelling the more steady and respectable of the artizans. "We believe," says our friend of the *Birmingham Journal*, "that most of the private efforts of speculators in the same direction have failed." Of course they have: since doing good by recreative machinery to one class, does not prevent the evils resulting from corrupting and tempting another class through the institution of the Traffic. All efforts will fail which do not remove *causes of evil*, as well as initiate causes of good.

ii. *Libraries, Museums, and Crystal Palaces, etc., for the Drinking-saloon, the Ale-house, and the Gin-palace.*

Provided these *are* substitutes—provided the Traffic is not in connection, by neighborhood or institution, with the Reading Rooms and Museums themselves—they will undoubtedly do good, and *tend* to the lessening of drunkenness. But *how* shall you make them 'substitutes'? In the borough of Lynn, for example, a Literary Institute and Library (with exceedingly low terms of admission) were set up years ago—to which Lord STANLEY contributed the munificent sum of £1000—but Lynn has *still* above the average number of Public-houses, and is *still* notorious for drunkenness. Look at the neighborhood of the noble Free Library in Manchester—Deansgate—and you will find the most frightful intemperance and debauchery. It will require generations to pass away before the quiet library and museum (dependent for appreciation on a pre-formed taste) can make any sensible encroachment on its active and multitudinous rivals of the ale-house, the drinking-saloon, and the

fraught with disgrace and ruin to thousands. *The spirit that seemed to pervade the entire crowd was a mercenary one; every game played on the ground appeared to be played, not for its own sake, but for that of the winnings; these, when small, were mostly spent in strong drink,—and the ground, before the close of the last course, presented but a wild scene of inebriety.*"

gin-palace. Or go to the Crystal Palace, and what do we find? The numerous taverns and liquor-shops round about it crowded with customers, especially at holiday times; not to mention the inducements to drinking *within* the structure itself. It is just impossible to get libraries, and museums, and palaces numerous and attractive enough to cope with the public-houses and affect the masses; and if you did, the tavern in the meanwhile would be *counteracting* your counteractives, by debasing the tastes of the people.* What we cannot comprehend is this—the *monstrous respect shown to this greatest of nuisances, the traffic*—the proposals to abate its appalling evils by every circuitous and costly method of counteraction—when the thing can be, and ought to be, *swept away* at once and for ever. Cesspools and cellars are removed without question and without scruple—nobody talks about *counteracting* malaria by tonics and exercise in green fields—but the great national Sink of Iniquity, the Cesspool of Crime, and the Nest of Disease, is to remain *intact*—a social pestilence, made sacred by the imprimatur of law.

iii. *Light Wines in the place of 'heavy wet' and 'vitriol-gin.'*

It fatigues one to repeat the refutation of all the nonsense that has been penned and palavered on this topic. The lighter beverage engenders the appetite for the heavier; for as Mr DE QUINCY has it, "preparations of intoxicating-liquor, even when harmless in their earlier stages, are fitted to be *stepping-stones* for making transition to higher stages that are not harmless." A people who shall acquire a taste for the stronger, will never go back to the weaker beverage. Even Mr OLIVEIRA has said:—"We require *all* the cereal produce of the country for the sustenance of the people"—but "the maltsters and brewers need have no alarm, for it has been proved that *a very increased consumption of beer is consistent with wine at a cheap rate* in England, as in former times.†" So much for this bubble! If the *ale-drinking* remains, food will be destroyed, and pauperism and crime surely engendered. No large quantity of good wine *can* be got from France, at once cheap and not nasty. In the Parliamentary Committee some curious evidence was given. M. MAIRE, a French vine-grower, said:—"Our fine vintages, even of low wines, meet with a ready market; the *only assistance* we want, is *to get rid of our bad vintages*." Will JOHN BULL give up his frothy-beer for a beverage that is very passably imitated by throwing a spoonful of bad vinegar into a pint of ginger pop? M. LENOIR divides the French wines into six parts—1-6th good, 1-6th passable, 1-6th drinkable (at a pinch), 3-6th *from bad to detestable*!

* On the day preceding the Liverpool festivities, over the noble effort of Mr W. BROWN, M.P., to found a magnificent Free Library, the police attempted to suppress a cock-fight, attended by 150 persons. Not until the drink-shop as well as the cock-pit is suppressed will the Library have any chance to compete with these amusements and pleasures. It will benefit a class, but not reach the classes giving rise to pauperism and crime. Bodily sports would have a better chance, but the closing of the 'trap' is the essential preliminary.

† Speech in Town Hall, Pontefract, October 21st, 1856.

However good the prescription, then, we are quite sure that John Bull will not swallow it, and so there's an end of it. But even if he did, he would *not* get rid of drinking, pauperism, and crime. *Cider* is nicer to the taste, and not more alcoholic than good light wine; yet our *cider* counties are not sober counties, any more than our *beer* counties. About the same ratio of pauperism and crime results from these agents as from *whisky* in Scotland.

Volumes of evidence might be cited to prove these two points—that *wines* induce abnormal states, vices, and crimes as truly as spirits or beer—and that the weaker drink begets a craving for the stronger, as well as for more of itself. The appetite *grows* with what it feeds on. Where people's eyes are, who can find no intemperance in France, is to us a mystery. For three days of every week, there are to be found at least 25,000 persons, of both sexes, in the environs of Paris alone, occupied in drinking and debauchery of the worst kind. In the department of the North, there is one for every 64 inhabitants.

"The population of Algiers has only *doubled* since 1853," says M. BLANQUI, in his Report on Algeria (Paris, 1839), "but the consumption of wine has been *quintupled*." In the Goldmaker's Village* of the celebrated author ZSCHOKKE, he shows that German wines lead to idleness and crime there, as certainly as beer does here; and he wrote a tragic tale entitled 'The Brandy Pest.' If light wines, in their native country, do not keep off the pest, how shall they succeed in curing it here?

Nowhere, not even in wine countries, does the 'purity,' or the weakness, of intoxicating liquor, preserve society from excitement and its sad consequences.† Col. PINKNEY, the American, in his *Travels* (London, 1814), thus speaks of the south of France in 1812: "Supper is all gaiety and gallantry. The champagne then goes round, *and the ladies drink as much as the gentlemen*; that is to say, enough to *exhilarate* [till they are rather 'fresh,' as we say]. A French woman, *with three or four glasses of wine in her head*, would certainly make an English one stare" (p. 348). "The general aspect of the population in the south of France," says Mrs ELLIS, "would convey the idea that intemperance was much more rare than in England, and there is no doubt but cases of *gross intemperance are*

* *Das Goldmacher Dorff*. Oswald, the schoolmaster, gives amongst the seven golden rules for gold making, these:—"1. *You shall avoid all taverns*. 5. *You shall consume neither wine nor brandy, and be strictly temperate in everything, not even smoking tobacco*." When an old-set, confirmed in bad habits, referred to the fact that there was 'only one publican supported,' in 'proof of its going to ruin,' and adds 'Alas! we once had three!' Oswald reproves their mistake, saying, 'The lion and the eagle were *ravenous wild beasts* that had fed on the substance of the community too long.'

† "It was not without reason we drank *usquebaugh*, for it was the best remedy against the cold of that night, *and good for dispersing the crude vapors of the French wine*; and pre-eminently wholesome in those regions, where the priests themselves, who are holy men,—as the Abbot of Armagh, the Bishop of Cashel, and others,—and men and women of every rank, pour *usquebaugh* down their throats by day and night, and that not for hilarity only, but for constant drunkenness"—Capt. BODLEY'S *Journey into Ulster*, A. D. 1603.

much less frequent ...Still, on making further observations with strict reference to this subject, we have seen but too many old men led home from market in a state of comparative helplessness, and but too many young ones more than excited.* Are the ignorance, beggary, superstition, bastardy, and licentiousness—evidenced just now by the *arrest* to the law of increase—inducements to adopt their habits, manners, and amusements? Are we to inaugurate and imitate a system which terminates in the grossest sensuality, and politically, of course, in the alternation of a licentious liberty with a monstrous despotism? Are *these* model results of wine drinking, where a state of blood and brain, of perpetual physical excitement, is exhibited in the moral condition which regards a pure wife as a prodigy of virtue or of ugliness? Where the 'husband' and 'wife' are conveniences and cloaks for licentiousness? Where priests sworn to celibacy, and youths who have not arrived at manhood, openly keep their mistresses? Yet such is a *very common* state of things, especially in the wine-districts of the south. Mr SCHAUFFLER, the Missionary at Constantinople, thus wrote in 1827:—"The prevalence of drunkenness upon *pure wine* has been on the increase for some ten years past. *Before*, it was *checked* by the high price of wine. It is a matter of regret that the poor German farmers [settled in Moldavia] should have entered upon a field of industry [wine growing] promising in pecuniary respects, but so ruinous in its moral bearings. The number of *wine houses and cellars* has been on a most alarming increase since wine has become indigenous. It has often been said that pure wine did not produce that *artificial appetite* for more. This is certainly incorrect." The Paris correspondent of the *New York Observer* writes in 1838, as follows:—"Scarcely a day passes in which I do not see Frenchmen reeling. I have seen *women* in the streets, so drunk that they could not stand. These scenes are particularly common on Sundays and on *fête* days." In June, 1857, the *London Times* tells how the workmen of Paris went reeling by hundreds to record their votes. We have no need, however, to cross the channel for illustration, when we have our *cider* counties at home. The effect of introducing light wines would not be to *displace* the popular use by men of stronger drinks, but simply to make drinking *more universal*, by inducing large numbers of women and young people to partake of the alleged 'harmless' beverage. Hear, again, how DICKENS'S *Household Words*, even while defending the ale-shop at home, can discourse sensibly of its counterpart abroad:—

"*The wine-shops are the COLLEGES and CHAPELS of the poor in France. History, morals, politics, jurisprudence, and literature, in iniquitous forms, are all taught in these colleges and chapels, where professors of evil continually deliver these lessons, and where hymns are sung nightly to the demon of demoralization. In these haunts*

* *Summer and Winter in the Pyrenees*, 1841, pp. 86-87. A. Husson, of the Hotel de Ville, in his *Consommations de Paris* (1856), states that previous to 1830 each Parisian took 9 litres (quarts) of brandy per head annually; now 14 litres (or 3½ gallons).

of the poor, theft is taught as the morality of property; falsehood as the morality of speech; and assassination as the justice of the people. It is in the *wine-shop* the cabman is taught to think it heroic to shoot the middle-class man who disputes his fare. It is in the wine-shop the workman is taught to admire the man who stabs his faithless mistress. It is in the wine-shop the doom is pronounced of the employer who lowers the pay of the employed. The *wine-shops* breed—in a physical atmosphere of malaria, and a moral pestilence of envy and vengeance—the men of crime and revolution. *Hunger is proverbially a bad counsellor, but drink is a worse.*"

While spending four days in Paris, last year, we extracted from the only two numbers of *Galignani* we happened to see (September 22 and 24, 1856) the following cases:—

"A stonemason at Bercy, having received a legacy, invited six of his fellow-workmen to dine with him at a restaurant; *wine* was not spared. The friends proposed a walk, fell upon the man, and robbed him of his notes and gold. The police found the six masons *drinking and singing* in a low wine-shop."

"At Saônes-et-Loire, one Guyot, a drunken, idle man, is condemned for *beating his mother* who kept him."

French temperance is one of the hugeist of humbugs in an age of humbug.* We grant that there is far less *staggering* drunkenness amongst that people than with ourselves—that they are more *philosophical* in regulating their sensuality—that there is also more *universal* drinking, for *all* drink to excitement. If we may say of the French, they are rarely drunken, it is equally true, that they are *never sober*.

6. *Because it is better to remove the real causes of the evil.*

ATHENÆUM: "The true way of checking drunkenness is that already in practice, by educating the people, making their abodes more healthy and pleasant, and supplying them with more refined and *rational* amusements. It is an empirical method—to touch effects instead of causes. *It is the demand that creates the supply.*

* A few figures will illustrate this point. In France there are upwards of 360,000 shops for the sale of intoxicating liquors. In Paris alone there are above 6,000 drink-shops, of which 4,408 sell nothing else. Besides these, are *thousands* of inns, eating-houses, cafés, and restaurants, etc., where wine and brandy are sold by the glass. All over France, there is an average of *one drunkenness to one hundred persons* of all ages; in which, says a late authority, is sold 250,000,000 gallons of *Wine*; and above 17,000,000 gallons of *Spirits*, and 2,000,000 of *Liqueurs*. Need we wonder, with such facts before us, that DE WATTEVILLE should place *third in order* the use of strong-drink, amongst the *fifteen* direct causes of *Pauperism* in France? Paris consumes yearly, 118,000,000 quarts of Wine (M. DELAMARRE says that *one-third* of it is drugs and Seine-water); 14,000,000 quarts of Beer; 2,000,000 quarts of bad Cider; 12,000,000 quarts of Spirits; and 1,000,000 of Liqueurs. Add *Tobacco* to this 'combustible materiel' of Vice and Crime—(nearly 4,000,000lbs weight, costing £750,000)—the habit of smoking being *rapidly on the increase*, as with the use of all narcotics and poisonous stimulants once begun by a people. The 'Emperor' and 'Empress' are *both* smokers; and 'fashion' (not knowledge or morality) has, since 1840, *doubled* the consumption. With such temptations and habits amongst a people, can we wonder that every third birth in Paris, is that of an illegitimate child; and that there are 60,000 criminals permanently found in the prisons of the Seine?

"If people imperiously insist on 'the glorious privilege' of being drunk, the *means* will not be long to seek; and it is certainly better for all parties that there should be honest brewers, and well conducted places where the liquor is sold, than leave these places to less scrupulous characters."

There is no need for any elaborate reply to this 'clotted-nonsense.' The *supply* of drink tempts to the use, which *increases* the demand indefinitely. The *people* don't imperiously demand to be tempted to drunkenness—but, as shown by popular suffrage the other day at Stoke, freely elect the Maine-law candidate, who pledges himself to an endeavor to free them from temptation. The argument is equally good for 'well-conducted' betting houses and gambling saloons*—and moreover, contradicts the assertion, that "the trade will regulate *itself*"—for it is a *plea for keeping the Traffic respectable by Act of Parliament*, i.e. by a licensing system, involving a magisterial mockery of control.

Let us, however, examine a few of these alleged 'real causes.'

i. *Physical degradation; unventilated workshops; unhealthy houses.*

It is not denied that such conditions predispose people to the low and base, but *easy* pleasures of drinking, where the temptation to drinking exists; but it is denied that the absence of such conditions is any guarantee that the evil will cease. The truth is, that a sober people would *spontaneously* and *naturally* rise out of such conditions; though, in the meantime, we have no objection to Sanitary-Law prohibiting the most accessible of these causes of public injury—so that, while the law protects property, it shall see that such property fulfils its duty, before it reaps its privileges and profits. LAING, in his *Tour in Sweden*, twenty years ago, furnished a pertinent illustration of the inefficiency of 'comfort' to prevent drunkenness and crime, while the *temptations* are left and legalized. He thus refers to the Province of Angermannland:—"The people unite all the advantages of a manufacturing and agricultural population more fully than any district I ever saw. The land is in *small estates*, in the possession of the peasantry. The men do the farm business. There is *full employment* at the loom or in spinning for old and young of the female sex. About the houses there is all the *cleanliness* and neatness of a thriving manufacturing, and the abundance of an agricultural, population. Everybody is *well-clad*. In their houses, good tables and chairs, window curtains, clocks,

* An article on *The Trade in Opium*, attributed to Mr ISAAC TAYLOR, has some wise words:—"But it is said, the people *will* destroy themselves in this way. It was the argument of the slave-trader—it is the plea of those who live and fatten upon detestable practices—it is the plea of those who live by the crimes and vices of others—it is the pretext of the receiver of stolen goods—it is, and ever has been, *the legend upon the rogue's escutcheon*, all the world over—"I don't *make* the wickedness, I only live by it." The time is passed, or it is passing away, in which courses of conduct on the part of governments or corporations, which the *individual* man would abhor, may be palliated, and left to weigh upon the soul of the *automaton* whose business it is to sign official documents. That which is false and wrong, and *cruel and ruinous to the weak and ignorant*, is coming to be scouted as a mistake in political œconomy, as well as a crime."—*North British Review*, February, 1857: p. 548.

fine bedding, papered rooms, and a few books. It is here that what a country may be justly proud of, is realized" (p. 192). Nevertheless, there is one criminal to every 400 inhabitants; one crime in six is *recorded* as having been committed in drink, and it is certain that 'excitement,' short of intoxication, but amounting to perversion, occasions at least three times more crimes than absolute drunkenness. At p. 74 we have given the case of a village town in Perthshire, where twenty years of the *remedy* had *not cured* the disorder. As to an English village, we may cite the testimony of *Lady Una*:—

"Dr SOUTHERN had fought the good fight of sanitary and social reformation almost single-handed; the judge's countenance and connections secured him other allies; but, only after the great and unexpected change effected in the property of Selwyn was the great stumbling-stone to permanent improvement *removed*. Alas! for all parties, *the Public-house, the Public-house*, which had for years been the source of the wretched condition of the place, was ever drawing back to perdition those whom otherwise he might have saved. *Law and License* were equally confederate to maintain it, and not one of the respectable inhabitants had power to put it down" (p. 317).

The prescription is virtually an abortive proposal to cure drinking by abating its effects, and is akin to an attempt to extinguish typhus fever by tonics and stimulants, instead of preventing its existence by removing the material CAUSES which generate it.

ii. *Deficient food, etc., arising from Poverty and Low Wages.*

This is a remedy of the same kind as the former, which would dry up a corrupt fountain by diluting the streams that flow from it. The facts given under the preceding objection are equally refutations of this. There is no necessary connection between poverty and drinking. In our Brussels' Congress Paper (English Edition) we have shown that in the wealthier districts of the Continent, where wages are highest, intemperance most abounds. It is the same at home, where the results of commercial prosperity are well known. "Persons," observes the Rev. J. CLAY, of the Preston Gaol, "who, in hard times, are led into criminality by destitution, are, in *better times*, led into it by drunkenness." In his report for 1845, he says, "*the practice of excessive drinking diminishes or increases with the fall and rise of employment*. It is a melancholy reflection, that when reviving trade succeeds one of those periods of gloom which ever and anon darken our commerce, that the people should have learned so little from their previous distresses, and feel so little what is due to themselves and their families, as to *waste their increased means in the debaucheries of the gin and the beer-shops*." "It is desirable," says Mr TREMENHEERE, in his report on the operation of Lord Ashley's Act in South Wales, "to direct especial attention to the fact of the *great and general increase of intemperance since the return of high wages and prosperity*, in the autumn of 1844.

On *Sunday* nights, as at other convenient times, the public-houses are generally full." Among the statements made to him were the following:—The Rev. T. DAVIES, Incumbent of Pontypool, "estimated, that on Sunday evenings, there were now from 1200 to 1500 people in the public-houses and beer-shops of his parish, containing a population of 7000." A highly respectable dissenting minister, in another part of the district, thus expressed himself:—"The people began to drink away all their earnings *as soon as the good times returned*. I have labored among them many years, and I am sorry to say, I see no improvement in their habits in this respect."

What was the occasion of the crowded calendar which so affected Judge TALFOURD on the morning of his death upon the bench? *Drinking, promoted by great commercial prosperity*. Poverty, in the form of pinching want, would disappear from the country under the operation of a Prohibitory Law,—homes being made what they ought to be, *two-thirds* of our juvenile delinquency would disappear of itself,—and a permanent *home-trade*, far more valuable than any other, would spring up, free altogether from those depressions now so frequently recurring. But our politicians tinker effects instead of touching *causes*—and would fain persuade the nation to waste its efforts for another half-century in battling with symptoms—like quack-salvers, they anoint the boils and eruptions upon the skin of the body-politic, instead of *purging out* the poison which infects the constitution.

iii. *Want of Political Liberty and Social Equality.*

The States of America—where the Maine Law prevails—have extreme liberty and social equality—yet *Prohibition* was called for because drunkenness flooded the land. Denmark has not nearly so much liberty as ourselves, yet Denmark is sober and England is drunken. Our opponents cant a good deal about 'Continental temperance'—but *have* they much Political-liberty and Social-equality there? "Facts are stubborn things," continued ANTONIO. "Amongst us there is scarcely an example of wives and daughters bearing the marks of the brutality of their husbands and fathers; *drunkenness is a very rare thing, and so is crime*. There are whole provinces—that of San Remo is one—in which no murder has been committed within the memory of man."* Yet there we have Poverty, Despotism, and Ignorance all combined—but *not* drunkenness. This political objection is best characterized in the expressive phrase of Mr BURCHELL—"fudge."

7. *Because Education is the true and effectual Cure for crime and drunkenness.*

Mr KINGSMILL, Chaplain of the Pentonville Prison, thinks that criminals are *not* "more ignorant than non-criminals in the same walks

* *Doctor Antonio*: by M. RUFFINI, 1856. p. 127.

of life ;" * and that " Ignorance marks the lowest order of crime [petty larceny] far more than it does the highest" [crimes against the person]. This agrees with everybody's knowlege ; for who does not know many very illiterate persons who rank amongst the most honest and virtuous members of society ? *Ignorance* may keep many men in a certain circle of poverty and temptation, which sometimes *results* in crime ; but ignorance is never the *inciting* cause.† Hence many convicts in Australia become excellent citizens—no more inclined to crime than people generally. The Rev. RICHARD BURNET, Chaplain to the Sussex County Prison, at Lewes, states in the *Philanthropist* for June 1st, 1857 :—" I have taken our criminal records for the last four years, and subjected them to analysis. The result is, that the *excess of readers and writers amongst our graver criminals is increased* ; it is now *more than double* the amount found in the lowest class of crime ;—and this, I expect, is a general fact. Such are the *facts* upon which those will have to reason who would discuss the subject of education in its bearing upon crime. I can see in them *neither encouragement for those who hope to check crime by the bare spread of knowlege—secular or religious ; nor discouragement for those who devote their energies and their property to the education of the young—the training of their habits and affections in truth, piety, and love.*"

Prejudice is stereotyped, or it would long since have given up Education as a panacea for Crime. Home-facts abundantly confute the crotchet. For example,—in Lancashire, in 1845, the ratio of ignorant criminals was 13 per cent more than in Kent ; yet agricultural Kent, with more instruction than manufacturing Lancaster—it is now as 1 scholar in 8 to 1 in 11—had 7½ per cent more crime. Of 1150 boys, received into Parkhurst, only 36 have not been at school at all—700 of them having had an average of nearly four years.‡ The Governor says of many—" They were truants ;" which shows that the criminal cases are traceable to something *earlier* than schooling, leading them to undervalue that. Mr C. PEARSON, solicitor to the City of London, in his evidence in 1847, before the Lords, says :—" I have been a devoted advocate of education, but I am satisfied that the *cause* of juvenile crime is *not* the absence of education" In Miss CARPENTER's book on *Reformatory Schools*, pp. 18-19, he says of the juvenile delinquents in Newgate, "*a very large portion of them had received a considerable degree of instruction.*"

* Mr MANN has shown, in the *Educational Census*, p. 32, that ignorance is greater among the population *out of prison* than among the criminals *in*.

+ " If a close, and, with proper allowance for counteracting tendencies, a virtually unvarying correspondence between crime and ignorance could be detected, it would be an unwarrantable, and, we believe, an untrue inference, that the ignorance *produced* the crime. To prove things to be connected, as cause and effect, something more than constant association—which in this case you have *not*—is needed."—*National Review*.

‡ See *Argument*, p. 174. The true causes of *Juvenile Delinquency* are exhaustively exposed in a short, but admirable lecture by Mr THOMAS BEGGS, F.S.S. (Sold by Tweedie, London.)

No one can reasonably question the close connection between drinking and crime. If Education cannot avert Crime generally, how can it prevent this special cause of Crime? Now, what *kind* of Education and Training *has* ever prevented intemperance, either in a community, a church, or a family? None but that which taught and enforced the *exclusion* of the drink itself. Men of the highest culture and position have been numbered amongst the victims of strong drink in the past generation; and many sad and striking examples could be cited from the recent literary history of the past two years. The Hon. HORACE MANN, U. S., asked, in June, 1852—"What can be hoped of a President and Senate, when, but a short time since, we had *three foreign Ministers at three European Courts*, each of whom was a notorious drunkard, and one of whom was so permanently drunk, that it is said he was never presented to the sovereign to whom he was sent." The great President JEFFERSON said, a little before his death:—"Were I to commence my administration again, with the knowledge which, from experience, I have acquired, the first question I would ask with regard to every public candidate for public office should be—*Is he addicted to the use of ardent spirits?*" The objector, in the face of experience, would persist in asking—Is he educated? If "he that trusteth in his own heart is a fool," he that trusteth in his own intellect is no less so: "but whoso *walketh* wisely, he shall be delivered" (Prov. xxviii. 26).

National examples abundantly refute this theory. West Prussia, where *Education* prevails far more than in the North, has *one-third* greater mortality and drinking. In France—as seen in QUETELET'S shaded maps—the dark-parts of Ignorance are the light-parts of Sobriety. That able statician admits crimes of violence to be great "according as the intellectual state of the accused was more highly developed," and expressly refers the fact to *the greater use of intoxicants* in the educated districts.

Sweden furnishes another example. It has a full and active machinery for instruction: yet, excluding offences against the Forest Laws, there was, in 1830, 1 criminal to 320 of the population; and 1 crime in 11 was *committed in drink*. From 1785 to 1825, the population increased 20 per cent, but the consumption of brandy 400 per cent—notwithstanding the education.*

"It is well that we should guard ourselves against undue and extravagant expectations of the amount of good to be derived from School instruction. *Centuries of Education will not remove the evils of bad and mischievous customs and laws*, which form, in fact, an indirect Education of another kind, often more powerful and lasting in its influence than any series of lessons taught within the walls of a school-room."†

* "Swedish Clergy highly educated and intelligent (p. 303). A great variety of Educational establishments exist, both private and public. The order of the Peasants (Yeomen) number 2½ millions, and own *double the property* of all other classes put together." (SCOTT. p. 322-3.)

† *Westminster Review*, vol. xxxiv. p. 69.

8. *Because Religious Instruction alone goes to the root of the Evil.*

How was it, then, that Noah, Lot, and "the Priests and the Prophets, erred through strong drink?" Had they no religion, or no religious instruction?

How is it still? The Church, so far from reforming the world, is corrupted by the common curse. Witness the shocking revelation, the other day, at an inquest in Cumberland, where it is proved that a Clergyman, in a state of drunkenness, lies down on a sofa, while his wife, in a similar condition, sits down on a stool by his side, and, by her drunken and depressed condition, is actually suffocated—the husband being too drunk to note, or, too helpless to avert the catastrophe!

Or take an illustration as to the people, from the Reports of the Commissioners of Education in Wales (1846). Mr LINGEN says:—"Poetical and enthusiastic warmth of religious feeling, careful attendance upon religious services, zealous interest in religious knowledge, [just as in Scotland,] the comparative absence of crime, are found side by side with the most unreasoning prejudices and impulses, and with a wide-spread disregard of temperance WHENEVER THERE ARE THE MEANS OF EXCESS, of chastity, of veracity, and of fair dealing."

Such is human nature, and such are the facts in relation to it. The wise religionist will take it as he finds it, and act accordingly. Since he can only raise an *individual* here and there *above* his circumstances, he will strive to save the *multitude* from the influence of that debasing environment which tends to sink them below their nature—to remove those surroundings which *foster* evil and degradation by wholesale. Such is the *Traffic!* A *Report on the State of Popular Education in Great Britain to the Lord President of Council on Education*, by the Oldest School Inspector in England (London; December, 1856), has the following demonstration:—

"Of all the most obviously influencing causes of crime, Public-houses are evidently the most potent; *often undoing all the good work of the Teacher and the Pastor.* Taking the six counties having fewest of these pestiferous places, though they have on an average one of them to every 235 persons, we find a criminal annually among 762 inhabitants; while in those six counties having a public-house for 109 'thirsty souls,' there is a criminal among 591 inhabitants. Where they do most drinking, we find *one-fourth more paupers, one-fourth less property, only about one-half the amount of deposits in Savings' Banks,* and yet there are ONE-FIFTH MORE SCHOOLS, AND ONE-THIRD MORE WORSHIPERS, to population, than where the people have fewest drinking-shops."

With such massive and multitudinous facts before him, the thoughtful reader will begin to comprehend the meaning of that Divine prayer—*Lead us not into temptation:* to see how essential it is to harmonize the *objective* and *subjective* conditions of social life, if we would not stereotype the curse of Disappointment, and eternize the reign of

"CIRCUMSTANCE, that unspiritual God and miscreator,
"Whose touch turns Hope to dust."

9. *Because a combination of various moral and social agencies would effect more than Prohibition.*

Now, certainly, we cannot object to a combination of agencies, provided, only, that the *essential agency* is not left out, viz. Prohibition. In the United States we have long had, in full play, all the agencies for the cure of Drunkenness, Pauperism, and Crime, which our political and social Empirics are perpetually proclaiming as a perfect cure—namely, diversions, fine beautiful scenery and cheap facilities for enjoying it, Libraries, Lyceums, a stringent License system *restricting* the Traffic, national Education, light wine of apples (cider) freely used, an inspiring climate, breathing space and pure air, high Wages, good Food, social Equality, extreme Liberty, and the preaching of the Gospel ; yet, notwithstanding all these lauded nostrums, twenty years ago the United States were as drunken as Great Britain is now, and the sheer necessity of self-protection has recently forced upon the New England States the adoption of a prohibitory liquor-law.

Our own country, however, has had ample experience of many fashionable and increasingly applied panaceas. For our part, we are sick of these pretentious philosophies, which yield the minutest of palatable fruits. All have been tried, with the exception of cheap and acid French Wines ; and, in lieu of that flatulent prophylactic, we have had sour cider, cheap beer, and ginger pop ; which, indeed, are quite as efficient. Many of the prescriptions for curing our national Drunkenness, Pauperism, and Crime, have been good in themselves—even *vast gains to society*—but they have not *proved* to be remedies for the evils of the Traffic. They have spent much of their virtue in merely holding the disorder in check ; but they have *not* restored the patient to health and soundness. For example, note the ameliorating agencies of the past quarter of a century,—agencies, the excellence of which, for their proper purposes, few persons will doubt.

A. *Physical or Material.*

- (1.) The application of Gas to the illumination of our streets.
- (2.) The unexampled advance of art, science, manufactures, machinery, and railroads.
- (3.) The development of agricultural wealth and edible produce.

B. *Social and Political.*

- (4.) The extension of liberty and equality civil and religious.
- (5.) Abolition of Commercial Monopolies, and cheapening of Food.
- (6.) The amelioration and adaptation of punishments, and improved prison discipline.
- (7.) A more effective system of Police, and its extension to rural districts.
- (8.) The famous New Poor Law system.

C. *Educational and Moral.*

- (9.) Freedom of discussion, repeal of taxes on knowledge, and consequent greater activity of the Press.

(10.) Great increase of educational agencies, both voluntary and governmental.

(11.) Establishment and universal extension of mechanics' institutes, libraries, reading rooms, saving banks, coffee-houses, etc.

(12.) Opening of singing galleries, parks, places of recreation and instruction, and the encouragement of bands, people's concerts, and railway excursions.

(13.) Better education of pauper children, improved training of juvenile criminals, and efficient support of 'Ragged Schools.'

(14.) Unparalleled progress of philanthropic and prudential institutions and charities, and especially the wide extension of Temperance Societies.

D. Religious.

(15.) The unprecedented circulation (by private hand, by church associations, by the regular trade, and by an organized system of 'Hawking,') of the Bible, and of religious tracts, periodicals, and books.

(16.) The establishment of *Town Missions* throughout the country, and the extensive introduction of Missionaries amongst gangs of workmen and into workshops, and of *Scripture Readers* amongst the poor.

(17.) The extraordinary multiplication of Churches and Chapels, and great activity in the workings of the entire Ecclesiastical System, both amongst Episcopal organizations and Dissenting bodies.

Here, surely, is an array and progressive combination of material and moral power adequate to cope with Pauperism and Crime, and to defeat the Traffic—*provided always that the principle is right*. If these agencies, singly or combined, are really *adapted* to the case, they should vastly have diminished the evils. Yet what is the Fact? The Government returns (which do not include summary convictions) show, on an average of twenty-five years, that we have had $15 \frac{1}{10}$ Criminals to 10,000 of the Population. The ten years ending 1855, show an average of $15 \frac{1}{10}$: or a decrease of a *fraction* as the result of our complicated, continuous, and costly efforts! "*These are facts,*" says Mr HENRY MAYHEW, "*which teach us how slight an impression has really been made upon the great body of criminals by all our late efforts.*" In the face of this great disappointment, the Alliance submits its propositions to the Nation. It announces a prescription founded on an accurate *diagnosis* of the disorder,—it proposes a process that would cost nothing save the sacrifice of a mere convenience of the ready purchase of a luxury,* but add millions to the national treasury,—and it has the strongest guarantee of success in the fact, that, instead of playing with mere effects, it goes at once to the demonstrated *causes* of the evils, and, by preventing the social malady, supersedes the painful, expensive, and bootless attempt at cure.

* *What is the sacrifice now?* Hundreds of persons in country parishes, and thousands in remote places, cannot purchase strong drink *near home*. A permissive-Maine-Law would simply decree the same condition to all, with the consent of two-thirds.

CHAPTER III.

MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTIONS AND CRITICISMS.

I.

WHEN Lord WELLINGTON was in his greatest exigency, during the Peninsular War, retreating before the overwhelming masses of MASSENA, "it is almost incredible," says his biographer, "that he should not only have been inadequately supported by the government at home, but likewise exposed to the mad violence of party spirit from the opposition. The heart of the nation, however, was still true, though there were not wanting individuals who said, in their place in Parliament, that the contest was hopeless, and should be abandoned, and *who seemed to do all they could to weaken the hands of our commander.* The same remarks apply to other periods of the contest; and, no doubt, these ebullitions of partizanship *had* unfavorable results; they added confidence to the common enemy, by seeming to indicate a divided people; they were easily taken hold of by NAPOLEON, and exhibited to the French in his mendacious bulletins; but over all these attacks WELLINGTON triumphed."

This history finds its parallel in the recent contests of Prohibition in America, and the visit of NEAL Dow to this country. Curiously timed to meet his arrival here, and with the inevitable tendency to frustrate his philanthropic campaign, the *Temperance Weekly Record* of London, followed by the *Glasgow Commonwealth* and the Scottish Temperance League's *Journal*, gave currency and sanction to an extract from a private letter, purporting to announce two great facts:—1st, That the Temperance cause was in a *depressed* condition. 2nd, That the Maine Law was a *universal failure*, and a *dead letter everywhere*.

The exact words of the writer are:—"The cause IN THIS COUNTRY is in a depressed state. The Maine Law is a *dead letter everywhere*; more liquor sold than I ever before knew in Massachusetts, and in other States it is about as bad.*

"Mr Dow can tell, *better* than any other man, the state of the Maine Law movement here, and the cause of the *present* UNIVERSAL FAILURE OF THE LAW TO PRODUCE THE DESIRED RESULT."

* The *Boston Bee*, recently apologizing for the blunder, alleges that the statement of the law being "a dead letter" was "partially true" at the time, concerning some parts—but is so no longer! Yet the false friends of the letter-writer, as well as the foes of prohibition, elevated him to the very pinnacle of authority,—nay, many of them insulted the Hon. Mr Dow and his friends, because they insisted upon testing the value of a statement which has grown

"Small by degrees, and beautifully less."

+ Mr Dow, the authority appealed to, *denied* that the Law was a failure at all, either presently or pastly; and therefore could not talk about the causes of the Law's failure.

The statement was eagerly seized by the NAPOLEON of the Press—the *Times*—which was almost the *only one* that inserted the rejoinder; while the country press, with rare exceptions, issued their mendacious bulletins, insulting Mr Dow, and gloating over the failure with an inhuman glee—pitting a ‘dramatic orator’ against the great and philanthropic author of the Law, and drawing the senile inference that a system which was thus assumed to have failed in the States, must, *therefore*, fail in Britain! We had already anticipated that objection in our ‘Argument,’ and illustrated it by the slave-trade; and we might here add the case of Municipal government, which is a wretched ‘failure’ in New York, but by no means so in Manchester or Southampton.*

Some special facts have already been given in reply to the objection that the law is disappointing (p. 58); but here we must find room for an official and collective ‘deliverance’—if we may even borrow a Scotticism without offence?

At a Temperance Convention from the counties of Hampshire, Hampden, and Franklin, Massachusetts, held at Northampton, June 18th, 1857, it was

“RESOLVED,—That we feel both *surprise* and *regret* that statements emanating from this country have been circulated on the the other side of the Atlantic, to the effect that the Maine Law is ineffective in this country, and that intemperance is increasing here: *surprise*, because we know the law to be satisfactory to its friends, and a terror to the vendors of intoxicating drinks, many of whom

* The *Daily News* correspondent states that the city is *mis-ruled* by its blackguardism, at an expense many times greater than that incurred by the Manchester corporation. From the *New York Tribune* we collect that a score of Murders have been committed in the city from the 1st of April to the 1st of July, 1857: and that “10,000 lazy, drunken people—thieving short-boys, killers, roughs, and rowdies of other names, lounge on the rum-cursed corners of the streets, making day disgusting, night hideous, and travel dangerous to all who can be suspected of having respectability or money.” When did *Maine Lawism* fail in this terrific fashion? Professor LAYCOCK’S ‘no fear and moral suasion-ism’ has fair play. “Thousands of emigrant swindlers, mock auctioneers, lottery dealers, policy-backers, pickpockets, hall-thieves, burglars, wharf-rats, area-snakes, pimps, and vampyres, practice their knaveries as openly and with as little fear of punishment as though they were engaged in the most virtuous and legitimate of human pursuits. The swell mob of London, flying from the Argus eyes of a real police, and the unendurable felons of San Francisco, expatriated by the bullet and the hemp of the Vigilance Committee, are received here with open arms, parade our streets under not only the toleration but the protection and personal friendship of the police, carry our primary elections, and fill high places on our nominating committees. On every hand we have vice, and crime, and splendor; crime, vice, rum, and beggary. Here, in the most fashionable *faubourg*, in the Crockford’s of New York; there, between the residences of a millionaire and a divine—is the *maison de joie* of a woman whose dress is the most brilliant, whose equipage the most costly, whose appearance is the most stunning of any of the gay butterflies, virtuous or vicious, whose beauty and wealth add glitter to the opera, or sunshine to the promenade. Within a bow-shot of these palaces is the other side of the world; for brocade, rags; for diamonds, dirt; for Johannisberger, whisky; for millionaires, beggars; for divines, devils; for Aspasia, drabs; with here and there some poor, starving wretch, painfully enacting ‘The Song of the Shirt,’ her besieged virtue glimmering in the misery of this tangle hell, like the fabled jewel in a dunghill. And over all, we have a set of men called Rulers, wrangling like hungry dogs for the public purse; lying and cheating for advancement; plotting to overthrow all law, that they may rob the people; and, in their influence upon our vast criminal population, recklessly flaring their incendiary torches in our moral powder-house.” Such are the *anti-Maine Law* men will their British brothers acknowledge their relatives?

have already met condign punishment under its operations, after having exhausted all the subterfuges of legal skill to avoid their fate; and because we also know, and hereby express our conviction, that intemperance is not increasing in Massachusetts;—*regret*, because they betray haste in the wrong direction, and obviously tend to embarrass seriously the labors, and to diminish the efficiency, of noble friends of the good cause, who are urging on a most promising movement in other lands, in whose labors we sympathize, and in whose success our hearts rejoice.”

A Committee of the Massachusetts State Temperance Society, under date of May 25th, 1857, write thus:—

“There is now no *Anti-Liquor-Law* paper in New England. The press is generally in favor of the law. . . . We take the liberty to state that any representation that the prohibitive law has proved a failure in Massachusetts, or is unpopular, or is not generally enforced, or that intemperance has increased in the *commonwealth*, IS INCORRECT, and must have been made by parties who are unacquainted with the facts.”

Under date of May 16th, Professor McCox, of Albany, writes:—

“*Never was the faith in the efficacy of prohibition so firm, never was the determination to have it so resolute, as now.* I cannot doubt that three-fourths of all the men in New York, and nine-tenths of all the women, would hold up both hands for it to-morrow.”

The *Maine Journal*, of April 30th, '57, published at Portland, thus speaks of prohibition:—“*Even in its apparent reverses it has gained strength and solidity*, and it is just as sure to be finally triumphant as the world stands. The enemies of prohibition continue to fight, and by all possible means to procrastinate the time of their utter destruction, but in the end they must perish.

“In Vermont the laws of prohibition stand as firm as her Green Mountains: in New Hampshire the hosts of rum are shattered and in distress: in Maine the momentary triumph of rum was the last struggle of a dying leviathan: in Massachusetts, opposition grows weaker and weaker, and the friends of temperance increase in strength, zeal, and wisdom: in Rhode Island all rum-shops are pronounced a nuisance, and the sheriff is sending the greatest consternation into their ranks: in New York, a stringent license law is to be tried, but it is only to be tried, for the large majority of the people demand and will have prohibition; and we may be assured that *through all the Northern States the sentiment is becoming more and more positive*, that the traffic must be wholly swept from the land, be made an outlaw, pronounced a nuisance.”

In the annual report of the American Temperance Union read at their 21st anniversary, held at New York, in May, we find the following passages:—“*The tidings from New Hampshire continue to be of a most favorable character.* The Prohibitory law adopted by a vote of ten to one in the Senate, and of 213 to 50 in the House, has had the most triumphant success. It was fully endorsed by a State Convention, in September, 1856, as correct in its principles and most salutary in its main provisions;

by the General Association of the Congregational Church, as the most important means of suppressing and preventing intemperance, and demanding all the energies of ministers and Christians to insure its success; and more than all, by the people at the polls in the month of March. No Governor ever received so large a vote in the State, as he on whose banner was inscribed PROHIBITORY LAW. The execution of the law has been most signal and honorable. 'The Prohibitory law,' said the Secretary of the State Society at the close of March, '*was never so strong as now. It is being more generally enforced throughout the State than at any former period.*' And said his Excellency the Governor, at the opening of the Legislature—'*The act for the suppression of intemperance is having a salutary effect. It is more fully regarded and practically sustained than any license law ever had in the State. In many towns, the sale of intoxicating liquors is wholly abandoned, and in others it is sold only in secret, as other penal offences are committed. I am not aware that there is a city or town in the State, where spirituous liquors are openly sold. That there are places where the law is secretly violated, is not doubted, and the same may be said of every law, whether statute or common, from the highest to the lowest grades of offence.*'

"RHODE ISLAND, long struggling against corrupt officials, has recently placed herself in the first rank of self protectionists and reformers, by declaring every place where intoxicating liquors is sold contrary to law *a public nuisance*, and providing for its abatement in five days; and if it is not abated, holding the owners of the building where it is sold criminally responsible.

"CONNECTICUT has stood nobly firm in her Prohibitory law. In the session of her Legislature for 1856, resolution after resolution, some for the repeal of this section, and others for the modification of that, and one or more for the repeal of the entire law, were brought before the Legislature without success. *The Senate did not even come to a count in a single instance, but each petition as presented was voted down with hardly a dissenting voice.*"

One of the resolutions adopted at the anniversary was the following:—

"*Resolved—That, in the progress of the cause, we are more and more satisfied of the correctness of prohibition, as a means which directly accomplishes, and without permanent injury to any, the desired end; that where it has had trial, even for short periods, as in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Delaware, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, it has even exceeded expectation.*"

If the best men of America—the great majority of the acute natives, and of the educated and religious inhabitants, of New England—can thus act, write, and speak in reference to 'a dead letter' and a demonstrated 'failure' in their midst—then beyond all doubt, they are the most extraordinary illustration of a National Chronic Insanity which the history of the world has yet furnished. *Credat Judæus!* 'The Marines may believe it, but will the Sailors?'

II.

In a large work like the *Argument*, based upon facts and statistics derived from a thousand sources, it was to be expected that some error of fact or inference would creep in. We, therefore, on the very back of our Title-page, invited private and public notice of all errors, so that they might be corrected in our second edition. Only two alleged mistakes have been pointed out; and neither by 'able editors.'

The first is regarding 'Highland Destitution,' in § 82; and as the mere figures do not affect our reasoning, we have, in the third edition, modified the paragraph, and said the best we truly could for the poor Highlanders. Certainly, however, vastly too much whisky is still consumed by them.*

A Mr DONALD ROSS, in the Glasgow papers, fiercely assailed us for publishing an erroneous Excise Return—and, with the weakness of his countrymen, imputed it to *English* hostility! The Excise people, it seems, put £10,000 as spent on whisky in Skye, instead of £6,000 odd. The statement originally appeared in the *Quarterly Review*—then, with the objectionable inference, in *Chambers' Journal*—then in Reid's *Cyclopædia*, published by the Scottish Temperance League—and, the other day, in the *Scottish Review* for July, 1857, p. 238. The *English Review* and the *English Essayist* both corrected the error as soon as it was pointed out.

The second statement which has been doubted, is the remarkable one of Dr WALD (§ 20), given in a Report published at Berlin, in 1852, and quoted in Reid's *Cyclopædia*. We gave it as we found it, and confess to seeing nothing incredible in it. It is only one of a SERIES of facts, and no worse than many others which are beyond question true. Dram-drinking and its concomitants are literally shrivelling up the constitution of the people in many parts, reducing their stature and arresting their increase. A Berliner may not know the facts in relation to the Rhenish provinces: but what infirmities and defects MUST inhere to a people where, amongst the poor, the annual mortality reaches the frightful ratio of 1 in 23; which is greater than the mortality amongst the lowest classes of our large cities. (The Conscript-class, to which Dr WALD refers, of course, excludes the rich classes, who can find substitutes.)

Various critics, indeed, agree in expressing *scepticism* and *surprise* in relation to some of our statistics—but those are manifestations

* HIGHLAND DESTITUTION.—"In a village in the Highlands, which lately received relief from the Destitution Committee, one hundred and twenty gallons of the Black-cow's milk [whisky] were consumed on Christmas-day. In the hamlet of Durrie, in Torriden, *eodem die*, thirty gallons went to assuage the thirst of the natives, being at the rate of one gallon to each particular throat."—*Rosshire Advertiser*.—[Quoted in the *Northern Temperance Cresset*, Feb. 16th, 1849.]

† PRUSSIA.—"The proportion of mortality is 1 in 34, and in this respect it stands nearly on a footing with Austria and Russia, where the mortality is one in 33. The difference of mortality in the several parts of Prussia is very great, so that, while in one part of the kingdom (for example, Berlin, Westphalia), 1 death occurs among 41 persons; in other parts (West Prussia) almost every 27th individual dies."—*Medical Times*.

which *do* pretty generally characterize the ignorant and the prejudiced. One thing, however, they prudently avoid—viz., any attempt at *specific* statement—knowing that the vague generalities are most likely to escape exposure.* The *Saturday Review* and the *Economist*, while professing to review and refute our 'Argument,' have not dared to grapple with any one of its real positions, but have 'fabricated' others in the place of them—certainly the greatest compliment *they* can possibly pass upon the work.

Most of our reviewers have, however, spoken fairly and favorably of our book; but some have misunderstood it, some have not scrupled to misrepresent it, and some have even called upon the invention in order to sneer at it.

One critic, commenting on our first edition, represented the argument as consisting of this pretty enthymeme;—"Regulation has failed, *ergo* Prohibition must succeed." This, however, is one of the 'children of the mist,' and bears not even the most distant family-likeness to *our* offspring: we cannot admit it within our logical *Commonwealth*;—and our friend must, therefore, excuse us for rejecting the paternity! The same paper has also said that "the whole argument proceeds upon the assumption that the form of Government under which we live is a *Paternal* Government." Now, our only assumption covers *ALL* forms of Government—it is, that Government must give *protection* from public evils—or, failing this, it is *not* Government, but sham.

* Commenting on the Hon. NEAL DOW's speech in Exeter Hall, the *Saturday Review* forgets this prudential rule, and becomes a little *too* specific. He accuses that gentleman of importing his passions into his arithmetic, when he supposes, in round numbers, that *about* £75,000,000 are spent upon strong drink in the United Kingdom, every year. The reviewer then fortifies his *scepticism* as to the hugeness of British folly by appealing to Mr G. R. PORTER's estimate of British rentals!—another exquisite specimen of a literary exquisite's logic. Quoth Man-Saturday—

1. John Bull's rent reaches £40,000,000 only.
2. John Bull's Crimean campaign costs only £76,000,000.
3. *Ergo*, John Bull's drink does not cost nearly £75,000,000.

Now, what does Man-Saturday's *own* authority say on this subject? Here are G. R. PORTER's figures, read before the British Association, August 1st, 1850.

Brandy	£3,281,250
Other Spirits (British and Colonial)	20,810,208
Malt Liquors	25,383,165
Wines	5,000,000
Home-brewed Liquors, illicit Spirits, Smuggling, and Adulterations	15,515,807

[This great total seven years ago.] £69,990,430

The last *item* of Mr PORTER's table is far under the mark; and so, also, is £5,000,000 in our own eleventh item of the loss of the Traffic £179. Mr SMITH, in his work on Juvenile Delinquency and Prison Discipline, exceeds the sum we have fixed upon. In his paper, Mr PORTER refers as authority to Chambers' Tract (written by Dr LEES), entitled *The Temperance Movement*, where it was computed that £65,000,000 were paid every year for strong drinks. "The two estimates," says Mr PORTER, "will be found very nearly to approximate."

The *Saturday Review* (said to be conducted by young graduates of Cambridge and Oxford), says that *we* know the essay to be *very ill written*. Either the reviewer has not graduated in Veracity, or else he is incompetent to understand plain English. There is a vast difference between an Essay that may be *better*, and one that is *bad*. Our graduate has forgotten his Grammar: changing the formula—"Good, better, best"—into "*Bad, better, best!*" After spending 25 lines over this important fiction, he complains that we did not compress our 'volume' into a *thin* 'pamphlet'—"which," says this critic, "might easily have been done"! Then comes an immortal specimen of social logic.

1. "Drunkenness is an enormous evil. It is possible to exaggerate it.
2. "Scotland is more drunken, and more prosperous, than Ireland: England better off than sober Naples, Turkey, and Egypt.
3. *Ergo*—"Dr Lees has accomplished the feat of exaggerating the bad effects of drunkenness."

If Man-Friday had not more sense than Man-Saturday, the savage deserved whipping. Is the Traffic good, or Prohibition bad, because there are other bads—or worse bads—at Jericho? Are the *actual evils* of England—its pauperism, its juvenile and adult crime, its wife-beating, and its taxes—LESS EVILS than we have stated them to be, *because* a priggish critic chuses to cant about Foreign States? With such reasoning—and the other specimen given at p. 46—the reader will come to his own conclusions as to the *intellect* of the *Saturday Review*—which seems to us a sort of receptacle for literary *syllabub*, for that, if we mistake not, is a juvenile and frothy dish composed of *milk* coagulated with acids—and holding forth a larger promise to the eye than is ever realized by the stomach.

The reviewer invents a second fiction, thus:—"As Dr LEES "would put the case, the prohibition of the Trade is a sacrifice "which the law *ought* to impose upon the sober for *the sake of the* "intemperate." By no means. As we put it, it is this:—That the law ought to prohibit the Traffic, not for the sake of the Intemperate, save incidentally, but *for the sake of the interests of the sober and moral, of the children and the wives, in all classes.* (See Prop. II.)

The *Scottish Review*, in an article on the Prize Essay, while saying very handsome things of both the author and his book, fell into the singular, and to us unaccountable notion, that the Alliance was seeking Prohibitory law at the hands of Parliament, without a preliminary agitation of the question through the people—a notion distinctly *repudiated*, again and again, in the Essay.* We wrote to

* The *Scottish Review*, though a professed temperance organ, has quite an obliquity on this topic. The fact that it *too* highly praised our Argument (for we are not blind to its faults), must not prevent us from correcting mis-statements. The reviewer (October, 1856) admits the *unanswerableness* of our Indictment—"it is just one great syllogism"—and then, referring to the British Constitution, supposes that we are seeking for "a prohibitory law *at variance* with the wishes of the people." Now, we are relying upon the syllogism being sufficient to move the common sense and heart of the People to *demand* the abatement of the Guilty Traffic; which plan is of the very

correct the strange error—and our letter was inserted in the advertising pages—the *Review* being too great an organ to fall into the undignified plan of the *Edinburgh* or *Quarterly*, and acknowledge its ‘fallibility.’*

A later and less wise article in the *Review* (July, 1857), propounds the monstrous paradox that *restriction* is prohibition, “and the principle of *License* not different from the principles of the Maine Law!” Nay, “it is *potentially* a prohibitory law”!! Can the reviewer deceive himself by such shallow sophistry? A law which says that the Magistrates MAY license a Man to do mischief, and protects him in doing it, never can be the same *in principle* as that which righteously declares that a Man OUGHT NOT to do mischief, and *shall not* do it, save in violation of law—until the distinctions between vice and virtue have ceased. The *exercise* of the power to refuse—the *determination* to *disallow license*—is NOT the principle of the License, but of Justice and Prohibition *behind* it. The same organ, we observe, denies the fundamental principle of the Temperance Society—makes drunkenness and the drunkard’s appetite the *fruits* of our indigenous *Sensuality*—and not, as teetotalers have taught, the work of the PECULIAR DRINK. It is *unsound*, therefore, alike on Prohibition and on Temperance; and real teetotalers should see to it.

The Press might be a great help to our movement, if it were ruled by reason and conscience, instead of being the mere tool and slave of selfish interests and parties, or of cliques and prejudices. It has, with rare exceptions, shown no respect for *our* opinions, and as little honesty as capacity in dealing with them.

The *Saturday Review*, which reasons in the *jejune* fashion exposed, calls our notions “the Maine Law craze.” In less pretentious organs, how is this movement treated? The *Carlisle Journal* in discussing it, talks of “the LEES and *dregs* of Teetotal oratory,” and

essence of the British Constitution. It is another mistake to assert that “the People of New Brunswick would not have the law.” The governor and his party stretched the Constitution to get rid of it; and the People this year, on the prohibitory issue, have defeated the Government by way of punishment, and placed Mr TILLEY, the prohibitionist, at the head of the poll. It is another mistake to suppose that the Alliance was “born before its time,” or is “a proposal in any way to *supersede* voluntary abstinence.” It is a *Supplement* to abstinence, coming a quarter of a century after it; and the *getting-up* and *organization* of a political element and feeling in reference to the Traffic, which are both *older* and *wider* than mere Abstinence. As the reviewer well says, in another page, “The two things are not antagonistic. They are, properly speaking, *just the natural COMPLEMENTS of each other.*”

* This led to Dr MACCULLOCH’s bringing a motion before the League, with which we had nothing whatever to do; but in letters in the *Commonwealth*, and in a 6d. pamphlet entitled ‘The League and the Alliance,’ we find our name very liberally and insultingly used. These Scotch scribblers seem to think themselves at liberty to introduce anybody’s name and character into their squabbles, for the gratification of their pugnacity. We cannot afford time to read, much less refute, their ill-tempered lucubrations; but a glance at the beginning, middle, and end of the pamphlet—before we threw it into the waste basket—convinced us that it was an elaborate piece of natural blundering—a kind of clotted nonsense, in which the writer confounds things that differ, and distinguishes things that are alike. Failing to understand himself, he of course misunderstands everybody else. There is no help for this sort of thing.

hints that Mr Dow copies his figures from Prize Essayists who *fabricate* them for their purpose.*

The *Dumfries Courier* calls us "Maine Law Fanatics;" and its Edinburgh correspondent—a briefless wig of the innumerable Smith clan—proclaims us to be "an ignorant, illiterate, stump-orator." The *Cumberland Pacquet*, reviewing the essay, says, "A desire to pocket the cash is evident in almost every page." Need we waste more time in sticking up, in our entomological case, other specimens of literary insects, the odour of which is so offensive? We use these simply to 'point a moral'—to show the necessity of a law to compel men to put their names to their productions, and thereby neutralize their own vice and folly, without putting honest men to the trouble of doing it.

It is not the Press, however, that will long retard the cause of the Alliance. Lies and fallacies are short-lived, and *must* give way before a persistent agitation based on Truth. The Press is not a Lion in the path, but a Cur with a lion's skin, which we shall meet and lash. Our worst enemies are those of our own household—our professing friends, who play fast and loose—but even these shall be overcome by our faith. As regards those external to us, indeed, the great obstacle is a self-created one—*want of faith*. Good and intelligent men desire Prohibition—would hopelessly vote for it, perhaps—but they don't expect to get it! Thus men persuade each other into a delusion—not seeing that 'the beginning of the end' of every great movement and success, is the *desire*. The perception of the desirability of a measure is the first sure step to its realization—the desire *must* increase and gather power, as certainly as the descending avalanche, and finally, when the *public consciousness* of this desire is evoked, it will overwhelm the system on which it falls. Law and Providence never fail: hence that which we ought to get, we *shall* get, unless we fall short in our duty. It is our business to inspire the community with the same faith which animates ourselves. The performance of a duty should rest on the present obligation, and not be postponed for an impossible assurance of success from the Future. As the 'Iron Duke' epigrammatically said in support of another society—"It is your duty to do it—there are your marching orders."

The same want of faith induces many shallow and secular minds to project the dark shadow of the present over the brighter prospects of the future. The *Times* well said, the other day (September 12, 1856), "There is an age of extinguished zeal; but, thanks be to Heaven, youth is ever sending up the great and good, and the

* Who is the secret 'we' who thus treats a great question, by insulting its advocate, whom he designates as a "HOLLOWAY in morals"? For anything the public knows, he may be a young profligate, given to champagne and seduction, divorced from his wife as evidently as from decency, and an abuser of woman as well as of ourselves. We know of one such editor, in fact, residing recently in Scotland, who, though of this character, may still write leaders which, but for their innate vulgarity, might pass as the teachings of somebody entitled to teach under the present irresponsibility of the press.

rough work of life itself is ever throwing to the surface new and vigorous minds." But sometimes even the young have enthusiastic and prophetic insight prematurely burnt out; sometimes, too, are born without a spark of that Divine fire. A young gentleman said, in some lectures 'On America,' whence he had then recently returned—lectures, by the way, that had a disgusting 'odour' of the South about them*—that "when listening to the sanguine speeches, and fanciful predictions, of the advocates of the Maine Law, he had often been tempted to reply, in the words of MARCUS ANDRONICUS to his kinsman TITUS—

Oh! brother, speak with *possibilities*,
And do not break into these deep extremes."*

This juvenile statesman—for a golden key has since unlocked to him the doors of Parliament—is unmistakably the mental and moral representative of a certain class—a class that will never be impeached for excess of faith or enthusiasm, either in reference to man or God, earth or heaven. *The* Parliaments of vested interests—the palpable Parliament of St Stephen's or Washington—this young gentleman can understand; but as to anything much better in the future than in the past—as to any potency of Truth or Good for eventually realizing

The Parliament of Man—the Federation of the World—

why, that is a modern myth, or a midsummer madness!

We would not, however, claim too much for Prohibition. It will, of itself, when faithfully enforced, do but a negative work—namely, SUPPRESS THE EVILS OF THE PUBLIC TRAFFIC. The positive work of humanity will remain to be done—the seed to be sown—the harvest to be reaped. The law aims simply at preparing the way, by draining the swamps and destroying the weeds, so that the fertilizing elements of nature, and the agency of light, may effect their Divine mission. That great and glorious possibilities *are* enclosed within the womb of the Future, is at least our faith—and it has been the faith of prophets since the world began.

The greatest of the moral writers of America—CHANNING—has well apostrophized these material, mediocre minds.

"When will they learn that the great moral and religious ideas which have now seized on men's souls are the most efficient, durable forces acting in the world? *When will they learn that the past and present are not the future?*—but that the changes already

* The Scotch *Commonwealth*, which itself severely attacked the Scotch lecturer objects to our *English* assault as ABUSE!—and quotes against us TENNYSON'S verses 'anent' the 'falsehood of extremes.' Now, our reply did not concern the word 'extremes' at all, but the italicized word '*possibilities*'—so that the critic is quite at sea in his cock-boat of quotations.

wrought in society are only forerunners, signs, and springs of mightier revolutions? Politicians, absorbed in near objects, are prophets only on a small scale. They may foretell the issues of the next election—though even there they are often baffled; but the breaking out of a deep moral conviction in the mass of men is a mystery which *they* have little skill to interpret. Principles of a higher order are beginning to operate on society, and the dawn of these primal everlasting lights is a sure omen of a brighter day. *Politicians, seizing on the narrow, selfish principles of human nature, expect these to last for ever.* Would politicians study history with more care, they might learn, even from the dark times which are past, that the course of human events has been more determined, on the whole, by *great principles, by great emotions, by feeling, by enthusiasm*, than by selfish calculations or by selfish men. In the grandest epochs of history, what was it which won the victory? What were the mighty, all-prevailing powers? Not political management—not self-interest—not the lower principles of human nature—but the principles of freedom and religion, moral power, moral enthusiasm, and the Divine aspiration of the human soul. Great thoughts and great emotions have a place in human history, and the future is to be more determined by these than the past.”

It is not for peddling politicians to put limits to the ‘possibilities’ of social development, or bounds to the issues of human enthusiasm. The plumb-line of a common mind is too short for the great deeps of Humanity: much less can it traverse the space between the ‘extremes’ of Providence. Predicted to a Druid, the interval between the ancient and the modern Briton would to him have appeared as impossible an extreme as *our* genial Utopia appears to the frigid genius of the Member for Montrose. What then? The inspiration and enthusiasm which are now directed against the most tremendous enginery of social Obstruction and Calamity which the world has ever known, as it springs from strong and living hearts, will find its echo and response in the common heart of the People. Light will spread, until all grows luminous; truth will quicken enthusiasm, and enthusiasm evoke consistent action. The obstruction *shall* be overthrown—the curse *shall* be removed. So will free play be given to those thousand positive and benign agencies which ‘wait’ the advent of our great protective Law for the efficient commencement of their work.

Then comes the statelier EDEN back to men;
Then reign the world's great bridals, chaste and calm;
Then springs the crowning race of human kind.

May these things be! is at least THE AUTHOR'S fervent prayer.





