

SHALL AMERICA GO BACK?

By COMMANDER
EVANGELINE BOOTH

PAPER READ BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE
NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE
UNION, HELD AT PHILADELPHIA, PA., IN
WHICH THIS QUESTION IS ANSWERED
FROM THE HEART OF THE
PEOPLE



THE AMERICAN ISSUE PUBLISHING COMPANY
WESTERVILLE, OHIO



COMMANDER EVANGELINE BOOTH



Gift-
Publ.
5.29.1923

HV5089
B84

Shall America Go Back?

By **COMMANDER EVANGELINE BOOTH**

WE are assembled today for the consideration of a question of immeasurable magnitude—a question that is perhaps of all most vital to universal righteousness—to which cause our prayers and our powers are dedicated—for among the formidable foes of human weal there is none so insidious, so implacable, so utterly execrable as intoxicating drink.

This question, "Shall America Go Back?" suggests an investigation of the progress of prohibition. I am aware that from a technical standpoint the phrase may be open to criticism, because the very word prohibition is a word of finality.

It has been progressive in its on sweep through the years. Review invites one at a time like this.

Away back in the forties Abraham Lincoln wrote:

"Of our political revolution of '76 we are all justly proud. In it was the germ which vegetated, and still is to grow and expand into the universal liberty of mankind.

A STRONGER BONDAGE BROKEN

"Turn now to the temperance revolution. In it we shall find a stronger bondage broken, a viler slavery manumitted, a greater tyrant deposed; in it more of want supplied, more disease healed, more sorrow assuaged; by it no orphans starving, no widows weeping; by it none wounded in feeling, none injured in interest.

"And when the victory shall be complete—when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth—how proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace and the cradle of both these revolutions that shall have ended in that victory!"

I feel Abraham Lincoln's spirit is here this afternoon. Shall America go back?

Every step of the way has been contested. Ever since December, 1917, when Congress favorably acted upon the resolution recommending the Eighteenth Amendment, powerful and sleepless foes have sought to make it ineffective. Despite this organized and persistent opposition one by one the States fell into line until little over a year later the thirty-sixth State ratified the resolution, and so made possible the President's proclamation.

During the year that by law preceded the enforcement of the Amendment the air was filled and the public fed with the most dismal predictions. We were to see disaster in almost every conceivable department of life. The Government would go into liquidation because of the loss of taxes. Real estate would slump in value because of the closing of the corner saloon. Starvation would come to large numbers because of the drying up of their source of living. Crime would become rampant because of the desperate appetite and unleashed passions of the outlawed. Social life would lose its zest for lack of stimulanting help. The very religion of the people would be embarrassed because sacramental wine would be unavailable.

NO SIGN OF BANKRUPTCY

What utter nonsense these vain predictions have proved to be! Our Government has shown no signs of bankruptcy. It is delivered from its unholy alliance with blood-money as one of its sources of support and is apparently unembarrassed by the saving of five billion dollars. The corners vacated by saloons are not desolated wastes, but are occupied with profitable and reputable business.

Take the case of Packingtown, the dwelling section behind the stock-yards of Chicago. W. F. McDermott says that the famous automobile rows of the Metropolis of the West must look to their laurels now that Packingtown has become a strong competitor.

But Packingtown's motor row is more than just an evidence of prosperity. Back of it lies a story of the evolution of a community.

In the old days the back of the yards district had its "Bucket of Blood" saloons and the famous whisky row, in shootings and sprints and revels and carousals, its woeful women and terrified children. Today it would be hard to find a community where, in spite of hard times, children have more laughing eyes, are better dressed or men and women more prosperous-looking.

About fifteen saloons of the old "whisky row" have given place to the splendid Packingtown Day Nursery. Drug stores and barber-shops have entered into other vacated saloon quarters, and the automobile salesrooms have become the centres of interest. The brass rail of the saloon has given place to the running board of the automobile.

AMOUNTS TO A REVOLUTION

From the social standpoint the change amounts to a revolution. Money spent on liquor now goes—at least a substantial part of it—for gasoline. Formerly it meant deprivation and often cruelty for the family. Now it means healthful recreation and the cementing of the family ties instead of the destruction of them.

Saturday that used to be the dreaded day, because pay day, is now the glad day. Every Saturday afternoon there are happy parties en route for the country. Father, mother, children, grandmother—sometimes four generations, gleefully chugging along in the "family Ford."

Look at the evidences of prosperity. There are ten million automobiles in the United States. Every tenth person is said to own one. A car for every two families.

More building of homes than ever before, despite exorbitant prices. Workmen of all trades erecting homes that cost ten, twelve, and even fifteen thousand dollars.

In other sections of Chicago which were made unavailable for high-class retail trade because of the blight of the saloons, department stores have sprung up catering largely to the needs of women and children. Just outside the Loop on Lower State Street, splendid locations were formerly occupied almost uniformly by low class saloons, girl shows, lady barber shops, fake auction establishments and similar places. A recent investigation shows that since prohibition this section is developing at a remarkable rate. As an instance, Hinky Dink's Workingman's Rest Saloon formerly paid \$150 rent for the four-story building. Since prohibition closed this saloon \$500 rent is paid for the first floor alone.

RESTORATION OF VALUES

But the building up of realty values in Chicago has been of little significance in comparison to the restoration of human values. Here is the

testimony of the Superintendent of Oak Forest Institution which formerly cared for the poor unfortunates of the lodging house district:

"The advent of prohibition undoubtedly has much to do with the shrinkage of our population. A large percentage of our inmates came right from the lodging house districts and were heavy drinkers. In the days when liquor was cheap and lunches were served in saloons free of charge these men were but little interested in caring for themselves outside of living from hand to mouth. Temporary breakdowns in their physical and mental conditions were of frequent occurrence. The infirmary's doors were open and they flocked hither in great numbers. They came for repair and they received it. However, about the time the price of liquor began to soar, and as saloon free lunches no longer were spread, there was a noticeable lessening in the arrivals at the institutions. The squandering of earnings, meagre as they might be, was halted; physical and mental breakdowns became a thing of the past and the habitual poor-house guests no longer sought shelter here."

Our brewer friends—with those employed in allied trades—have none of them died of starvation, even though some of them might have expressed fears of so doing, like the saloon-keeper's wife who asked in despair: "What in the world will we do if prohibition comes?" and the washerwoman replied: "You can have my job then."

"Prohibition has taken the 'wash' out of Washington. There were in this city in one year before prohibition 180 husbands committed for non-support and only 18 in 1921. Wives no longer have to wash for a living."

As to prohibition causing non-employment, take the case of Peoria, Ill., formerly known as the whisky centre of the world. Thirteen of her distilleries which once employed 1,000 men in the manufacture of alcohol now employ 3,000 men manufacturing thirty different useful products such as stock-feed, wheat flour, cane syrup, jellies, jams, etc.

As for crime, it is certainly no worse, but vastly decreased now that the chief hotbed and incubator of crime, the saloon, no longer swings its open doors.

The effect can be seen in the figures supplied by twenty-five of our largest cities in the United States. These show that for all causes there was a reduction of over one hundred and twenty-two thousand arrests.

In these same cities in the same periods there were 441,859 arrests for intoxication against 216,115. A decrease of over one-half.

VISITOR FOUND JAIL EMPTY

A visitor from Australia found that in Pittsburgh, Pa., in the County Jail 315 cells were empty, and that in Seattle, Wash., only 95 persons were in prison where there were accommodations for 300.

Judge Gemmill, of the Chicago Municipal Court, has said: "I have collected prison statistics for the last seven years in several of the leading States, and everywhere the number of prisoners has decreased since prohibition. I have not found a single State nor a single prison where there was not a marked decrease in the prison population in 1919 and 1920. In most of the States there was an increase in 1921 over 1920, but with that increase the population is still twenty or twenty-five per cent less than it was before the war, and in eighty per cent of them the number of prisoners has been reduced from fifteen to eighty per cent."

MUST REMAIN ON BATTLEFIELD

Remember that the wets and wet newspapers never compare dry years with wet years. When they say crime has increased, drunkenness has

increased, etc., they purposely give years which do not show the before and after effects of prohibition. The 1921 figures are a warning to us that we need more, not less, prohibition. They prove what I have already said that we must remain on the battlefield to defend to our last energy what we have gained.

As we turn to the Homes for Inebriates, we find that in the Washingtonian Home in Chicago, the oldest institution of its kind in the country, in one year before prohibition it admitted 1,620 inebriates. It is now closed.

The Neal Institute for Alcoholics reveals the same story. In 1910 68 such institutions in the country cared for 125,000 patients. Now they are almost all out of commission.

Alcoholic Ward in Philadelphia General Hospital:

1918.....	2,320
1921.....	702

Admitted to Ohio Hospital for the Insane:

1911 eleven and eight-tenths per cent of admissions attributed to alcohol and drugs.

1921 two and seven-tenths per cent.

Is this not an all-convincing answer to the unwarrantable complaint that prohibition has increased drug addicts?

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS DECREASE

In a letter of Judge Gemmill to Gifford Gordon, of Australia, he wrote:

"There has been a decrease in the number of persons arrested in America for drunkenness of over 600,000 per year. This figure is based upon the figures I have in my possession for all the largest cities in the United States. In most of these cities the decrease is from 100 to 400 per cent."

The bodies which hold those precious souls which The Salvation Army is pledged to save are our special care. Wonderful and beautiful as are the physical features of God's creation, what are its greatest wonders, mountains and seas and stars and valleys, in comparison to man—God's greatest work—man—God's best, created after His image, earth His footstool, Heaven His Home—God his Father, eternity his lifetime? Should not the goal of every government be to legislate to the limit to keep hurt and breakage and destruction from him? Must we not, therefore, rejoice when we read such testimony as that given by Dr. Haven Emerson in "The American Review of Tuberculosis" in June, 1922: "In the last fifty years the tuberculosis death rate only fell seventy-seven and nine-tenths per cent. In the last eleven years the death rate only fell fifty-one per cent. In the single year of 1921 the death rate fell eighteen and one-tenth per cent. The greatest factor in this rapid decrease is lessened expenditure for alcohol and more for food, lessened alcoholism with improved conditions of the poor."

Think what this signifies in the homes of the incipient or would-have-been consumptive! Think of the anxiety, the waste, the suffering, the contamination of young children, all saved because the saloon is gone and the nation has outlawed the disease-breeding liquor traffic!

WHISKY AND PNEUMONIA

Here is a startling medical testimony as to the effects of prohibition on pneumonia. Remember how liquor advocates cried "Shame!" because we would deprive the poor pneumonia patient of his life-saving whisky! In "The Journal of the Medical Association" of July 28, 1922, discussing pneumonia, Dr. Alexander Lambert, New York, says: "There has been a great change

in the pneumonias in New York City. When we had all the alcohol that was desired in life in Bellevue Hospital one-third of the 40,000 patients were in the alcoholic wards with or without delirium tremens. That made a strong alcoholic group among pneumonia patients and the death rate was sixty-six per cent for the alcoholic and twenty-three per cent for the non-alcoholic group. The type has changed. One does not see the thoroughly poisoned, chronically soaked alcoholic person in the hospital. The change in pneumonia has also been distinct. We had two wards of fifty patients each; in one group alcohol was given, and the death rate was forty per cent; in the other group alcohol was not given, and the death rate was fourteen per cent."

Dr. Russell L. Cecil, New York, says: "The Change in the pneumonia death rate of which Dr. Lambert spoke is a striking thing. In Bellevue Hospital the death rate before prohibition was from forty per cent to fifty-five per cent; but the present death rate is only twenty-eight per cent."

Now our adversaries declare they have a case against prohibition. In the indictment there are several counts.

First, they say:

"Prohibition was surreptitiously secured."

They say that the Congressional resolution was passed and the ratification under process while "the boys" were overseas, and that but for this fact it never would have been possible. While this allegation, because of its repetition and somewhat widespread belief, has been frequently and completely denied, let me cite the facts, with which many may not be familiar.

OVERWHELMING DRY MAJORITY

Who adopted prohibition? The people themselves through their representatives in Congress and State Legislatures. In Congress 347 votes were cast for submitting the Eighteenth Amendment to the State Legislatures for ratification and 148 against. In the forty-six States out of the forty-eight which ratified the Amendment 5,084 votes were cast in the State Legislatures for ratification and 1,263 against it. The total vote was seventy-nine per cent for ratification and twenty-one per cent against.

You can impress the whole situation on your mind by remembering that prohibition was "put over" by only forty-six of the forty-eight States in the Union with only ninety-eight per cent of the population and only ninety-nine and three-fourths per cent of the area of the United States. To sum up, only two small States—Connecticut and Rhode Island—refused to ratify. Prohibition could have been no surprise to the country, for thirty-three States were dry by State enactment and eighty-seven and eight-tenths per cent of the area and sixty and seven-tenth per cent of the population were under license law before the Eighteenth Amendment went into effect. How ridiculous to say that this was secured by surreptitious means!

DRINK ALWAYS LAWBREAKER

The second count in this indictment is:

"Prohibition does not prohibit."

It is rather strange that our enemies blow both hot and cold. We hear much about the drastic nature of the Volstead Act. It seems to prohibit overmuch, and our friends say: "We would be satisfied if they would allow light wines and beers." Then with almost the same breath they say: "Prohibition does not prohibit." If it doesn't then the "wets" are well served. But they know it does, and that every time they slake their thirst with the forbidden beverage they are breaking the law. This, in the drinkers' realm,

may not be looked upon as particularly bad, but then drink is always true to form, and in the days when it was legalized its devotees were the most flagrant breakers of the law in the land. Drink will not be regulated. Its law-breaking proclivities are not new, but are as old as history; be they laws of nature or laws of nations, laws of health or laws of home, laws of mind or laws of morals, the drink stands condemned—the red-handed criminal, the greatest law breaker in the land. So it is no new role for it to assume when its apologists cry: "Prohibition does not prohibit!"

That there are violations of the law, all admit, but to cite that fact as an argument against the prohibition law is as futile as it would be to demand the cancellation of the whole decalogue because of repeated infraction of that law which is fundamental to all jurisprudence. We of the Salvation Army aspire to order our lives by the standard of these Ten Commandments, and to persuade others to do the same, and it would be about as sensible to engage in an effort to expunge that code from the Book of God because of its non-fulfilment in lives of men as it is to advance the theory that the Prohibition Law is a failure because it does not prohibit.

AMENDMENT MUST STAND

Because of the laws against arson, theft and murder are being violated, shall we abandon these laws and their penalties? Certainly not; and by the same token the Eighteenth Amendment and its supporting law must stand.

The third count in this indictment is:

"You cannot by law make men moral."

This statement cannot survive the acid test. Its reasoning is fallacious and its implications untrue.

The statement that morality is divorced from law is not true. Moral conduct is the aim and end of law. That is the meaning of law. Its enactment and administration has good conduct for its objective, and while conduct may at times be governed by a fear of penalty, law is still universally recognized as necessary to the existence of well-ordered society. When people say: "You can't legislate people into good morals," I reply: Into the whole fabric of our nation's law is woven the ethical element, and any law that violates a correct moral standard is foredoomed to dishonor and its repeal is certain. By this test the old liquor-license laws were tried and condemned and ultimately superseded, and I feel quite happy in the realization that the same searching trial will reveal to the whole world the soundness of our present legislative position. Meanwhile depopulated prisons and rebuilt homes witness to the fallacy of this argument advanced against prohibition.

The fourth indictment is:

"Prohibition invades personal liberty."

Into this supposed tower of refuge probably more of our opponents run than any other, and from its flimsy ramparts they fling the cry: "Prohibition invades our personal liberty by prescribing what we shall eat and what we shall drink; and we deny any man's right to prescribe our plum pudding or our exhilarating cup."

The principle, basic to the restraints of all law, is precisely that which enters into the Prohibition Law. No man objects to the denial of his liberty to steal; anyway, he doesn't object to the curtailment of his neighbor's liberty in this direction; therefore he should intelligently accept the application of this same principle to that house-breaking, home-destroying, child-abusing, business-wrecking thief, Alcohol.

NO OTHER CONSISTENT COURSE

Liberty, true liberty, is a priceless heritage, but no man's liberty comprehends a right to strike another down—not even if that other is his own child. In the exercise of society's right to protect itself the nation came to an appraisal of the monstrous wrong that was perpetrated upon it by the permission of the drink traffic. The process toward that evolution was slow and tedious, but the final appraisal was correct—correct politically, correct economically, correct scientifically, correct socially and correct morally. With the soul of the people awake to this solemn fact there was no consistent course possible but for the nation to wash its hands forever from the cruel partnership that had dishonored it, and refuse longer to traffic in homes, in happiness, in health, in the very lives of its children. To speak this holy purpose our nation flung her starry pen across the Federal books and by strictly constitutional means wrote into the organic law of the land that which every officer and every citizen is pledged to support. There is no liberty apart from law. There is but one alternative—anarchy.

TEST OF RESPECT FOR LAW

What about the enforcement of law?

That splendid American, the Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Secretary of State says: "Everybody is ready to sustain the law he likes. That is not in the proper sense respect for law and order. The test of respect for law is where the law is upheld even though it hurts."

Law must be, and must be obeyed. Yet there are those who argue that the breach of the prohibition law is excusable. Some say it is laudable, while others are defiant and make it their business in life to forward their sinister work of doing those things that the law prohibits. There are others that go still further, and in their wild thirst for gain the lives of their victims count not, and murder is added to fraud, when they trade upon the weakness of their fellows and for fabulous prices sell deadly poison.

When I begin to analyze the crowd opposed to prohibition I must confess I am impressed neither with their quality nor their reasoning. Clean and loyal citizens, opposed to prohibition, place their reputation in jeopardy by such association. How sorrowful that opposition to prohibition has united, as in a great dragnet, the good and the bad, so that the respected citizen and the professional brewer are cogitating and co-operating together for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. But—"they shall not pass."

The prohibition law sprang from the soil and soul. It germinated in remote and sacred places where mothers pray and fathers think. The country church, the country W. C. T. U., the country home and school took the lead—the West far in advance of the East. Long and wearisome has been the struggle. Shall those who fought and gained it never go back? "Kansas," William Allen White says, "and States of her tradition and her kind would no more lose their forty years' fight for prohibition than they would lose their four years' fight against slavery."

COMPROMISES ARE BANE

There are those that pronounce themselves in favor of light wines and beers. They are the "happy medium" folk. To them the Prohibition Amendment is good, but its enforcement is bad. Their cry is "Modify." Their name is legion. According to a recent independent poll, the number of these "would-be" modifiers nearly equals the number of those who support unqualifiedly the Amendment and its supporting legislation. Herein lies our

danger. We have nothing to fear at the hands of the out-and-out "wets." They constitute a dismal and discredited minority. The compromisers are the bane that threatens the nation's Prohibition policy.

A very large number, I might say nearly all, of these friends repudiate the saloon, and if it were a choice between the return of the saloon and Prohibition, then they would choose Prohibition. But the menace of their position lies in the thought that light wines and beers are effectively divorced from the saloon and that the one can exist without the other. They say, "No saloon—it is gone forever—but give us light wines and beers."

Now, if it were possible to meet their demand I am still for Prohibition as prescribed by the present statutes. But it is not possible. It is not possible constitutionally. Intoxicating liquor is barred and little or no argument is needed to prove that so-called light wines and beers are of the proscribed class.

WOULD DEFEAT PURPOSE

Ex-President Taft and present Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court says: "As a matter of fact I am not in favor of amending the Volstead Act in respect to the amount of permissible alcohol in beverages. I am not in favor of allowing light wines and beers to be sold under the Eighteenth Amendment. I believe it would defeat the purpose of the Amendment. No such distinction as that between wines and beers on the one hand and spirituous liquors on the other is practicable as a police measure."

These "modifiers" for the most part hate drunkenness. Nobody defends drunkenness as a habit. The poor drunkard excites universal pity and almost universal contempt. What an infinite shame it is that reasonable men can be found to defend and plead for the stuff that makes drunkards! But these modifiers say that three per cent is safe. I deny it! I challenge it! Some subjects will become noticeably intoxicated on drink of low alcohol content. Some can take drink of much stronger proportion and reveal to the casual observer no bad effects. But what are the facts?

Science tells us that alcohol is a narcotic, habit-forming drug, the first effect of which is to paralyze the higher centres of the brain. It may be quite unobserved by the man himself and the surrounding company, but even as the microscope will discover the bacteria that threaten, and the microphone detect the sounds inaudible, so science with its delicate and accurate instruments startlingly shows that no person can take into his system the small quantity of alcohol contained in a glass of light wine or beer without the sign of incipient physical degeneration.

INSURANCE STATISTICS SUPPORT

This fact is, in the experience of men, demonstrated beyond all contradiction, and what science claims, life insurance statistics support.

Arthur Hunter, Chief Actuary of the New York Life Insurance Company, said regarding the death-rate of policy holders in Germany during the war: "Our total mortality was 12 per cent better during the four years of the war, including war losses, than in the preceding 11 years of peace." This largely resulted because of limitation in the consumption of alcoholic beverages. The Germans, of course, we all know are beer drinkers.

The Life Extension Institute published a report of actuaries for 43 American life insurance companies showing the increase in 25 years in the mortality rate of moderate users of alcohol. The report stated that very moderate users increased their death rate by 18 per cent over the normal rate, moderate users with occasional excess by 50 per cent, and those who drank more than

two glasses of beer or more than one glass of whisky a day increased their death rate by 86 per cent.

In an interesting investigation by the Actuary of the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company moderate users who were classed as "users of wine only not exceeding four glasses of light wine, or three of heavy wine daily; and users of beer or light ale, not daily and not more than three in any one day," showed a mortality of over 16 per cent greater than abstainers. Those who took five glasses of light wine daily were classed with those who took whisky, brandy or gin, and their mortality was 50 per cent greater than that of total abstainers.

Shall America go back?

Long before Prohibition was written into the Federal statutes Prohibition was the inexorable practice for the forces operating the great arteries of travel, and a thousand other equally important centres of industry where risk had to be reduced to the minimum and efficiency increased to the maximum.

Labor Union Bulletin, of Newark, N. J., said: "Our employes have increased their efficiency 100 per cent, because of Prohibition."

ACCIDENTS IN PLANTS DECREASED

A recent survey of managers of the big industrial concerns throughout the country conducted by the Manufacturers Record shows that the laboring man does not need and is not clamoring for his beer. Ninety-eight and one-half per cent of the manufacturers answering favored Prohibition, and most of them ascribed to the absence of drink improved home conditions among their employees, fewer accidents, better care for women and children and a keener sense of responsibility.

When decent people talk of bringing back beer and wine without the saloon they, of course, do not realize that more than 90 per cent of the alcohol consumed before Prohibition was beer. They do not realize that if we bring back beer we will bring back more than nine-tenths of the old liquor traffic. They do not realize when they talk of letting America have wine that France, Spain, Italy—the countries which produce about seven-tenths of all the wine in the world—show the highest per-capita consumption of pure alcohol. France, the country of wine, has one saloon to every 82 inhabitants, or every 20 families. France impoverished as she is, had a drink bill of one billion and a quarter dollars in 1921, and this money was spent, not on cocktails, but on wine.

They are ignorant of the fact that wine and beer contain proportionally the same alcohol as spirits—that if you place on the table before you half a pint of wine containing eight per cent alcohol, a pint of four per cent beer, a glass containing three tablespoonfuls of 42 per cent whisky, each contains the same amount of alcohol, which will have the same degenerating effect on brain and soul and body.

UNDO ALL THE GOOD ACHIEVED

Recent exposures of the wine-drinking habits of foreign countries should convince America that to introduce this form of alcoholism would be to undo all the good we have achieved in our fight for Prohibition. Dr. Lyman Fisk, of the Life Extension Institute, says of beer-drinking: "It is nonsense to claim that beer is a hygienic drink. Anyone who says that beer does not produce a certain form of intoxication is wrong. They need only visit the saloon and watch the beer-drinker in various stages of befuddlement or excitement. If beer does not intoxicate or produce any alcoholic effect, what becomes of the racial craving for stimulants which it is to satisfy? The heavy mortality

of brewery employees is sufficient evidence that beer, so far as its effect on masses of men is concerned, is not a hygienic drink."

The superintendent of our Slum Settlement Work tells me that applications for relief are reduced 50 per cent. She says: "The majority we now relieve are widows. The families in the districts we visit are better fed, better clothed, and better housed. Another significant feature is the decrease in death among young children. It used to be a common thing for reports to reach us of babies that had fallen from fire escapes and infants that were smothered on account of drunken parents, but not one such report has reached us during the last year!"

AN ARMY OF WITNESSES

Yes, something has happened. Our Women's Rescue Officers bear testimony to the effects of prohibition upon the broken hearts of our city streets. These experienced workers cannot be deceived regarding strong drink's or light wine's relation to the social evil. They have a greatly simplified problem with the drink factor eliminated. Whereas in the past hundreds came to the refuge of our homes as victims of the wine-room or saloon-parlor seductions, today drink cases are rarely found, and from the different calibre of cases coming under our care it would seem that the baser forms of the monster's subtle designs cannot be sustained without the stimulus of intoxicating drink. Shall America go back?

Yes, something has happened, for the whole force of our Industrial Home managers bear witness that the old type of needy man is no more. There is need, but need begotten through drink is practically wiped out, whereas, formerly it was one of the most prolific causes of poverty. Our Relief Department and Labor Bureau contribute the same evidence, and every phase of Salvation Army actively unites in extolling the Prohibition Law as beneficent in its results.

THRIFT AND FRUGALITY

Since prohibition many of the inmates in our Industrial Homes have banking accounts. Here are just a few figures which are representative of the many which the actual facts would supply. In eleven of our 88 institutions 166 men have saved \$6,880, an average of over \$41 per man. Not a very large nest egg to be sure, but nothing short of phenomenal when it is remembered that before prohibition these men were in a state of perpetual destitution, and they could not under any emergency keep twenty-five cents in their pockets.

The Continental and Commercial Trust Savings Bank of Chicago reports that since prohibition the deposits have increased ten million dollars.

America with the eye of the world upon her has accomplished this thing by the votes of free men and free women. She has erected a new statue of liberty with which to enlighten and lead the people of every land. Is there one with hand ruthless enough, or with eye blind enough, or with heart selfish enough, to dare the attempt to extinguish that light and bring this noblest monument low? From the advanced moral standard taken among the nations, shall America go back? All the vile foes that have ever trailed their bloody tracks across street, or vale, or plain; all the cruel instruments of war, ancient and modern, that have drawn blood, torn flesh, maimed bodies and slain life; all the destructive powers that have ever sunk ships, devastated cities, plundered homes, and brought down kingdoms—all in their massed aggregate have never occasioned one-half of the sorrow, the breakage, the ruin, the death, and self-destruction that has poured from the cauldron of this

red-eyed, firemouthed, gory-handed, hydra-headed, diabolical monster—
Alcohol!

My God, Thou knowest it! My God, Thou knowest it! Shall America
go back?

Drink has drained more blood, hung more crepe, sold more homes,
plunged more people into bankruptcy, armed more villains, slain more chil-



KEEP THE DEMON OUT FOREVER

dren, snapped more wedding rings, defiled more innocence, blinded more eyes,
twisted more limbs, dethroned more reason, wrecked more manhood, dis-
honored more womanhood, broken more hearts, blasted more lives, driven
more to suicide and dug more graves than any other poisoned scourge that
ever swept its death-dealing waves across the world.

A BLACK PICTURE

Can it be that men and women are so bewildered by selfishness, and beset
by appetite, that they will take again into their national life, into the bosom
of their homes, this baneful, loathsome, reeking, wrecking abomination?

Shall America go back?

Let me ask you to step back to the days of the wide-swung doors of the
saloon. Let me tear the film from the eyes of men who are blinded by
mercenary gains and selfish appetite. Let me point the mothers and fathers
of every status of life to the handwriting on the wall of the nation, and bid
you read what is written there. Such trembling strokes—such weak, shaky
characters—such long spaces between the words; words ill-formed—words

ill-spelled—words ill-placed. Such simple little sentences, but vastly comprehensive—such faint impress, but never to be obliterated. Whose are the fingers that have wielded the trembling pen—the thin fingers—the misshapen fingers—the twisted fingers? Whose is the writing? Why, it is the handwriting of the children—the handwriting of the children, across the wall of the nation—stretching from sea to sea!

THE PRICE IT PAYS

Ah! You can hush to silence all other voices of nations and individual complaint; you may make mute every other tongue, even of mothers of destroyed sons and daughters, of wives of profligate husbands; but let the children speak—the little children, the wronged children, the crippled children, the abused children, the blind children, the imbecile children, the nameless children, the starved children, the deserted children, the beaten children, the dead children! O my God, this army of little children! Let their weak voices, faint with oppression, cold and hunger, be heard! Let their little faces, pinched by want of gladness, be heeded! Let their challenge, though made by small forms—too mighty for estimate—be reckoned with! Let their writing upon the wall of the nation, although by tiny fingers, as stupendous as eternity, be correctly interpreted and read, that the awful robbery of the lawful heritage of their little bodies, minds, and souls may be justly laid at the brazen gate of Alcohol!


SHALL AMERICA GO BACK?

I hear the answer this afternoon coming as the voice of many waters from thousands of homes rehabilitated, from thousands of wastes reclaimed, from thousands of half-damned souls redeemed; from thousands of drunkards with manhood regained, from smoking flax and bruised reed, the chorus thrills on and on until it is caught up by ten thousand times ten thousand voices of faith and hope and love and liberty. Still on and on in jubilant song it wings its way. Mothers in the cottage sing it, the sick of the hospital join in it, the children on the school bench lift it, the convict in the prison cell catches it, the striplings of new character in this new day, shout it.

Still on and on it rolls in volume through garret and palace, over hill and through dale—on and on, ever onward and upward until the dear ones in Glory catch this refrain and with all the redeemed, their faces shining, join their silver tones that send their echoes along the everlasting hills, fill all Heaven with gladness and ring in the eternal jubilee.

AMERICA—AMERICA SHALL NOT GO BACK!

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 895 652 1