

Powerless for good but powerful for evil

An address by Albert Griffin to the Third Party Prohibitionists delivered in the Church of the Saviour in New York City, New York on October 6, 1887. Griffin, the Chairman of the Anti-Saloon Republican National Committee, focuses on temperance, economics, and politics in his speech.

Creator: Griffin, Albert

Date: October 06, 1887

Callnumber: K 178.5 Pam. V. 2

KSHS Identifier: DaRT ID: 211981

Item Identifier: 211981

www.kansasmemory.org/item/211981





DOCUMENT No. 12.

Powerless for Good but Powerful for Evil.

AN ADDRESS

— TO —

THIRD PARTY PROHIBITIONISTS

Delivered in the Church of the Saviour, N. Y. City, Oct. 6, 1887,

BY

ALBERT GRIFFIN,

Chairman of the Anti-Saloon Republican National Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND FELLOW CITIZENS: Knowing that, with the peacock element in our nature, one criticism outweighs a dozen commendations, public speakers naturally try to secure favor by saying only such things as will please their friends. Nevertheless, I feel impelled to-day to speak with a plainness that may offend some members of all parties. In truth, no party (and probably no individual) is either altogether right or altogether wrong, and we are apt to be unwisely sweeping in disapproval. If greater efforts were made to be exactly right in all things, the world in general, and ourselves in particular, would be the better for it; there would be less vice, and more virtue; less sorrow and more happiness. Will you not, then—on this occasion—try to resist angry impulses until you shall have heard my last word, and taken time for reflection.

I.

Hindering Helpers: The temperance cause can well say, with the satirist: "Save me from my friends; I can defend myself from my enemies," for its most grievous wounds are received from its advocates. Zeal without knowledge is as erratic as a headless fowl, while zeal impelled by erroneous ideas is more likely to injure than to benefit others. Some industrious and well meaning men pull up two plants for every seed they sow, but the resulting loss is as great as though they had been bent on mischief. The defence that "my intentions were good," may save a quack from the gallows, but will not restore life to his victim. The truth, when found, should be maintained fearlessly, but the genuine article must be sought for patiently, intelligently and honestly. It is always unwise, and often wicked, to close one's eyes against truth, but self-interest, vanity, prejudice, jealousy, disappointment and passion frequently do this for us. We would be nearer right than we are, if we are willing to be, "You cannot convince me," often means "you shall not." Most men are not entirely honest—even with themselves. We admit, in a general way, that we are not omniscient, but find it hard to act on that idea in particular instances: Like the pettifogger, we are inclined to "claim everything and admit nothing."

II.

Temperance Men have Two Lines of Work:—The first, is to induce individuals to become total abstainers, which can be done only by argument, persuasion and example. There is absolutely no other way, for *ideas and appetites cannot be changed by statute*, and this first line is the more repeated in the closing hours of legislatures, when the true

important, as the other results from and succeeds it.

The second, is the annihilation of the business of drunkard making, which is justified and made necessary by the fact that the appetite for liquor is largely created in and by the saloon and must be accomplished mainly by means of laws and courts. But men cannot be compelled to enact new laws. It requires a majority of a Legislative body to do that, and, as such majority can be rightly obtained only by argument and persuasion, every word and act that strengthens the opposition is a blow at the temperance cause—and such blows do as much harm when dealt by friends as when they come from foes. The one essential preliminary to success on this line, is for the enemies of the saloon to procure a plurality of votes at the polls. The all-important question, therefore, is, How can such a plurality be most easily and quickly secured? And any policy which makes it more difficult of attainment is self-evidently unsound, no matter how plausible the reasoning may appear which sustains it. "By their fruits shall ye know them," is as true in the political and social as in the physical and moral world. Though as beautiful as the apples of Sodom, if the fruit is noxious, the tree should be condemned. The traveler in the desert saves the life of his child, by using the water raising machine already provided, instead of wasting time trying to induce unwilling men to make and substitute a new one, or an untried model. And, in like manner, in the political world, it is sometimes best to submit, for a time, to vexatious delays and serious wastes in order to avert greater ills.

Do you appreciate fully the drift of these preliminary remarks—that, in discussing any phase of the temperance question, a kindly spirit is all important, even when dreadful facts have to be stated with appalling plainness? Remembering that clubs are not trumps in this work, and that a child's tear, dropped on a brawny hand or bloated face, may melt a heart that bluster would only harden, I ask you to go with me through this discussion, not as a partisan, carper or cynic, but as a real searcher after truth.

III.

How to make Success Possible:—The saloon question is, in my opinion, by far the most important political problem now in process of settlement—but it is not the only one needing attention. Those that are of less consequence, and course, be subordinated to it, but not devoted be ignored. The real one is a mistaken, ma- They know what I say is and should not allow those whose conduct



Powerless for good but powerful for evil

2

cessful advocate, even when his idea is a good one, for his absorption separates him from his fellows, and arouses so many antagonisms that he repels more than he draws. The farmer with several crops growing, may give the most of his time to to one of them, but he will not entirely neglect any, except in case of necessity. As a matter of fact, three-fourths of our voters do not agree with any one of us in our estimate of the relative importance of public questions. The tariff, currency, banking, protection of the ballot box, woman suffrage, civil service reform, control of corporations, labor laws, land tenure, public schools, immigration, transportation, postal telegraphs, civil rights, and a score of other questions, all demanding immediate solution, are each important—and each is, by some, considered pre-eminently so. If each voter were indifferent to all but his own specialty, there could be no progress. It would belike a multitude of horses hitched independently to a wagon, whose wild attempts to draw in different directions causes inextricable confusion, if not disaster. Political success is possible only when the advocates of several measures, based on or springing from the same fundamental ideas or characteristics, are drawn together and welded into a compact whole.

In politics, as in everything else, where joint action is necessary, a spirit of compromise is essential. Those who claim that they never compromise err, for without compromises free Government would be impossible, nor could any voluntary organization prosper. Indeed, society and the family relation itself, would soon cease to exist. The man who persistently insists on having his own way, at all times, is not prompted by an extra amount of honesty or independence, but by a superabundance of egotism or selfishness. The jurymen who refused to consent to the omission of one item from a bill, thought by eleven to be unjust, and which was afterward found to have been inserted by mistake, wished that he had had less self-conceit and mulishness when he learned that destitution, resulting from his attempt to "make others come to him," was the probable cause of the death of the plaintiff's wife and child, but his regrets lifted not the load he had placed on crushed hearts. When acting singly, and sharing responsibility with no one, we must proceed upon our own judgment, but, when concert of action is necessary, we should be willing to advance or recede, when conscience and the interests of humanity will permit—and should be very careful not to let self-interest, prejudice or resentment, call themselves "conscience," nor transform molehills into mountains. A thousand men who wished to rescue the starving occupants of a cluster of islands agreed that it was their duty to adopt whatever plan would secure the best results. Fifty proposed to fill the main channel, (which was the shortest route, and was also admitted by nearly all to be the best, if practicable,) but the others insisted that the current there was too strong to be overcome, at that time, and voted to take a longer route, to where there were several small channels, instead of one large one. The small band insisted that its plan, or none, must be adopted—the consequence being that some who would have helped the main body became disgusted and retired. Weakened, but determined, those who remained, struggled on, and, though their progress was slower than it would have been if all had helped, they succeeded at last and saved some. Can there be any doubt as to which set deserved the most commendation? Do not misunderstand me. I urge compromises only as to non-essentials, or when it is plainly necessary in order to avert evil or secure good. That is, the right must be the gainer—be left in better shape than it would be without concessions.

IV.

Party—but a sacred
bishop has a right

to use it to gratify grudges or whims. It should be used solely for the public good, and those who dispose of it wrongly are political embezzlers. The law gives each man the power to vote rightly or wrongly, but he is morally responsible to his fellowmen—and to God—for the manner in which he discharges his duty as a citizen. It is every citizen's duty to vote, and to make his vote accomplish as much good as possible.

V.

Responsibility Cannot be Evaded.—Morally, as well as legally, men are presumed to intend the natural results of their acts, and are, therefore, responsible for them. To this rule, there are but two possible exceptions. The first is ignorance, or a different intention, illustrated by the hunter, who aimed at what he supposed to be the wattles of a turkey in the bushes, and killed his friend, who had on a red neck-tie; and the other is insanity, illustrated by the murderer, who believed he was doing the will of God when he killed his children. Moreover, the presumption, and responsibility, are the same for refusing to discharge duties, as for actually doing wrong acts. The watchman, who seeing enemies approach an open gate, remains passive, is as truly a traitor as the gate opener himself. Let me try to impress these important principles upon you indelibly. Much can often be said in palliation of wrong acts and needless failures, but they never can be justified—made right. If the natural consequences of a proposed act are evil, it must be wrong to perpetrate it. The act and its known legitimate consequences cannot be separated, and a sane individual who denies, or tries to shirk, responsibility for what he knew would probably follow his acts, will fail—but will personate a coward remarkably well. Need I add that these principles apply to political matters as forcibly as they do to business and social affairs, and that, when inclined to run counter to them, men should honestly enquire if their impelling motives are not passion, prejudice, ambition, laziness or self-interest? As this is one of the most important divisions of my subject, I trust you will weigh it well. God holds the minister and church member to as strict a responsibility for his acts as he does the libertine, rogue and murderer.

VI.

The Political Aims of Temperance Men are:
1. The suppression of the drink traffic, wherever and whenever possible; and
2. Its greatest possible restriction at all other times and places.

Does any one answer, "I will accept nothing but absolute prohibition?" If so, he can hardly mean it. That would be like saying no effort shall be made to save life, until the best known remedy can be obtained, even though death must ensue in the interim; and, if there is such a moral idiot here, I have no time to waste on him. Unfortunately, however, many men appear to act on that hypothesis, and, to the extent that they do so, help to protect the saloon and oppress its victims. Some may think this harsh, but it is unadulterated truth. Let us consider now how these desired ends can be best promoted.

VII.

Temperance Divisions: Much—very much—has been accomplished on non-partisan lines in the past, and may be in the future, especially at the South, but, in nearly, if not quite in all Northern States, other methods must hereafter be generally relied on to secure needed legislation. The liquor power is now so thoroughly organized, politically, and used so aggressively, that it can be speedily overthrown only by meeting it with a larger political force equally well disciplined.

There are temperance men in all parties. By far the largest number are Republicans, the next largest body are Democrats, and then com-



Powerless for good but powerful for evil

3

the Independent Prohibitionists and smaller factions. While they remain thus divided, they are comparatively powerless, and a still further division would necessarily weaken instead of strengthening the cause. Concentration is all-important, and, as we must operate through some party, it is important to ascertain through which one the work can be best and most speedily accomplished.

VIII.

Pharisees. Answered: Some light will be thrown on this problem, by answering the question, "Who enacted the temperance laws already on our statute books?"

Democratic Legislatures have submitted Prohibitory Constitutional Amendments in North Carolina, Texas and Tennessee, and Republican Legislatures in Kansas, Iowa, Ohio, Maine, Rhode Island and Oregon. The proposition was defeated in North Carolina, Texas, Ohio, Michigan, Tennessee and Oregon, and was adopted in Kansas, Iowa, Maine and Rhode Island,—fully five-sixths of the affirmative votes in each Northern State being cast by Republicans.

For years, all Southern Legislatures have been decidedly Democratic, made so, in most cases, by methods and laws under which free and fair elections (as we understand those terms) are unknown. Republican party platforms there, for the past two years, at least, have been more favorable to temperance legislation than those adopted by the Democrats, but most of the temperance work has been done, and temperance votes cast by Democrats. It is, however, impossible to even approximate what would be the relative position of the two parties if each had an equally fair chance. I shall, therefore, in this address confine my remarks to the North, except when the South is specifically mentioned.

Of the rest of the Union, it can be truly said that, since the birth of the Republican party, much the largest part of the votes for each and every law passed, amended or repealed, in the interest of temperance and against saloon opposition were cast by Republican legislators; and that much the largest proportion of the votes against each and every law passed, amended or repealed in the interest of the saloon and against the opposition of the temperance element, were also cast by Republicans; while the Democratic record, in each and every case, is exactly the reverse. I do not believe a solitary exception can be found to this statement.

The assertion sometimes heard, that "Republicans have repealed more temperance laws than they have passed," that "they have passed more laws in the interest of the saloon than against it," and that "the record of each of the old parties is equally bad," are infamous libels, without even plausible foundations, and those who make them are disgracefully ignorant or wilful falsifiers. I do not, of course, claim, that Republicans have always been a unit for temperance and Democrats a unit for the saloon—for party lines have not generally been strictly drawn on this question, and there are many bad Republicans and a large number of good Democrats—but no intelligent, honest man will hesitate to endorse the statements I have made; and they are true, even when Republican Legislatures have passed bad laws and those controlled by Democrats have enacted good ones. When called to account, the defense made by the ignorant or unprincipled pettifoggers and Pharisees to whom I have referred, established the following points:

1. That many of their statements of facts are bald inventions.

2. That the most of the acts they now charge against Republicans as crimes, were committed when they belonged to the party, and often had their outspoken or implied approval when perpetrated.

3. Some good laws have been emasculated or repealed, and bad ones enacted surreptitiously or in the closing hours of legislatures, when the

mass of members, not knowing what they were doing, might be justly charged with carelessness, but not with intentional wrong.

4. Some measures which were approved by a large majority of temperance men when enacted are now asserted to have been passed in the interest, and at the dictation, of the saloon.

5. Whenever a large or small body of temperance Republicans approve of, or consent to, temporary measures that a portion of the saloon fraternity accept, under compulsion, it is claimed that no more evidence is needed that "the party has sold out to the saloon," but, when reminded that the entire liquor fraternity and Third Party machine worked to secure the same result in the last New York Legislature, they feel insulted at the inference which such joint action suggests. In short, they are not willing to be judged by the rules they lay down for others, or concede to them the liberty or judgment of action they demand for themselves.

6. They assume that the millions of temperance men who favor or consent to laws they reject, prove thereby that they "care more for party than they do for the home," although they think it all right for themselves to allow saloon men to defeat prohibition Republicans rather than diminish by one vote the election returns of their own party. Sauce for our goose is never sauce for their gander.

7. Whenever Democrats, North or South, vote to submit constitutional prohibition propositions, which they do not intend to support at the polls, or vote for local option, high license or any other restrictive measure, or extol non-partisan methods, it is all right, and lovely, and beautiful, but when Republicans do the same things they are described as cowardly trucklers, hypocrites or "sworn allies of the saloon." That is, the character of the judgment depends not on the act but on the party to which the defendant belongs.

8. The Republican party, as a whole, is held responsible for the wrong acts of a minority of its members, no matter how small, but is given no credit for those of the majority, even when it approximates unanimity; while, on the other hand, the Democratic party, as a whole, is credited with the commendable acts of its minority, no matter how insignificant, but is not held responsible for the wrong acts of its majority no matter how overwhelming. If, in a Legislature with a Democratic majority of two, three Democrats unite with every Republican and pass a temperance law, it is heralded as proof that the Democrats have been foully misrepresented; but when the Republicans have a majority of two, and three of them help the Democrats to favor the saloon, it is referred to as evidence "the Republicans are as closely bound to the saloon as the Democrats."

9. It is assumed that Republican Legislators are simply puppets and, when any of them vote wrong, it is charged that it was done "by command of the leaders, who could have secured different results if they had desired." In short, whenever unbridled anger or vicious cunning can conceive of a possible wrong motive for a right act in a Republican, or invent some pretext for giving others the credit for it, it is done; and whenever even a flimsy pretext can be found for falsely charging them with wrong, it is seized upon with avidity.

Some of the Pharisees who do these things are leading lights in your party. They go up and down the land, proclaiming their "devotion to the cause," and thanking God that they are not like other men; no not even like those millions of church members and ministers who are more anxious to help, prevent or ameliorate sufferings than to pose as leaders of this a new party. Fortunately, this class is not as large as many suppose. The most of the leaders as well as the rank and file, of your party are honest and devoted men, and it is to this honest, but mistaken, majority that I appeal. They know what I say is true, and should not allow those whose conduct



justifies my strictures to occupy positions which give color to their claims of leadership.

While legislative records establish a very strong presumption, they are not conclusive as to what may be expected in the future. Let us, therefore, examine the character and tendencies of parties as now constituted.

IX.

Present Democratic Attitude: The last Democratic National Convention took ground openly for the saloon, and, as its candidate especially endorsed that plank, they committed the party to that side in every State that has not repudiated it—and there is no such State. On the contrary, ten State Conventions added resolutions of their own, and nearly, if not quite, all the others have specifically endorsed the national platform.

An overwhelming majority of the liquor sellers and manufacturers have been Democrats, and now it appears certain that all will become active members of it within a year, at the latest. No one who has any appreciation of the influence of the saloon keepers over party primaries can fail to realize the gravity of this fact. Indeed, the party has, at the North, almost ceased to struggle against the tightening folds of this monstrous anaconda.

There is, however, a large and increasing number of temperance Democrats, but they advocate non-partisan methods, and are either opposed to prohibition, or have so little faith in it, that they cannot be induced to join the Prohibition party—especially while it is so weak as to be powerful only for evil. At the South they are doing splendid work, and deserve hearty commendation, but at the North they are not numerous enough to seriously influence their party. They will not join us so long as our party retains saloon keepers, by satisfying them, in any way, that its success will not hurt their business, but many of them will do so, as soon as the lines are distinctly drawn and publicly avowed. Since the vote on Prohibition in Texas, there are many indications that the Southern Democratic leaders are preparing to commit their party openly against the policy of Prohibition.

X.

Some Minor Parties:—The United Labor, Union Labor, Socialists, Greenback, American, Anti-Secret Society, and other small parties, are divided, but in what proportions cannot be ascertained. They fluctuate greatly, and it is not claimed that any one of them can be trusted to overthrow the saloon power.

XI.

Present Republican Attitude:—Without an exception, every Republican platform utterance on the saloon question that I have seen has been against that business. Some of them have been tame, or somewhat ambiguous, but their learning has always been to the temperance side. In six States, Republicans have enacted, and the party now sustains prohibitory laws, and everywhere the sentiment among its members in favor of more effective legislation against the saloon evil, and a more rigid enforcement of laws, steadily increases. The stronger the party in any State, the more radical is the position it takes on that subject. Nor will these facts surprise any one who recalls its past history, and remembers the elements of which it was originally composed—the bulk of which still remains in it.

Three-quarters of the Republicans of the North are opposed to saloons, but, unfortunately, the remaining fourth, which sympathizes more or less decidedly with or is afraid of them, has heretofore furnished three-quarters of the office-seekers and party managers. Indeed, in all parties, this last class consists largely of those who have some personal end in view. Many of them are honorable men, but others being thoroughly unscrupulous, make promises they have no thought

and when in spite of their industry, finesse, duplicity and downright swindling, temperance men are nominated, unite with dramsellers to betray while pretending to support them. In short, it is, with them, a game of "heads they win and tails we lose."

No honest man, conversant with political history, will deny any of these statements, and no sensible man ought to be surprised that hundreds of thousands of anti-saloon Republicans have become so indignant at such acts, persistently repeated, that they will no longer submit to them. They will not allow a small minority to drive them out of the party they love, but intend to boldly repudiate improper methods and candidates, and to hold no further political fellowship with those in whose interest these crimes are committed. This policy of avowed hostility to the business of dramselling, and to all laws and candidates that are acceptable to dramsellers, is fast being accepted by all party managers who take counsel of their brains instead of their prejudices. Some do this joyfully, their sympathies being strongly on the right side, while others make a virtue of necessity, seeing that the current has become irresistible. They know that, if they refuse to accept the inevitable, the next step with temperance Republicans must be to "smash all unsound and nerveless machines and make new ones," and, admitting, as they do, the truth of the statement that "the Anti-saloon Republican movement has thus far been managed with wise caution, consummate skill and dauntless courage," they realize that it cannot be successfully resisted, and that the best interests of the party—as well as their own—will be promoted by giving it a hearty support.

The liquor dealers see clearly that the Republican party is against them, and are hastening events by publicly proclaiming the tactics they have long pursued in secret. The *Public Leader*, of Detroit, Mich., a recognized saloon organ, lately published an article headed and italicized as follows:

SLAUGHTER.

Legislators whom liquor dealers must black list. Twenty-four Senators and fifty-one Representatives voted for local option who must be politically killed—The same must be done by the men voting high license.

If the time is ever to come when liquor dealers must take some steps to protect their interests in the State, that period has now arrived. A fierce and implacable hostility toward the liquor traffic was manifested by a majority of the members of the legislature, particularly on the Republican side. There were many men, under more than one obligation to the members of the trade, who worked hard and voted steadily against the latter's interests. The names of all these must be taken, so that when the day of reckoning comes stern and merciless retribution can be meted out to them.

No liquor dealer can conscientiously support or vote for a man who would deliberately stab him in the back. This is exactly what each and every member of the legislature has done by voting for the local option law, and we call upon the whole body of the liquor trade in the State to remember the following names, and blacklist those persons to whom they belong, through time and eternity.

[Then come the names and the following:]

Pretty nearly the same men who voted for the local option bill also voted for the high license.

It makes no difference what excuse any of these men have to make in explanation of their votes, all the liquor dealers want to know is, that they voted as they did, and that should be sufficient to blast their political prospects forever, as far as the liquor vote is concerned.

The Germans of Philadelphia organized a powerful society, and the same paper says of its constitution:

It is also provided that in each political canvass every candidate shall be questioned by a committee of the society regarding his temperance views; and in case candidates are endorsed by the society, every member is bound to vote for them at the polls.

Two objects are, therefore, held in view: To have a bureau for constantly manufacturing citizens of the United States who can be counted on for the cause of liquor, out of raw material sent here by Germany; and to strike down every temperance candidate at the polls, and thus drive political parties into repealing all the laws that really hurt the liquor traffic.



The Wine, Beer and Liquor Dealers' Association of New York, in a published manifesto, says of itself:

It is organized to protect ourselves from the enactment of unjust and fanatical laws, and to urge the repeal of such laws. In the furtherance of such object we hereby pledge ourselves to lay aside all political preferences, and to defeat any and all candidates for offices of public trust who will not give us such equitable laws as we, as good citizens and honest merchants, are entitled to.

Patrick H. Butler, President of the Brooklyn Liquor Dealers' Association, after the adjournment of the New York Republican State Convention, said:

"We intend to pitch in and work for the Democracy. We have 1,700 members, and we control a lot of votes. We are going to organize on a political basis, and make every man in the business a working Democrat."

It is foolish for Republicans, and wicked for Third party men, to try to make themselves believe that "this isn't much of a shower." Here and there individual Democrats will suffer, but the blows are aimed at the Republican party. A few Republican dramsellers may stand out for a while, but the number will be small, and some of those will simply be spies. The influences at work are so strong that it can be safely assumed that, in a very short time, every man pecuniarily interested in the liquor business, who does not care more Republicanism than he does for his business, will be "a working Democrat." And, therefore, every opponent of Democracy ought to fight the saloons and every opponent of the saloons ought to fight the Democratic party.

XII.

The Third Party:—The Third (or Prohibition) party was organized ostensibly to fight the drink traffic, and its advocates, think all sincere opponents of that business should join them. It has only that one avowed object, and insists that all other political aims and ideas must be entirely ignored, or kept in the background, until the drink traffic shall have been suppressed, no matter how long a time that may take, and the several million honest Prohibitionists who are too deeply interested in other issues, or too hopeless of speedy success on this line, to approve such a policy are excluded, blackballed as it were. Moreover, the millions who, for different reasons, are not willing to reject any any every practical method of dealing with the saloon except absolute and immediate prohibition, without regard to consequences, are also fenced out. If its builders had desired to organize a political machine that would be as "lovely to look upon" as a toy engine, and as worthless, they could not have acted more wisely. As a matter of fact, the most of its leaders freely admit, in conversation (and sometimes publicly) that they do not expect their party ever to become strong enough to carry elections, and suppress the drink traffic, but they do hope that it will destroy the Republican party, after which another can be organized to suppress the saloon. A fair statement of their real aims would, therefore, seem to be:

1. The destruction of the Republican party.
2. The formation of a new party.
3. The destruction of the saloon.

No wonder dramsellers smile serenely over a policy that promises them absolute security until so much shall have been done. Let me say, right here, however, that, in spite of what seems to be the idiotic folly of their plans, and the wickedness of the work they have already done, and are still doing, I do not question either the intelligence or honesty of most of the members of the Third party. Some (including a few of the most influential) are thoroughly bad, yet, as a whole, the party averages higher, in moral character and motives, than any other political organization. But a vastly greater number of equally sincere and intelligent individuals once believed that a friend's story

was a divine institution; and at another time a still larger number thought they were doing the will of God when they murdered each other for conscience's sake; and, as ten times their number, of those who are their equals, in every respect, condemn their course, the merely larger percentage of intelligence and honesty in a small party carries no presumption in favor of the soundness of its position against the immensely larger aggregate of those qualifications in other organizations.

XIII.

Necessary Calamitous Results:—The first necessary effect of the organization of your party is to still further divide the friends of temperance, and consequently to diminish their power at the polls. The voters who constituted it are taken from rivals, and, of course, leave the temperance element in them that much weaker because of their abandonment; and so long as it remains a third, or even a second party, its growth must necessarily increase the present security of the saloon. The importance of this fact, which must be admitted by every one, can hardly be overestimated. Those who join your party practically abandon the political field to dramsellers, for the present, for all except parade purposes, and risk the temporal and eternal welfare of millions upon the chance of swelling an insignificant minority, into a majority at some more or less distant period in the future; to do which they must first destroy a compact, well disciplined and enthusiastic party, twenty times their size, and then gather its fragments with parts of others, and fuse them into a victorious host. These hopes of accomplishing wonderful things in the vague future, after impossible events shall have occurred, are as illusive as the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, which children hopefully, but vainly, trudge after—but, in this case, the consequences of the waste of time and power, are simply terrible—and must be borne by those who already carry crushing loads.

Nor is this the worst feature of the case. Another equally inevitable and deplorable result is that the opponents of the saloon had been set to fighting each other. As a new party can be built up only by tearing others down, its call for recruits must be predicated upon their alleged incompetency or unworthiness, and therefore, the necessities of the situation compels champions of the new parties to attack those parties already in existence. Many, undoubtedly try to be, honest and fair in their criticisms, but the average partisan, in every party, is carping in tone, or misleading in statement, even when he does not intentionally lie. One unscrupulous advocate makes a statement he knows is false, or about which he knows nothing, and others, greedy for anything that will "injure the opposition," circulate it as a well established fact. The members of your party are no worse, in these respects, than other men, but they are not left far behind. They certainly play a strong game, for beginners, and, if anything, some of your D. D.'s take the lead. It sometimes seems as though no story can be invented that is too vile, or improbable, for them to swallow and eructate. As a matter of course, these attacks are resented, and the assailants repaid, with interest. Recrimination follows erimination, bitterness engenders bitterness, and gross libels are answered with groundless slanders. Unfortunately, there is a great deal of truth, as well as error, in what both sides say, but, no matter how black Mrs. Kettle is, she is sure "to hurl back with scorn the base insinuations and infamous charges" presented by Madame Pot. If the consequences of this state of things were not so deplorable, it would be amusing to note the assumption of righteous indignation with which some members of the Third party, who commenced the wordy war, with a savageness that would have done credit to pirates on the stage, now as weak-eyed martyrs, whose reputations are

Powerless for good but powerful for evil

6

being murdered "simply because they are trying to persuade men to unite against the terrible drink traffic." Misrepresentation, falsehood and abuse are never justifiable—no, not even "when answering back"—but, I submit that, if anything they look blacker than usual, when coming from those who claim to be a select party of extra good men, laboring in a holy cause. The better the cause and the higher the plane on which an individual assumes to live, the fairer do we expect him to be.

XIV.

A Dishonest Defense:—The influence for evil of these necessary results of attempts to build up a new party is greatly enhanced by another fact. A party organized solely to fight the liquor traffic should put forth its chief efforts where that traffic is strongest, and should certainly be careful to do nothing that would increase the strength of its enemy, but the most of your party's work is done where the saloon power is comparatively weak, and would be defeated but for your labors, the often avowed reason for which strange course is that, "in those localities, it can do the most harm to the Republican party." Do not get angry with me, friend, if you do not like this, for it is not my work. The facts are, that the Third Party machines do the greater part of their work in States which would be Republican but for those efforts, and in the Republican strongholds of those States. No one but a professional liar will deny this statement. Nor is it a mere coincidence, but a matter of design. Moreover, their speakers and writers, say ten times as much against the Republican party as they do against the Democratic,—and say it more venomously. Indeed, the little they say against the latter is of a perfunctory character, and, whenever the Democratic party (which they acknowledge is a whiskey party) is enabled by them to gain a victory, many of them rejoice over the result as a triumph for themselves, exactly as Copperheads did during the war when the Union forces were defeated—and they do this even when the defeated Republican candidate was an ardent Prohibitionist and the victorious Democrat an avowed saloon defender.

Because of this spirit, and its results, Democratic papers and speakers, aid and encourage your party. The spirit of their comments is always in harmony with that of the *Boston Post* which said, "in practical politics, the mission of the Prohibitionists is that of a thorn in the side of the Republican party." In short, the actual attitude of these theoretically implacable enemies is that of "you tickle me and I'll tickle you." The reasons by which this course is defended are substantially as follows:

"The saloon can be destroyed only by a party which has prohibition for its chief aim. Neither of the old parties can be induced to honestly espouse the cause of prohibition—therefore, one or both, must be disintegrated, and we don't care which; but, as only temperance men will join our party, we can most easily destroy the one that contains the most of them, and will also ourselves gain the most recruits by doing so. Therefore, as most temperance men are Republicans, we propose to destroy it first."

Without stopping to show that, as a part of the above premises are unsound, the conclusion falls, is it enough to say that this defense is not honest. It is a misleading subterfuge. Do you think this is an unwarranted charge? Look at the facts. Your advocates never tire of asserting that, while at the North most temperance men are Republicans, at the South they are Democrats. Therefore, if the reasons given were the really controlling ones, they would assail Democrats at the South as vehemently as they do Republicans at the North, but this is not their custom. At the North, their denunciation of Republicans is unceasing, and often unchristian in spirit, while at the South, their speakers gen-

erally has a right

ground, or touch it very lightly, and, in what they do say, manifest an entirely different animus from that which they exhibit at the North, and are more severe on Republicans than on Democrats.

One of their staple arguments with young men is, that "a new party is needed to break the solid South," but, instead of trying in real earnest to break it, they hold a dozen or twenty meetings in the North for every one held in the South. They assert that the harvest is ripe in that section, but make very slight efforts to gather it in. They claim that they can do wonders down there, but their attempts are few and feeble. In 1884, the sixteen Southern States cast 14,792 votes for St. John, of which Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Arkansas and Louisiana, (nine States) gave only 2,142; and to-day their party cuts no figure, to speak of, in any except Maryland, Kentucky and Texas, and but an insignificant one in them.

Let me repeat the statement that the defense is not honest, and to add that the most active Third Party machines are controlled by coteries of men and women, the most of whom, for different reasons, hate the Republican party so intensely that some would not hesitate to give it a stab, even if they knew that by so doing they would retard the progress of prohibition, while others are so prejudiced that they prefer not to see, or so blind that they cannot. A baser reason is sometimes given, but I prefer to believe it is the controlling motive with but few.

It is not surprising that temperance Republicans, finding themselves and their party misrepresented and maligned, and the grip of the saloon power on the Government strengthened by men and women who claim for each other superior sanctity and "devotion to the cause" have been greatly disturbed in spirit. Some were grieved, but others became angry and met injustice with injustice, and mud with mud. And what was worse still, a large number, who had embraced prohibition views, or were almost converted, identified that cause with their assailants, who used it as a shield or mantel, and, in their blind rage, arrayed themselves against both. That this was foolish as well as wrong, goes without saying, but, as long as human nature remains unchanged, such conduct will bear similar fruit. Is it reasonable to suppose that the saloon can be destroyed by a party that can be built up only by methods which necessarily produce such results as I have referred to? If you think so consider some other facts.

XV.

Powerless for Good, but Powerful for Evil:—I am not excited, and do not exaggerate when I say that, in my judgment, the Third Party is more dangerous to the cause of prohibition than was the old man of the mountain to those on whose shoulders he perched. But for it, the laws against saloon would be more stringent in most States than they are, several others would have adopted prohibition, and that cause would have several hundred thousand more aggressive advocates than it now has. Pressure from outside has undoubtedly caused some politicians to advance, but pressure from inside would have been much more effective, in that direction, but for the fierce animosities you have aroused in those who already were or would have become friends. Sound reasoning in favor of the prohibition method of dealing with saloons is always likely to do good, no matter from whence it comes, but I do not believe all the arguments ever delivered in favor of a Prohibition party, has caused one believer in saloons to become their enemy. If a balance could be struck between the good and evil done by the Third party agitation, the evil would probably predominate over the good a hundred to one. No matter how much you may regret it, the cold truth is that, so long as the next largest body to minority the Prohibition



party is and must be practically powerless for good but exceedingly powerful for evil. It claims to, and does, hold the balance of power in some localities, but it always so uses that power that the candidate most favorable to the saloon is elected, and the only party committed to the saloon triumphs. If told, a year before joining that party, that you would ever act thus, would you not have asked, with the prophet, "Is thy servant a dog that he should do these things?" In spite of all quibblers and sophistries, the fact remains that the only candidates and the only party that have reason to thank you for benefits received are those who are first, last and all the time for the saloon and against prohibition. Do you not know that this is true? Twist and turn as you may, the appalling fact stares every one of you in the face that, as now managed, and at the present time, your party is a saloon protecting and perpetuating party,—and, because of that fact, Democrats and dramsellers smile upon and encourage you. They are very much opposed to and afraid of prohibition, as a measure, but have not the slightest apprehension that the Prohibition party can ever control a single State; and knowing that it weakens the only one they dread, they help it in every way they can—except with votes. It should be added that, when liquor dealers expend money and form combinations for the protection of their business, it is the measure of prohibition that they dread and fight, and not the Prohibition party. Denials will do no good here, for the facts are too notorious.

It is not strange that Third party men try to shirk responsibility for such acts, but they cannot. It sticks to them as closely as the shirt of Nessus. When a man asserts that every other political issue should be subordinated to that of the "destruction of the dramshop," and then deliberately and systematically pursues a course he knows is likely to cause the defeat of honest enemies of the saloon and the success of its defenders—and, being pleased with such results, claims them as victories—no amount of logic chopping, hairsplitting or mental squirming can clear his skirts of responsibility for resulting sin and misery. It was his duty to so use his ballot as to secure the best possible result, but, instead of doing that, he used it so as to produce the worst possible (present) result, and the substance of his excuse is, that he hoped the thistles he planted would produce figs, at some future day. With due respect, I must be permitted to say that humanity would be the gainer if such men had less faith and more common sense. The man, who, seeing several children drowning, refuses to rescue one within his reach, because his neighbors had refused to make the draining of the pond, by his pet plan, the sole issue at their town election, is as responsible for the single death he could have prevented as though he had thrown the child in himself. If the pond ought to be drained, he should constantly urge others to help him secure that result, but he should not allow his preference for his own plan to lead him to put in power those who are opposed to draining by any plan.

XVI.

Some Chilling Figures:—To break the force of such arguments as the foregoing, it is assumed that the amount of good which the party will do when it obtains control of the Government, will be so great as to warrant present sacrifices made to hasten "the good time coming." But, unfortunately, the practical effect of the effort to build a party on that idea, is to postpone prohibition for a long time, if not forever. The average mind rejects the arguments in its favor, and the average heart is shocked by the ideas enunciated and methods used by its advocates: so that, in the future, as in the past, it is likely to be powerless for good and powerful only for evil. Its leaders, ignoring the best known laws of human nature, and the teachings of history, delude their followers with hopes founded on mis-

conceptions, downright misrepresentations and ecstatic visions. Let us now examine a few of their points.

Only one party can elect its candidate, and, at fair elections, the party that polls the most votes is successful. Some of our Prohibition party friends gravely claim that they expect to elect a President in 1892—five years hence. Their party has been organizing eighteen years, and, in the following table, their presidential vote is taken from "The Political Prohibitionist," published by *The Voice*.

	1872	1876	1880	1884
Total vote cast....	6,438,149	8,426,273	9,215,947	10,067,610
Prohibition vote...	5,607	9,737	9,678	150,626
" per cent.	.09	.12	.10	1.49

Compared with itself, the Third party-vote has thus increased 2,686 per cent. in twelve years, which sounds big enough to make an enthusiast's eyes bulge. But when we reflect that this is only an increase of from about one in one thousand and voters to about fifteen in one thousand, the real hopelessness of the movement becomes apparent. But, it is suggested, that between 1880 and 1884 the Third party-vote increased nearly four hundred per cent. per annum. If such an increase could go on compounding, the party would soon triumph, but even feather-heads do not claim that it will. The "Political Prohibitionist" gives the vote for 1886 at 294,853, with five states not voting, upon which a claim is made that the present strength of the party is 300,000. The figures are misleading, but, allowing them to stand, the previous four hundred per cent. rate of increase is already reduced to fifty. How long can it run down at that rate before it digs a hole in the ground? But, if this percentage test is disheartening, try another. The annual increase in votes cast was as follows: from 1872 to 1876—978; from 1876 to 1880—(a loss of) 17; from 1880 to 1884—(gain) 35,014; and 75,000 (claimed) each of the next two years.

It must be remembered, however, that the Third party does not do all the growing. While it was increasing 145,020, between 1872 and 1884, the Republican party, which it imagines it is grinding to powder, between its upper and lower pebbles, increased 1,254,901, and the total vote swelled 3,636,461. The Republican increase from 1880 to 1884 was only 23,083 less than it was during the preceding four years, when it was 16,500 less than during Grant's last term. In spite of the powerful influences which operated against the Republican party from 1876 to 1884 (some of the most potent of which have ceased to exist, or spent their force, while favorable ones have set in), its lowest annual increase of votes cast and counted was 93,391. The problem before you, therefore, is to destroy the Republican party, which cast 4,851,981 votes in 1884, and is growing more than 100,000 a year, and to increase your own vote of 150,626 in 1884 enough to defeat the Democratic party, which cast 4,874,986 votes that year, whose normal growth is about 74,000 per annum, and which, should the Republican party be dissolved, would be largely increased by the absorption of its saloon and angry elements. And yet, in the face of such arctic figures, men who ought to know better, perambulate the country filling visionary or unthinking women and men with the idea that, if they only blow their trumpet notes of defiance long enough, and loud enough, the old parties will crumble to pieces as did the walls of Jericho when the hosts of Joshua tooted their rams' horns.

XVII.

Significant Facts about Parties:—The new party *ignis fatuus* annually leads large numbers of Americans to waste their time on barren moors, and risk their reputations, as well as the best interests of the country, in deceptive quagmires. It is as easy to start a new party as it is to put a new horse on the race course, but there is only one Maud S. and only one Republican party in America. Out of the same nature of parties that



Powerless for good but powerful for evil

8

have made the effort, in the hundred years of our national history, only four have come anywhere near carrying the country on a popular vote, and only two have died after electing a President. Successful parties are never laboriously manufactured, but come into existence almost spontaneously. No party ever obtained power that was born when there were two strong ones in existence, and no party ever carried the country that occupied the third rank in its first national contest. Successful parties have always represented general tendencies, rather than specific measures, the hopeful, progressive courageous, optimistic elements giving character to the one, and the conservative, pessimistic and reactionary forces to the other.

The present "Democratic" party is the old "Republican" party under a new name. The "Federal" party opposed the war of 1812 in such a spirit as to become obnoxious and quietly dissolved. After several years, during which there was but one party, the "National Republican" party was organized, and soon afterwards took the name of "Whig." It was, however, a child of misfortune, electing only two Presidents, both of whom died, and the Vice-Presidents who succeeded them deserted those who had honored them. It was not killed by either the Abolition or Republican party, but died of dry-rot, hastened by the political fungus known as the Know-Nothing party, which was invented in 1853, and had a Jonah's gourd-like existence for a few years. The Republican party, which was born in 1854, gave Fremont 1,341,264 votes in 1880, to 1,838,169 votes for Buchanan (Dem.) and 874,532 for Fillmore, candidate of the already disintegrating Know-Nothings. Mr. Lincoln could not, however, have been elected but for the insufferable arrogance of the slave oligarchy, which caused a division of the Democratic vote between Douglass and Breckinridge, and so disgusted many of its members, who cared but little about slavery, that they joined the Republicans to teach the Slaveocrats a lesson; and the further fact that the Know-Nothing party still had vitality enough to poll 589,591 votes. Even as it was, the Democrats would have regained power at the next election, and retained it indefinitely, if the Southern Democrats had not preferred secession. Allow me to say here, that the parallel sometimes drawn between the Republican and Whig parties is misleading. Although a majority of the Northern Whigs, and a few of the Southern, disliked slavery, yet, prior to the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, even a moderate anti-slavery platform would have swept it out of existence in the South and reduced it to a hopeless minority in nearly every Northern State—and when that bill passed it was in its coffin. While, on the contrary, a conservative but decided anti-saloon stand would strengthen the Republican party immediately in some States and weaken it permanently in none.

XVIII.

Falsifying History:—The case with incorrect statements about recent events can be made to pass current is surprising. Our Third party friends never tire of comparing their organization with the Abolition party, which, they assert, so weakened the Whig party that it became an easy prey to the Republican party. I have already shown that the Know-Nothings put it in its little bed before the Republican party was born, but I desire to call attention to the following figures:

Candidate.	Vote.	Total Vote.	Per cent.
1840, Birney,	7,050,	2,410,788,	.292.
1844, Birney,	62,900,	2,608,611,	.2397.
1848, Van Buren,	291,263,	2,871,908,	10.142.
1852, Hale,	156,148,	3,144,301,	4.967.

It will be noted that the percentage of abolition votes was larger to start with, and increased more rapidly than has that of the Third party. But, while Birney and Hale were Abolitionists, Van Buren was not. It is true that he ran on a Free Soil platform, but his candidacy was confessedly

Democratic nominee, and his campaign was engineered by Samuel J. Tilden and others who soon returned to the Democratic fold. Much the larger part of his vote came from the Democrats, for, although the Democratic vote in New York was 237,585, in 1844, Cass received only 80,023 to 122,500 for Van Buren. In fact, Gen. Taylor, the last Whig President, owed his election to this Free Soil vote for Van Buren. Mr Hale's vote was but little more than half that of Van Buren, but a considerable portion of it also was cast by Democrats, and his candidacy did not change the result. Again, although the Republican party abolished slavery, it did not commit itself to that policy until the task had been nearly accomplished. It was always an anti-slavery party, but at first it only pledged itself to restriction, and was bitterly opposed by the "crank element" among abolitionists, Wendall Phillips even denouncing Abraham Lincoln as the "slave-hound of Illinois." In short, on the slavery question, it did substantially what anti-saloon Republicans intend that it shall do on the saloon question, that is, pronounced against it, honestly and heartily, and fought it by the most practical methods that could be made available from time to time.

XIX.

The Republican Party Cannot be Destroyed:—

It is admitted by Third party men that the success of their plan hinges upon their ability to destroy the Republican party. They do not hope to triumph while it lives. Weakening it will not suffice; it must cease to exist—and some of them appear to really believe that if defeated next year, it will obligingly turn up its toes and give them a walk-over in 1892. But strong parties are not so easily destroyed. Even the Federal and Whig parties, with nothing in their records to be especially proud of, had more vitality than that; and the Democratic party, which, with a crushing load of infamy on its shoulders, lived in the valley of humiliation a quarter of a century, surrounded by ravens croaking "nevermore," emerged stronger than all the graveyards in the world. Let me whisper in your ear, my over-sanguine friend, that it is doubtful if the man is now on earth who will outlive the Republican party. To all appearances, it is stronger to-day than it was in 1854, and it will probably cast not far from 5,500,000 votes next year. Its members have not, for a dozen years, been so united and determined as they now are, and the campaign of 1888 promises to be conducted with a vigor that has not been exceeded since the war. "But suppose it should be defeated?" "It will pick its flint and try again." "Why should it not do so?" Its members are neither cowards nor mercenaries. The Democratic party rose up as often as it was knocked down. A remnant of the Greenback dwarf, after three crushing defeats, is still on deck, "though a little groggy." Your own pigmy has gone to grief four times in National, and eighteen in State contests, yet is as full of fight as ever. Are you really so utterly blinded by prejudice as to believe that the average Republican has not the average amount of American grit? You think its work is done, but its members, who outnumber you twenty times, do not. In their opinion, its mission is to support the right side of every living issue as it arises from year to year and age to age. They do not look upon it as a tool or toy, to be cast aside on a mere caprice. No! it is one of their household gods. It is enshrined in their hearts, side by side with father and mother, wife and child. To their imagination, it is "the Grand Old Party" that destroyed slavery, saved the government, grasped Rebellion's throat with fingers of steel, and made America the foremost nation of the world; while to their hearts it is "the Dear Old Party" that encouraged them with words of cheer, when the days were dark and dreary; that wiped the foulest blot from America's escutcheon, by making men of millions of slaves; that comforted the wounded soldier in the hospital, and remembers the veteran

ashod has a right next righted day we his story again, facile



Powerless for good but powerful for evil

9

and his eyes dim; that offered homes to the homeless, and is now girding itself for a deadly struggle with the saloon power. The boys in blue loved the flag, and, though defeated at Bull Run, Chancellorsville and Fredericksburg they guarded it through the dreadful years, waved it in triumph at Appomattox, and bedewed it with tears at the bier of the nation's martyr. In like manner, Republicans love their party, and, if defeat follows defeat through this century, the next will find them with ranks unbroken, under the same banner, then as now and in the past, standing for liberty and justice to all men, and the protection of the weak against the strong. Impatience, anger, ambition, greed, or a misconception of facts, have caused a few score thousands to drop from the ranks, and more may yet do so, but millions are as determined as ever. With hundreds of thousands of old soldiers impressing on millions of boys and youths the scenes through which the Republican party brought their country in safety, and with the pages of a quarter of a century of history, covered by its record, which has never been equalled, there is no danger that the Republican party will long remain in a minority.

But suppose that, because of your efforts, disaster follows disaster, until the Republican party becomes like a battered hulk, will the cause of Prohibition be a real gainer? If you take its aggressive temperance men, the Democrats will secure its decided saloon men, leaving you still in minority, with a Republican remnant (mostly fossils, indifferent about, or opposed to prohibition) holding the balance of power, as you do now. Can you, for a moment, suppose that they would, in such a contingency, use that power for your benefit, knowing that you had made especial efforts to destroy their party instead of the Democratic, avowedly *because it was the better of the two*? If they should do so, would they not thereby prove that they are more ready to sacrifice party for principle than you are, in spite of your loud professions of unequalled sincerity? Would there not, on the contrary, be danger, that when, if ever, they decided to bury their own loved party, they would join the Democrats instead of you? Can you, as practical men, ignore these questions which must be met some time, with every day's delay making a bad matter worse?

XX.

Are you Intentional Saloon Protectors?—And how would the cause of the home be affected during the long and anxious years in which this more than doubtful experiment was being tried? The Democratic party would, of course, be even more emphatically a saloon party than it now is, and the saloon, and its concomitants, would flourish, with all the evils that necessarily flow from them. I have shown that sane men are, and of necessity must be, morally responsible for the natural and expected results of their acts; and if that is so, the responsibility for the protection and perpetuation of that business must rest on those who, fully aware of its dreadful character, and, holding the balance of power, deliberately and persistently use that power so as to keep the enemies of the saloon divided, and secure the triumph of the only candidates and party that espouse its cause. Is there any honest way of avoiding that conclusion? Do you answer that, "ultimately there will be an uprising of the people against the saloon that will sweep it out of existence." You may be right, but, if so, it will "mop the earth" with your party, first. All history shows that, like the Free Soil uprising, over thirty years ago, it will, to begin with, reject extremists on both sides. In short, it will adopt exactly the policy that the Anti-Slavery Republicans did in 1854, and that the Anti-Saloon Republicans now propose. Do you not know that, unless human nature undergoes a radical change, it will have to do this? And if this plan must ultimately be adopted, should it not be ac-

Let me call your attention here to the fact that the growth of American cities makes it certain that they will soon control the National and most of the State Governments. In 1880 the population of New York was 4,382,759, of which number 2,695,070 lived in cities with a population exceeding 10,000. At present, more than two-thirds of the voters live in that class of cities, and, by 1892, the proportion will be three to one. The rural districts struggle hard against the domination of these political octopuses, but, as they continue to grow relatively weaker, the fate of the prisoner who saw the iron walls of his cell gradually closing in on him was not more certain than is that of the country in this contest with the cities. The most alarming feature of the case is that cities have especial attractions for the utterly selfish, weak and vicious, and sinks them to still lower depths, where the saloon organizes them in its own interest. Year by year, the number and strength of these saloon citadels increases, and they will certainly continue to do so until their enemies unite, and the longer such union is postponed the more difficult will be the task. Is not this the case? And if it is, do not common sense and humanity demand that the union be effected as quickly as possible? And can the conclusion be avoided that the worst enemies of prohibition are those who build barriers between and foment discord among those who are or may easily be made its friends?

XXI.

Fanaticism.—The truly fanatical character of many of the members of your party is shown by a number of circumstances, among which is their refusal to assist the Law and Order Leagues which have been established in many localities to help enforce law. One of their defences is that it is the duty of officers to enforce law, which is true, and no derelict official should be excused, but it is also the duty of good citizens and lovers of humanity to actively assist officers who do the best they can, and to prod or expose the remainder, and the temperance man who refuses to do this is simply a shirk, no matter how many frills and ruffles he puts on his conscience when it is on exhibition. Another excuse, which is as senseless as it is iniquitous, is that "the worse the saloon evil becomes the sooner will the people arise in their might and destroy it." That is, of course, only a soothing syrup guess. It can be nothing more, for there are no facts upon which to base such a hope. If it were well founded, war on the saloon tends to strengthen it and prolong its life, and all temperance work should therefore cease, and the Third party should, of course, be disbanded or put in a tree to hibernate. None of the incidents cited by these zealous Do-Nothings are parallel. Always, as in San Francisco, the class that was ruthlessly put down, consisted of gamblers, thieves, murderers, and other criminals, whose vocations had been outlawed for generations, and the work was done by Law and Order Leagues organized to enforce existing statutes. There never has been a case where the majority suddenly awoke to the evils of a long established and wide-spread legal business or social habit, and banded together to entirely destroy it at once, either by violence or by new drastic laws. Extirpation, in such cases, always has been, and always must be, the result of long and patient labor; and yet some prohibition priests and levites not only leave wounded travelers to suffer and die, but actually denounce the Samaritans who bind up their wounds as "sworn allies or tools" of the thieves who robbed them. Can you think it strange that such fanatical talk and conduct on the part of some who assume to be your leading apostles, has led many who were beginning to favor prohibition to distrust the cause?

The same spirit leads to the contemptuous rejection of local prohibition, and all restrictive laws passed by Republican Legislatures as steps toward prohibition. Everything is rejected except



Powerless for good but powerful for evil

10

immediate State and National Prohibition, and some bluntly declare that they do not desire prohibition through either of the old parties. The aim of some of these worthies, whose fervid prayers would indicate that they are solid chunks of holiness and condensed milk of human kindness, is apparently, not so much to cripple and destroy the saloon as quickly as possible, as it is to construct the narrowest possible platform, and then stand it edgewise, so that the few who will be able to occupy it will be the more conspicuous. Each appears to desire the honor of "going a little higher" in his demands than any one else—of being the most radical inmate of the asylum; but, while they are making broad their phylacteries, a great army of sufferers limp and stagger, unhelped by them, through the Valley of the Shadow of Death to the dungeon of Giant Despair.

In Kansas, the Republican party has, for years, been committed to maintain prohibition, and it is better enforced there than anywhere else in the Union; yet, even there, strenuous efforts are made to build up a "Do-Nothing party" at its expense.

In Iowa, where the party has defied the saloon, and is driving it out of stronghold after stronghold—where Republican Congressman Strubel's home was burned because of his zeal, and the Republican martyr Haddock gave his life for the cause, a pestiferous gang of temperance Pharisees keeps up a fire in the rear of the only honest anti-saloon party there.

In Pennsylvania, when a Republican Convention pledged the party to submit a constitutional amendment to the people, you insisted that it should be defeated, because it was dishonest and did not intend to redeem its pledge. But it did redeem it, and more, and has agreed to give the finishing vote next year; yet the same sneering voices are heard charging insincerity, and persistent efforts are being made by your associates to defeat every Republican friend of the amendment, and make it impossible for the party to redeem its promises.

In Massachusetts, after the Republican Convention had declared in favor of submitting a constitutional amendment, your party defeated more than a dozen candidates who would have voted for it, and thereby made it impossible for ours to redeem its pledge; and then, because you succeeded in tying its hands, you upbraid it for being intentionally dishonest.

When advocating *prohibition*, you justly emphasize the splendid results of that policy in Maine, Vermont, Iowa and Kansas; but when arguing for your *party* you unjustly contradict yourselves, and untruthfully insist that it is substantially a failure in those States, thus endorsing the assertions of unscrupulous anti prohibitionists and neutralizing your own efforts in behalf of the measure. You may in this way induce a few ultra and ill-informed Republicans to join your *party*, but you prevent many times that number of honest doubters from believing that "prohibition can be made to prohibit." Is it not evident that those who can pursue such a course have minds so warped that they cannot be safely trusted as leaders?

In short, your party acts the part of a common scold, but while it does so, from church, school-house and street corner goes up a cry, the purport of which is, "Give us the offices," "Give us the offices," and to the inquiry, "Is it not Prohibition that you want?" the response sounds very much like, "Oh, yes, of course, after awhile. After we shall have secured the offices, and we don't intend it shall come until then, if we can prevent; for don't you see, you fellows ain't honest, and we are. You are a set of hypocrites and can't be trusted. To make Prohibition a success the Government must be in the hands of a Prohibition party, and that means us (as we have a patent on the name), so hand over the offices, and be quick about it, for we are awful hungry, and there's no meat in the house." Indeed, my friends, in all earnestness and in sorrow, rather

than anger, I am compelled to say that, almost everywhere, so far as I can judge, a large part of your people "put party before principle" with an openness and persistence never before known. Generally, your recognized leaders put every obstacle they can in the way of anything being done against the saloon, until the offices are given to them. I am aware that they talk grandiloquently about their "love for the cause" and profess entire "disinterestedness"; but the freezing fact remains that, if their advice is accepted by one-quarter of the Prohibitionists of the country, "the cause" cannot anywhere advance a step until their terms are complied with, and those terms are that "none except members of their party shall be put in office," no matter what the consequences may be. Do you say these are unjust aspersions on your motives? I answer that I make no charges, but simply state undeniable facts, and what it seems to me your acts and words indicate. You may be entirely unselfish in this matter—as I believe a large majority of you are—but you have put yourselves in a position where appearances are certainly against your sincerity or your sense.

XXII.

Who Must Suffer in Consequence.—It would be bad enough if all the evil effects of their errors had to be borne by those who commit them, but, unfortunately, they bear with crushing force almost entirely upon other and innocent parties—upon the ignorant and thoughtless, in whose paths pitfalls are kept open; struggling drunkards, for whom no avenue of escape is opened; and parents, wives and children, who must suffer on, and on, in hopeless misery. The man who goes to sea alone in an unsafe vessel risks only his own life. He is more or less of a fool, but not necessarily a scoundrel. But, if staying at home himself, he allows it to sail filled with women and children, without having done what he could to prevent even a possible disaster, no coroner's jury will acquit him. And if it should be ascertained that the loss was due to the fact that, knowing the vessel to be short-handed, he had persuaded some of its crew to abandon it, hoping that it might be wrecked, so that he could use the material to build a better one, it would hardly be possible for him to weep and pray, and sing and shout enough to induce the world to canonize him as a saint.

Would that I knew how to cause every man to realize that it is mainly the *present* hour he has to deal with; that it is his duty to do *to-day* all he can against the saloon (be it little or much) and to continue doing so through life; that an opportunity in hand is worth a whole bunch in a bush—especially when that bush is on the opposite side of a bridgeless chasm. Once, after an avowed Prohibition Republican had been defeated by an acknowledged saloonist, solely because former Republicans had industriously worked the Third party racket, I heard a minister of the Gospel boast that he was one of those who had had "courage enough to stand up and be counted." At first, I grew angry at the thought that any professed Christian should try to weaken, instead of strengthen, the only champion in a contest who could possibly help protect the home; but that feeling was quickly supplanted by contempt for a man so innately pusillanimous that such an act could appear heroic to him; and this was succeeded by pity for one who was compelled to go through life with such a cross-eyed mind. It is sometimes proper and noble to stand up to be counted on the right side: at school, that is on the side farthest from the dunce block, but in all matters that affect others it is the one that actually secures (not merely proposes to), the greatest good to the greatest number, without bringing glory or profit to the one who is counted. It is true, as a noted betrayer of a noble cause once said, that "God and one man is a majority." Indeed, he could have dropped himself from the count without affecting the proposition; but, is it not equally true that God and a million is a larger



majority; and is not there a greater probability that God is with the million of his servants than with the one? Is it not very bad taste for every little band of men who imagine themselves better than their fellows to be constantly parading the assumption that God is on *their* side and turns his back on the rest of creation? Is not the presumption almost overwhelming that a course which necessarily strengthens evil-doers at the present, and cannot do otherwise in the future, unless an unparalleled political earthquake occurs, is unwise and immoral, and that a merciful God cannot be with those who favor it?

XXIII.

Holding a Mirror before Them.—Some prominent Third party advocates never tire of assailing the motives of those who differ from them; going so far as to assume that Republicans are nearly all fools, tools or knaves. They accuse them of "cowering under the party lash," of "caring more for party than for principle," of "being controlled by prejudice instead of reason," of "sacrificing everything for offices and emoluments," of "being in the pay of the liquor power," etc. In short, every Republican has a mote in his eye. That some Republicans could be convicted on this indictment I do not deny, but, at the risk of arousing fierce denunciation, and of calling forth floods of crocodile tears from unctuous martyrs, I must ask permission to hold a mirror for some of your apostles to look into.

1. Self-interest influences every one more or less. Some deliberately do wrong for a consideration, but a vastly greater number are blinded by greed for something, and Third party men are not very much better than others in that respect. Those who do the bulk of its work are newspaper men, publishers, and lecturers, whose appointments are largely arranged by partisan clubs and lecture bureaus. To the most of them, the maintenance and growth of the party means more money and fame (or notoriety), and its dissolution a diminished income, harder work and a more commonplace existence. Is not this so? And if so, must it not, even insensibly, have a powerful influence upon them?

2. Most people have a considerable amount of human nature, and the average American is ambitious. The number of men who can be tickled by an "unsought nomination," even by a party whose vote is ridiculously small, or by an invitation to speak or sit on a platform, is surprisingly large. One of the hardest headed men I ever knew was actually drawn into the Greenback party by an appointment on a village committee. Its National Convention has not been called, yet, a prominent Third party brother, who loves to repeat the charge that "the Republican party is so rotten that it smells," has already intimated that he is willing to pay \$10,000 for the second place on the ticket. The cases are rare where a party that polls two per cent. of the votes of a community gets through three consecutive campaigns without a contest over nominations with charges and heart burnings; and the per cent. of aspirants for nomination in a party is generally in inverse proportion to its size. While, in all parties, those whose pecuniary interests are involved do the largest share of the party work, the aspirants for office, and those who have an itching for notoriety, come next—and these desires and feelings are often as misleading and blinding as pecuniary interests; indeed, with many, they are more so.

3. When men think they have been unjustly treated, they are apt to become angry; and when they feel that they have not been properly appreciated, they often become soured. No party ever existed ten years that did not lose members from these causes. The tendency with such deserters is to go into a new party, rather than the one they had been mainly fighting, but, wherever they go, resentment against the one they left is certain to be strong. The judgment of those in this class is necessarily more or less influenced

by their antecedents, and they are generally active, unfair and bitter.

No party ever did, or can, get along without machines, and no party of any consequence ever had efficient machines composed wholly, or even mainly, of men who are entirely disinterested, unbiassed lovers of the truth. Your party machines, large and small, illustrate this truth as well as ours. They may be somewhat better than the average of their opponents, but the majority of those who constitute them are not over-scrupulous, and the stronger the party becomes the more nearly like others will they be. The success of a Prohibition party depends upon its ability to convince men that Republicans cannot be induced to wage an honest war against the saloons. Its advocates, therefore, have a direct interest in preventing, or making it as difficult as possible for that party to move forward. As an illustration of the lengths to which some of them go, I need only cite the course of their leading organ, *The Voice*. In 1886, when a constitutional amendment bill was pending before the New York Legislature, it opened an extensive correspondence with Republican liquor makers and sellers, asking them what course they would pursue if the bill passed, and published their threats of dire vengeance against the party. This was, unquestionably done for the purpose of helping to defeat the bill—and it did help. Yet, after thus actively supporting and strengthening the opposition, it has continued to denounce the party for its "duplicity" in not passing the bill, and cites its failure to do so as proof that Republicans cannot be relied on to redeem any pledge they may make, and that "they care more for party than they do for principle." While the most of you would not resort to such reprehensible (or should I not say, infamous?) methods, many appear to take delight in putting the worst possible construction on the acts and sayings of the Republican party and its advocates, and when a bad one cannot be invented, assume dishonesty or intended treachery—or sneeringly assert that "they were forced to do it." Those who do not desire to be misled should, therefore, weigh well what even members of your party say. It will not do to assume that none of them ever misstate intentionally, or mislead unintentionally. The interests at stake are so great that the touchstone of reason should be applied to every proposition. The classes I have described necessarily constitute a much larger percentage of any new and small party than they do of any old and large one; and there is, therefore, the greater need to exercise caution, when listening to their advocates.

XXIV.

Men are not Puppets.—Some men appear to think the parties they oppose are mere machines, which do whatever their leaders wish them to, but this is a mistake. A considerable portion of the members of every party have independent wills. They follow or resist, just as they think best. The members of no party are a unit on all phases of any subject, and even after the majority has announced its decision the minority often continues its opposition. A large majority of your party is favorable to woman suffrage, and your platforms declare for it with more or less fervor, but the minority still rejects it. A large majority of Republicans are protectionists, and the party is strongly committed to that policy, yet a minority, at one time large, but steadily dwindling, continues to fight it; but minority opposition does not, in either case, raise a presumption that "the party declarations are dishonest and merely intended to catch votes." The fact is that, in these and other cases, a party declaration, while it cannot absolutely control the action of all its members, is an educator, when nothing more, and this is as true on the saloon question as it is on the tariff, suffrage, labor and other problems. Moreover, as the interest in any issue strengthens, the tendency of the majority to in-



Powerless for good but powerful for evil

13

sist that candidates shall be nominated whose views accord with their own, increases, and the minority gradually joins the majority, silently acquiesces, or leaves the party. If these positions are sound, and I do not believe any intelligent, candid man will dispute them, the steadily increasing earnestness of the Republican masses and platform utterances on the saloon question indicate with unerring certainty that the majority will soon insist that the party shall everywhere take a decided position upon it. All that is needed is patience, a conciliatory spirit and persistent work of the right kind.

There is always more or less antagonism among party leaders, but, even when the principal ones are united, they are not all-powerful. The resolution adopted by the Richfield Springs, (N. Y.) Republican convention in 1883, favoring the submission of a prohibitory amendment to the people, is an illustration of this fact. Those who favored that resolution were as honest as those who denounced them, and intended to redeem their pledge, but found it impossible to do so. Why? Because there were members of legislative districts in New York City and other places, where there was hardly a voter in or out of the Republican ranks that wanted it done. Their delegates to the Convention had not favored the resolution, and the voters simply refused to be bound by it. Leading Republicans tried to persuade their representatives to change, but could not, for they cared more for the good will of their own immediate constituents than for that of all the rest of the State. Such things are liable to occur in any party, and it is uncharitable, and unjust, to assume that there was intentional deceit or treachery in such cases—and it is especially unchristian in those who claim to have uncommonly tender consciences. That there has been duplicity among some Republican politicians, in the past, and is likely to be in the future, I do not deny, but no party is spotless, and the sweeping and unjust charges that are often made greatly increase the tendency of public men to hesitate about taking even the first step in the, right direction—which result is, I fear, in some cases, desired and intended.

When Republicans nominate saloon men for office, a mistake is committed, and a wrong done, which should be corrected, and its recurrence prevented if possible. But how can it be? Certainly not by electing more saloon men, in other places, which is practically the Third party remedy, for that would only make a bad matter worse. In country district A, Republicans being mostly temperance men, elect an anti-saloon representative to the Legislature, but in city district B, a Republican convention controlled by the saloon element, sends a saloonist to Albany; whereupon, a few temperance Republicans in district A, shout, "We care more for temperance than for anything else," and join the Third party, knowing that the consequence will be the election of a saloon Democrat to represent them—two saloon legislators instead of one. And they do this with the knowledge that their course cannot possibly secure the election of a single enemy of saloons in District B, (or anywhere else), or the improvement or better enforcement of any law on that subject; but that, instead, its influence will be directly the reverse. Having deliberately consented to the election of a saloon defender, his acts and votes in the legislature of course become their acts and votes. They may not have enough of the Geo. Washington in them to acknowledge this, but it is the truth all the same. Under these circumstances, is it not hard to credit them with both honesty and good judgment? Is it not difficult to believe that the spirit of Christ prompts such acts? Indeed, is it not almost a matter of certainty that the controlling motive comes from a very different source?

XXV.

Important Points.—Let me briefly mention a

few points which our Third Party friends will do well to consider:

1. While their body is small, it is comparatively easy to manage; but, if it ever becomes large, a host of disturbing issues will come up to divide and distract. Already some of its managers have essayed to make a dicker with the Labor party, and been repulsed; and the nearer it comes to success, the more anxious will they be to "get more votes," even if "the standard must be lowered somewhat." How men feel, and what they will do, depends largely on circumstances. It is much easier for a candidate to say "Get thee behind me, Satan," to an offer of one hundred extra votes, if he knows he would still be largely behind, than it is when he believes they would elect him. And even as it is, many candidates are nominated by your party, not because they are the best men for the place, but because "they will strengthen the ticket," or "contribute liberally." Can you deny this?

2. There are about fourteen million voters in this country, of which number five or six millions might support Prohibition, on a distinct vote, but the largest number that has ever voted a Third party ticket is less than three hundred thousand. Suppose the number increased to five hundred thousand, that would still be only one in ten or twelve of the number who are ready to accept the principle. Is it not plainly impolitic for so small a minority to assail, with such virulence, the large majority? Should not the *minority* also seek to bring about a union—making it as easy instead of as difficult as possible? Is it not inexcusable arrogance for such a small minority to exhibit so dictatorial a spirit?

3. In politics votes count more than gush, and a large number of "rousing meetings" may be held without affecting many votes. A young and enthusiastic party can fill halls when it cuts an insignificant figure at the polls. Moreover, Democrats attend your meetings, cheer your speakers, and chip in for expenses—but do not vote your ticket. Is there no lesson in this fact?

4. The assertion that "new issues require new parties" is fortunately unfounded. An unsuccessful party cannot, of course, settle any issue, and, as the Whig and Republican parties are the only new ones that have ever controlled the government, (and the Whig party settled nothing,) there could have been, according to that idea, but one new issue settled during this century. If each problem, as it arises, must await the slow process of the destruction of one party and the upbuilding of a new one, political progress must be very slow.

5. The plea that it would be impolitic for the Republican party to take up the saloon question aggressively comes with a bad grace from those who denounce it for not having done so, because of alleged motives of policy. As a matter of fact, as has been demonstrated in Kansas, our loss will not necessarily be large—but, whether it be large or small, it should and will be incurred—because it is right that it should be. There are millions of Republicans who desire to fight the saloon, but are not willing to give up everything else in order to do so; and there are hundreds of thousands more who are indifferent to, or sympathize with it, but those affections for the party, or interest in it, is so strong that they will support it heartily, even if it does wage a determined war on the dramshop.

6. Your organs comfort their readers with the assertion that temperance sentiment and legislation never made as rapid progress as they have since the Third party was organized. This is true, but that progress has been the result of persistent hammering at the saloon. It has not been in consequence, but in spite, of needless attempts to wreck a powerful party. The conclusion of an Herculean task cannot be hastened by postponing it until another unnecessary and still more difficult one shall have been finished. The

ishop has a right next largest duty



Powerless for good but powerful for evil

13

copperhead fire in the rear of Union armies was coincident with their progress, but certainly did not hasten Appomattox. Third party men and women are entitled to credit for much good work done for the cause of prohibition, but ten times as many Republicans and Democrats have done their share of the good work. Your mistake is that you confound "the great cause" with your pocket party, and also claim credit to yourselves for other men's labors.

7. Allow me to recur to one point already made. In order to secure victory on your line, everything else has to be abandoned until your party obtains power. The men to whom possible changes in the tariff mean prosperity or financial ruin, the friends and opponents of railroad legislation, currency propositions, immigration restriction, civil service reform, a really free ballot, land tax theories, socialist doctrines, labor laws, internal improvements, national banks, coast defense, enlargement of the navy, and every other question affecting state or nation, must consent to see men who are opposed to their views obtain or retain power without the interposition of their ballot. And this sacrifice must be made not merely for one, or a few, but certainly many years, and probably to the end of time. The immediately attainable good must be given up for the positively improbable, and probably impossible achievements of a distant future, and that, too, by those who do not agree with you either as to the dominating importance or present feasibility of prohibition. Really, the price of admission into your party is exorbitant.

8. A common delusion with new party men is the supposition that the organization they left turned to stone on their departure, and can make no further progress, and they cannot understand how it manages to act as though it were alive. Most Third party men give, as a justification for leaving the Republican party, the fact that its last National convention declined to declare war against the saloon. When asked why they did not demand that it should do so in 1872, '76 or '80, the response is that "the time was inopportune," "Public sentiment was not then strong enough to warrant it," etc. That is, so long as you deemed a pronounced utterance premature, it was right for the party to remain silent; but as soon as you changed, everybody else should have done so also in the twinkling of an eye, and the slowness of millions of temperance Republicans proved that they had become "the sworn allies of the liquor traffic." Are you quite sure that mortification and anger because the multitude refused to dance when you piped did not have more to do than cool judgment had with your decision? Why should you be so hasty? Large bodies move slowly. The lump is never leavened in a moment. The most of you know that you yourselves once stood where the rest of us still are, or further back. And, admitting that you are better and wiser than the average man, does the fact that you travel faster than others prove that they are motionless, and can never—no, never—reach the dizzy height where your locks wave as banners in the air? I will concede, to please you, that we are common roadsters while you are racers. But is it not true that, while the racer wins the big money and applause, the ordinary plug plows the most fields, carries the most food to hungry homes, and is more indispensable to the welfare of men? Though but a plodder, he reaches the goal before he stops, and when he arrives the vicious elements are not the chief gainers. Seriously, my friend, is not the assumption that the departure of, say, one twenty-fifth of the Republican party on a wild goose chase has emasculated it a little—yes, intensely—egotistical? The facts prove that you are mistaken, for, when defending another portion of your lines, you assert that more progress has been made since you left the party than before—your mistake being that you claim credit for what you have often tried to prevent.

urged that temperance Democrats will not join the Republican party under any circumstances, and that, without their help, it cannot win if it loses the support of dramsellers. I will not stop to argue this point, but simply respond that, in my judgment, more Democrats, in both sections, will join the powerful Republican party in an honest and aggressive, but practical, anti-saloon policy, than can be drawn into an organization too small to be able to do any good even with their help, and so fanatical that it insists on doing harm to the cause it advocates rather than not be felt. I submit, however, that, while your opinion and mine on this matter are mere guesses, each one should do what he can, knowing that it is easier for several millions to attract a few hundred thousand than for the small number to draw the large one.

10. Like the gambler who stakes his all on the correctness of his calculations in a matter that is largely guesswork, you stake the cause of humanity upon the soundness of your judgment as to coming events over which you have no control; but there is this important difference between you, that the gambler puts up his *own* fortune, while you risk the fortunes and souls of *others*. You believe that your party can succeed, and that when it does, the good it will do is so great as to justify you in subordinating everything to it. On the other hand, we are equally confident that the Republican party can and will do the work much sooner than is possible by your plan—and we intend that it shall do it. Moreover, our plan, unlike yours, does not require us to refuse to do everything that can be done now, and from time to time. We seize on each and every opportunity as it is reached. We have the same goal that you have, and the obstacles in our pathway are not so great as they are in yours, nor do we have to wait until it is reached before gathering fruit. If it is right for you to follow your own judgment, even at such awful risks, is it not our duty to follow ours, when we incur none? And, if we do follow ours how much are the possibilities of success on your lines worth?

XXVI.

The License and Tax System.—Probably three-quarters of your Republican recruits left us when angry, and your scheme is so chimerical that they would have soon returned but for the persistence, heat, and skill with which you ring the changes on the proposition that "there is no difference between the license and tax systems, and that license is a sin which we cannot conscientiously consent to under any circumstances." When a stubborn man thinks "his conscience has got him," he is doubly hard to deal with, and is especially so when he belongs to that large class who raise the barrier of conscience chiefly when they have a lurking suspicion that they are in the wrong, but are unwilling to change. The most of those who make such a bugaboo of the license system are illogical. They do not demand the repeal of the present license laws, but strenuously oppose every proposition to increase the rate, so as to make it bear more heavily on the saloon business, and limit its ravages. On that point they heartily agree with the dramsellers, and, last winter, some of them went before the Legislature at Albany and helped the liquor dealers to fight the Crosby and Vedder bills, which, though imperfect, were exceedingly obnoxious to the saloon men. With a disingenuousness that is sickening, in good people, they insist that the license system is *intended* to protect and perpetuate saloons, and is supported by their owners. There is truth enough hovering around this proposition to enable intelligent men to mislead ignorant ones—but not themselves. Every well-informed man *knows* that the great mass of those engaged in the liquor business are entirely opposed to *all* State laws that take money from their pockets. When their only choice is between low and high taxes, they prefer the former, and accept the



Powerless for good but powerful for evil

14

latter only when the alternative is prohibition. Nothing but dire necessity leads them to consent to any law that proposes to burden or restrict their common law privileges.

The license system is advocated by three classes of men; those who hope and believe it will diminish the business of liquor selling and its resulting evils; those who think it an easy way to collect revenue; and those who believe it will prevent or postpone prohibition. A large majority of license Republicans belong to the first class, and all who do are anti-saloon men, but the members of the other two classes are not. Personally, I stand with that noble and able Republican, Henry B. Metcalf, of Pawtucket, Rhode Island, who says, "I am more than a Prohibitionist; I am a Suppressionist." Whenever suppression is possible, I am for it, and when and where it is impossible, I will come as near to it as I can. The idea of licensing any evil business is repulsive to me, but when the question is not what I would like to do, and *other people's* suffering will be prolonged if I spend time trying to construct an exquisite record for *myself*, I will do what I can. I am well aware that no system of restrictive laws ever did a fourth part of the good they were expected to do, and I do not suppose that such laws ever will; but the man who asserts that they cannot be made to do some, aye, a great deal, of good, speaks before he thinks, or is lacking in judgment or sincerity. Every saloon is a moral spider's web, and each dram-seller is a human spider. The more webs and spiders there are, and the less interference there is in their operations, the more flies will be caught; the more saloons and saloon-keepers there are, and the more untrammelled their business is, the greater will be the number, and the more complete the ruin of their victims. Closing a single saloon may make but little difference, yet it will unquestionably make some. There is no principle of political economy better established than the one that any and every obstruction to any kind of business tends to diminish it.

A license is, in its terms, an authorization, but the statute under which it is issued is a prohibitory law, in reference to more than ninety-nine per cent. of the population. But for those laws every one could sell, and their practical effect on the business is necessarily to diminish it. In that respect, they operate like the local option laws which you find so good at the South and so bad at the North. The tax plan avoids the technical authorization of the license, and is, therefore, less objectionable, sentimentally, and the plea that the imposition of a tax binds the government to protect the business is unsound. Wherever it is not specifically prohibited by statute, liquor selling is a lawful business, and those engaged in it are as much entitled to legal protection as is the banker. Neither license nor tax makes the slightest shadow of difference in that respect. They do not increase rights or liberties over what they were by the millionth part of a hair. Many good people are sadly befogged by the special pleading of able casuists on this matter, but all the volumes written cannot change the fact that both license and tax laws can be and have been made to considerably diminish the saloon business; nor the further fact that, to the extent they do so, they confer blessings on mankind; nor the still further fact that the man who, with that purpose in view, helps to pass or enforce a law that produces such results, is entitled to more commendation, as a practical philanthropist, than a college full of closet philosophers who care more for verbiage than for substance, and whose plan for the destruction of the saloon proves, on trial, to hopelessly divide its enemies and turn the control of the government over to its defenders for an indefinite period.

I dislike the license system intensely—partly because the necessary language of the permit grates upon the sentimental part of my nature—and I object to both license and tax, because I

prefer not to have a cent of such blood money in my pocket, and also because the good they do is somewhat neutralized by the deadening effect of the fee on some consciences. I would, however, gladly stifle sentiment and take every dollar the dramseller receives, if, by so doing, I could rescue one despairing drunkard or bring renewed peace to, or avert disaster from, one household.

XXVI.

Do you ask, Where Shall I go?—And what shall I do? I answer, go where you can do the most injury to the liquor business, and, when there, labor persistently, intelligently and courageously for that purpose. I believe the place for you is in the Republican ranks, where the most of those who already hate the saloon are to be found. Though not an ideal party, it has done, and can, and will do, better work than any other. Its positive saloon element will all soon be gone, and, if you take its place, with your additional motive power, and less dead weight to carry, and resistance to overcome, its progress will be more rapid than ever. Do you hesitate because you do not believe all its doctrines? Very few, if any, thinking men endorse every provision of the platforms of their party as generally interpreted. Each one has a mental reservation here, or his own interpretation there, even when he does not wholly repudiate anything. A general harmony and acceptance of essentials is all that is necessary, or possible. If you approach the matter with a strong *desire* to agree and act with the mass of your friends, and seek for reasons that will justify you in doing so instead of magnifying obstacles and searching for excuses for remaining in antagonism, you will see things very differently from what you now do. Fortunately, convictions cannot be changed by an exercise of will power; but every one's judgment is largely modified by his feelings and wishes, and our effort should be to have those powerfully moulding influences always operate in the right direction.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not asking you to join the Republican party merely to elect its candidates, but to help protect the home from the saloon, and the home can be protected only by electing its friends, and defeating its foes. For many years I have acted upon the assumption that he serves his party best who best serves his country, and when dramsellers, or dramsellers' tools, are nominated to make or execute laws which relate to the liquor traffic, I believe they should be defeated, even if they are Republicans. When such offices are to be filled by men who are known to be thoroughly dishonest or incompetent, or opposed to so framing and executing laws affecting the liquor traffic as to reduce it and the terrible evils which result from it to a minimum, it is better for Republicanism that other parties shall be responsible for them, and have to bear the odium of their character and misdeeds. If you had remained in the party, working on these lines, and spent one-fourth the time and money in trying to lift it onto higher ground, that you have in efforts to destroy it, the cause would be much farther ahead than it now is. The questionable, disreputable, contemptible and infamous conduct of some Republicans has disgusted me as much as it has you. In my hot anger I could have taken delight in smashing things; but knowing that others were to be the sufferers if I made a mistake, I have waited, before deciding what to do, until I became cool enough to consider the pros and cons calmly, and to sacrifice passionate impulses upon the altar of duty.

Your error has been in mistaking the proper remedy. When a man leaves a party, the managers look upon him as a lost sheep—or goat—and give no more heed to his wishes—except to thwart them. But, if he always attends caucuses, urges the selection of the right kind of candidates, supports the man who is nominated even if ner-

ishon has a right | next largest body ar Democrats, and then con



sonally distasteful to him, unless he really believes his election would be detrimental to the public weal, and, in such cases, unflinchingly and actively opposes him, at the polls, the managers may become very angry, but they will thereafter take increasing care to secure his support. He may not be able to reform a bad district all alone, or in a single season, but I think he can do it quicker in that way than by any other method.

There is not a county in the country in which it would not be easier to make the Republican party an aggressive enemy of the saloon, and win victories for the home under its banner, than to build up a successful new party. If you are really honest when you say that you care more for the cause than for party, should you not be willing to subordinate *your* party to it, instead of insisting that twenty times your number shall subordinate *theirs*?

Anti-Saloon Republicans do not ask you to cease advocating prohibition, but to go to the party primaries, and to the polls, saying everywhere, with them, "We are Republicans, but we are also enemies of the saloon, and intend to fight it to the death, by all practical methods, and will not help elect to office men who will use the power we give them to defend it. If we are beaten at, or excluded from, the primaries, we shall carry the fight to the ballot box, and if beaten there, shall try it again, and again, until we triumph. In short, we intend to adopt, openly and permanently, the policy which has been, more or less secretly, pursued by liquor dealers for years, and which many of them are now publicly avowing." If you will do this, we will soon have a united and enthusiastic party, strong enough to rule, and inspired with an inflexible determination to put in American dictionaries—in the near future—"Drinking saloon: (obsolete) Gone to join slavery."

XXVIII.

I have not time to argue this question more fully now, nor does it seem necessary. The one point upon which there can be no disagreement is, that those who hate the saloon should *try* to come together—and it seems equally clear that the first step in that direction must be for those who are, or should be, friends, to cease firing at each other. Even when repelling unjust assaults, anger should be restrained as much as possible. In politics, one voter cannot *drive* fifty, nor even five, but can often lead and *persuade* many times that number. Millions who are awakening to the tremendous importance of the saloon question are held back, or move slowly, because of anger over the unjust charges against and attacks upon the party they love, who, if pleaded with in a kindly spirit by comrades whose elbows touch theirs, would soon be ready for a vigorous charge.

Shall I epitomize a few points? The ballot is a sacred trust, and voters are morally responsible for the results expected from the use they make of it. The saloon question is undoubtedly the

most important political problem now demanding settlement, but there are also others which it is both unwise and wicked to ignore. As the saloon has gone into politics to protect itself, its enemies must meet it on the same ground. With one powerful party openly protecting the saloon, it will be safe until a stronger one is arrayed against it. The attempt to build up an independent Prohibition party, strong enough to destroy the saloon, being evidently impracticable, should be abandoned at once. The enemies of the saloon, who are now so divided that they can accomplish comparatively little, should unite, and it is natural and right that the small factions should join the large body, rather than the reverse. While it is admitted that the Republican party is not what it ought to be, it is rapidly improving, and is the only one that is able and willing to cope with the liquor power. In many cases, self-interest, and in others vanity, muleishness and passion, urge you to stand out, but every day you do so you strengthen the defenses of the saloon and sow discord among its enemies. You have embraced a theory and are following it regardless of consequences. The most of you have the spirit of the Samaritan, but are acting the part of the Priest and Levite. Rushing into darkness, in answer to cries of distress, you have mistaken a Will-o'-the-wisp for a light, and followed it through fen and brake, while the victims lie dying by the very door you left. You act like blind leaders of the blind, filled with holy zeal, but so tinctured with egotism, obstinacy, greed, anger and malice, that you cannot see the utter absurdity of the idea that you are *fighting* the saloon by strengthening the hands of its avowed and most powerful defender, and weakening those of the only foe it fears and fights.

Repeating what I have often said, publicly and privately, that I would vote the Democratic ticket—or even a Third party ticket—if I believed by so doing I could deal the saloon power a deadly blow, I appeal to you—and to all lovers of temperance and enemies of the saloon—to lift the scales from your eyes so that you may see the rum fiend's hosts, marshalled under the Democratic banner, fighting the Republican party, because of what it has done and stands pledged to do against the dramshop; and to unstop your deaf ears so you can realize that the agonizing cry of millions of suffering human beings is for *present* relief. It is now they want help—not twenty years hence. By the love you bear your own dear ones, I beg you to help tear down the barriers between friends instead of building them higher; to waste no more time wrangling over technical terms, or insisting on uniforms made after the most elegant pattern. As you love God and your fellow-men, I beseech you to sink pride and self out of sight, and join—not next year, but *now*, TO-DAY—the great army that is writing on its banners "Destruction to Dramshops," and, with your help, will be able to rid our beloved land of the accursed body, mind and soul-destroying monster.