

Prohibition, the Great War, and Political Advocacy:
The Wartime Campaign for Prohibition

by

Peter Sasso

A thesis
presented to the University of Waterloo
in fulfilment of the
thesis requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
History

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2010

© Peter Sasso 2010

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

Once a fundamental aspect of American life, by 1920 the 18th Amendment to the constitution prohibited the consumption of alcoholic beverages. Prohibition challenged traditional dogmas and called into question what constituted social progress. Throughout much of the debate over ratification of the 18th Amendment, themes of patriotism, progress, science, and personal liberties, were invoked by both those in favor of prohibition, (Drys), and those opposed to the Amendment (Wets). This paper will attempt to explain how dry forces crafted a successful wartime campaign that ultimately led to the ratification of the 18th Amendment.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the invaluable support and guidance that Dr. John Sbardellati provided to me in the focus and organization of my thesis.

I thank Dr. Andrew Hunt and Dr. Cynthia Comacchio for their assistance throughout my graduate program.

I express appreciation to The Ohio Historical Society for the sharing of important documents relating to the Anti Saloon League of America.

I extend my sincere gratitude to my family, especially my parents, John and Maryellen Sasso, as well as my siblings, Frank, Sean and Kate for their continued support in all that I do.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter I: Historiography.....	4
Chapter II: The Early Prohibition Movement	32
Chapter III: An Early Feminist, a Strategist and a Publisher	45
Chapter IV: The League Evolves.....	50
Chapter V: The Liquor Lobby Fights Back	63
Chapter VI: A Window Opens as a Trench Widens	67
Chapter VII: Congress listens	82
Chapter VIII: The 18 th Amendment, Organized Labor, the Working Class and Science....	91
Chapter IX: Exploiting Wartime Anxieties.....	99
Chapter X: The League Makes America Laugh.....	105
Chapter XI: Anti German Hysteria and Americanization.....	111
Chapter XII: The Debate over the 18 th Amendment at the State Level	117
Conclusion.....	140
References	143

Introduction

For much of the early history of the United States, liquor was an essential part of American life. Alcohol was an omnipresent force in early American society. Liquor was once wrongly believed to be a stimulant, and it even was given to manual laborers to increase their productivity. In fact, in New England towns the town bell rang at 11 A.M and 4 P.M to signal a work break to drink an alcoholic beverage that was supplied by employers.¹ Liquor was also a part of early American medicine; it was even prescribed by physicians as a treatment for heart failure, debility and other diseases.² Once a fundamental aspect of American life, by 1920 the 18th Amendment to the constitution prohibited consumption of alcoholic beverages. Prohibition challenged traditional dogmas and called into question what constituted social progress. Throughout much of the debate over ratification of the 18th Amendment, themes of patriotism, progress, science and personal liberties were invoked by both those in favor of prohibition (Drys) and those opposed to the amendment (Wets). This paper will attempt to explain how dry forces crafted a successful wartime political campaign which ultimately led to the ratification of the 18th Amendment.

A focus on the nation's largest dry advocacy group, The Anti Saloon League of America (the League) is essential.³ With the League acting as the primary focal point, the history of elite actors will be examined, through League reports, speeches and strategy memorandum. Newspapers published by the League as well as non-League publications

¹ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986)p.7

² James Timberlake, *Prohibition and the Progressive Movement, 1900-1920* (Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 1963).40

³ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985).

such as the *Washington Post* will also serve as sources. This work will be divided into five main sections. There will be an examination of existing historiography on the ratification of the 18th Amendment. A broad introduction into the foundations of the prohibition movement in the Eighteenth Century will be included. The paper will then transition into an inquiry of the League's attempts to introduce a national amendment in Congress from 1915 through 1917. How the amendment was ultimately ratified on the state level will be examined next. This paper will study the ratification process in the northeastern state of Massachusetts as well as the western states of Washington State, California, North Dakota and Texas. A focus will be on western states because of the region's history and diversity. The American west was a region legendary for its saloons.⁴ It was also the region in which themes of nativism, racism and progressivism galvanized the public. The American west was also a vast and diverse region that combined larger states with densely populated cities such as California as well as predominantly rural states such as North Dakota.⁵ By comparing several western states to the eastern state of Massachusetts, this paper will demonstrate that while the ratification effort in each state was a unique endeavor, the Great War enabled prohibitionist to craft a national campaign that successfully contributed to the ratification of the 18th Amendment. The diverse nature of the ratification campaign in these regions will necessitate avoiding a focus on one individual state, instead broadly exploring ratification in the states listed above. Thus a more holistic understanding of the ratification of the 18th Amendment will be provided. The conclusion will contain an

⁴ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986)

⁵ Peter H Odegard, *Pressure Politics; the Story of the Anti-Saloon League*(New York: Octagon Books,1966)

analysis of the justifications for the 18th Amendment. The 18th Amendment was ratified for a myriad of reasons, World War One and the League's innovative advocacy were instrumental in the ratification of the 18th amendment..

Chapter I: Historiography

Prior to this paper's analysis of the League's campaign for national prohibition, it is important to breakdown the existing historiography on the subject. The historiography of the prohibition movement is rich and diverse. It can largely be divided into two different schools of thought, the political and theoretical approach. Political historians such as Blocker Jr., Kerr and Szymanski examine the topic through the lens of political history, focusing on internal documents and newspapers to show how the League cultivates the support necessary to ratify the 18th Amendment. Theoretical historians such as Rumbarger, Timberlake and Sinclair concentrate on the larger themes influencing the ratification of the 18th Amendment such as class conflict, nativism and progressivism. While those themes will be explored in this paper, the main focus is on the political intricacies of the ratification of the 18th amendment and how the League's campaign of political advocacy impacted ratification of the 18th Amendment. The home-front studies, such as the one done by Professor Jennifer D. Keene, will be utilized to view how the League launched a successful campaign to manipulate wartime anxieties to gain support for the 18th amendment. This paper will briefly examine the historiography of the progressive era, proceeding into an analysis of the existing historical literature on prohibition and World War One.

The prohibition movement took place during a period of American history often characterized as the progressive era. The Progressive era occurred from the late 19th Century through the 1920s and was a precursor to many of Franklin Roosevelt's New

Deal Reforms.⁶ Columbia University historian Richard Hofstadter [1955] has been credited with writing on the seminal narratives on the American progressive era. Hofstadter provides a thorough examination of the progressive era in *The Age of Reform, From Bryant to F.D.R.* He contends that progressivism was “a rather widespread and remarkably good-natured effort of the greater part of society to achieve some not very clearly specified self-reformation.”⁷ The reforms of the progressive era attempted to transform a political system besieged by corporate and political corruption. Reform leaders intended to do more than just clean up the political institutions; they also wanted to usher in a new era of moral righteousness.⁸ Prohibition was a natural result of the progressive era. It allowed reformers to assault big liquor while advocating for a moral cleansing that would strengthen the nation. Prohibition also encouraged early dry advocates to condemn urban decay and crime caused by drunken debauchery.⁹

Hofstadter only briefly analyzes the origins of prohibition, however he successfully situates the prohibition movement within the broader progressive movement. Prohibition was part of the broader attempt to reform the social and economic concerns of that era. However, Hofstadter persuasively argues that the prohibition movement of the early Twentieth Century can not be simply characterized as either an exclusively conservative or progressive movement. Hofstadter contends that the prohibition movement combined conservative fundamentalism with progressive reform in a hybrid movement of the two political crusades.¹⁰ Hofstadter also astutely contends that while

⁶ Nell Irvin Painter, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919* (New York, NY: Norton & Company, 1987), 324

⁷ Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryant to F.D.R.* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1955), 5

⁸ Ibid

⁹ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986)

¹⁰ Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryant to F.D.R.* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1955), 287

prohibition was founded by rural elites, by the early 20th Century, wets and dries could no longer be divided along such simplistic demographic lines. Many middle-class urbanities became passionate prohibitionists in response to the nativist perception that dependence on alcohol was a leading cause of urban decay. However, many urban reformers opposed prohibition on grounds that it curtailed individual liberty and unfairly targeted the working class.¹¹ Hofstadter wisely warns future historians to avoid reducing prohibition advocates and opponents into convenient ideological classifications. Prohibition often divided both progressives and elite business leaders. Because of unclear membership records it is impossible to know for certain how diverse the prohibition movement ever was.¹² However, as prohibition became nationally more popular, prohibitionists grew rhetorically more inclusive, focusing their campaigns around issues of national sacrifice rather than Protestant fundamentalism.

Hofstadter argues that the Great War played an integral role in the ratification of the 18th Amendment. Specifically Hofstadter contends that the war enabled prohibition leaders to argue that big breweries with Germanic names were un-American and in some instances even aiding the German enemy.¹³ Importantly, Hofstadter also introduces the role wartime sacrifice played in popularizing the need for a national prohibition amendment, stating: “The sense that others were fighting battles and making sacrifices in which one somehow ought to share was greatly heightened by the war; and the dry agitation, with its demand for self- denial, struck an increasingly congenial note.”¹⁴ While

¹¹ Ibid, 287

¹² Though it is impossible to determine how successful prohibitionists were in their attempts to create a diverse and expansive base of supporters, this paper will argue that rhetorically, the League sought to win over Americans from all walks of life

¹³ Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1955),289

¹⁴ Ibid, 289-290

he introduces the idea that shared sacrifice helped prohibitionist win support for the 18th Amendment, Hofstadter neglects to illustrate how prohibitionist centered their campaign on the need for wartime sacrifice. This paper will seek to build on his important scholarship by explaining in great detail how the Anti Saloon League focused their campaign for prohibition on the importance of wartime sacrifice by exposing how the liquor industry wasted precious supplies such as coal. It is important to build on Hofstadter's contentions that anti-German wartime sentiment empowered dries to promote prohibition. This will be accomplished by analyzing League documents such as internal memorandums and the League's own newspaper, *The American Issue*.

Strangers in the Land by John Higham [1963] is a landmark piece of scholarship on the subject of American race relations and immigration; Higham only briefly discusses the connection between nativism, prohibition and racism in the United States. However, his contentions on the subject are poignant and relevant to this paper. Higham argues that the 18th Amendment was only successfully ratified nationally because of the Great War arguing that the war created a wave of "100 percent Americanism" that demanded conformity.¹⁵ Higham proceeds to explain how the lawlessness resulting from prohibition led to race conflicts throughout the Twenties. However, the relevance to this paper is that Higham briefly explains that wartime conformity greatly led to the ratification of the 18th Amendment. This theory is only briefly discussed in Higham's broader study on the nativism of the progressive era. This paper will use internal League records as well as public campaign material to explain in greater detail how "100 percent Americanism" was used as a rallying cry for the 18th Amendment.

¹⁵ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land* (Atheneum Press, 1963), 267.

Historian John Whiteclay Chambers II [1980] focuses his analysis of the progressive era on industrialism, urbanism and mass immigration. In *The Tyranny of Change, America in the Progressive era, 1900-1917*, Chambers contends that the growth of cities, a massive influx of immigrants and suddenly powerful industrial corporations led many Americans to launch the progressive era. These reformers attempted to re-establish a degree of order in a world many believed had become uncontrollable. Prohibition united reformers by enabling them to criticize some of their favorite targets such as liquor corporations and urban decay caused by drunken debauchery. Chambers explains that these progressive reformers “combined an evangelical optimism with a belief in the effectiveness of science and business organization.”¹⁶ In many ways that perfectly described the Anti Saloon League, an organization that combined evangelical optimism with an efficient political machine. However, as Hofstadter contends, it is important to avoid simply classifying drys as progressives; prohibitionists were a unique blend of economic progressives and urban conservatives. This coalition only became successful when the war enabled them to broaden scope of their message to include themes of wartime unity and sacrifice. Throughout his broad history of the progressive era Chambers glosses over the significance of prohibition and neglects to adequately explain how the war enabled the prohibitionists to finally compel the nation’s legislatures to ratify national prohibition.

Historian Ellis W. Hawley [1979] writes about the final stages of the progressive era in *The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order*. Though Hawley writes in great detail about World War One and the political institutions of the progressive era, like

¹⁶ John Whiteclay Chambers II, *The Tyranny of Change, America in the Progressive era, 1900-1917* (New York, NY: St. Martin’s Press, 1980), XVII

Chambers, he also glosses over the campaign for prohibition during the Great War. Specifically, Hawley only briefly addresses the successful campaign for prohibition by stating that dry forces used Anti-German hysteria to promote the ratification of the 18th Amendment in the United States.¹⁷ This is something that will be addressed later when this paper analyzes League cartoons appearing in *The American Issue* to demonstrate how dry leaders attempted to connect the German adversary to the liquor industry. Hawley focuses much of his analysis on the failed attempt to enforce prohibition following ratification. This was indicative of the broader historical literature on prohibition. The prohibition movement can be viewed as a three act play. The first act focused on the birth of the movement with figures such as Carrie Nation. The second act revolved around the final ratification of the 18th Amendment. The third and final act chronicled the ultimate failure of the prohibition experiment. Historians such as Hawley have focused extensively on the failure of the 18th Amendment which is one of the reasons why this paper will focus on the successful ratification of the Amendment.

In *Reform and Regulation: American Politics from Roosevelt to Wilson*, political historian Lewis L. Gould [1986] focuses almost exclusively on the elite political actors of the progressive age. Gould details how both the Republican and Democratic Parties responded to the progressive age by attempting to incorporate various themes of the progressive age into their party platforms. Gould argues that progressive reformers, originally allies of the Republican Party ultimately lost their struggle to gain support within the Party.¹⁸ Gould continues to explain that reformers briefly gained support from

¹⁷ Ellis W. Hawley, *The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order* (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1979),30

¹⁸ Lewis L Gould, *Reform and Regulation: American Politics from Roosevelt to Wilson* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1986), V

Wilsonian Democrats but eventually also failed to win a strong foothold in that party as well. Gould persuasively explains the political opportunism prevalent in the two major parties during the progressive era. Gould largely ignores the issue of prohibition which is unfortunate because his party analysis of the progressive era could have explained the willingness of both the Republican and Democratic Parties to support prohibition.¹⁹

Progressive historian Richard L. McCormick [1988] provides both important insight as well as a strong historiographical overview of the progressive period in, *The Party Period and Public Policy: American Politics from the Age of Jackson to the Progressive Era*. Specifically McCormick argues that the progressive movement was an attempt of well intentioned liberals who believed they could remedy the ills of industrialization through political legislation. Relevant to this paper, McCormick contends that much of progressive era legislation infused Protestant intolerance into legislative efforts. This is important because the League and other dry organizations were formed and led by Protestant progressives similar to the ones McCormick describes in his important narrative on the progressive era.

Historian Steven J. Diner [1998] provides a unique perspective into the progressive era in *A very different Age: Americans of the Progressive Era*. Unlike earlier histories on the progressive era, Diner focuses his scholarship on the people of the era rather than on large institutions and corporations. Diner deconstructs the progressive era by examining how the progressive era impacted a broad range of people differently. Diner explores how industrial capitalism impacted immigrants, rural Americans, African Americans and white-collar workers during the progressive era in a multitude of ways.

¹⁹ In particular more needs to be done to determine whether political leaders supported prohibition out of principle or due to the political pressures of the League. However this is a difficult question to answer because it is extremely difficult to determine the sincerity of any politician's actions.

Diner's work is important because it highlights the progressive era and how the reform movement meant different things to different people. Diner generally glosses over prohibition, except to explain that the Anti-Saloon League and the Women's Christian Temperance Union were important forces in promoting the dry cause. Diner also contends that prohibition was a movement led primarily by rural Americans. Diner's work does not contribute any new material to the historiography on prohibition though his work does provide important insight into how a diverse range of people acted throughout the progressive era.

In *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century*, historian Gary Gerstle [2001] explains that one of the negative legacies of the progressive era was a "draconian and radicalized system of immigration restriction."²⁰ Gerstle contends that this legacy of the era led directly to the ratification and enforcement of the 18th Amendment. Finally, Gerstle persuasively explains that the federal government grew exponentially throughout the progressive era, enabling them to ratify an amendment such as prohibition that attempted to use the federal government to control the drinking habits of private citizens. Gerstle provides a compelling argument that prohibition was a result of a bloated federal government that used nativism as justification for ratifying the 18th Amendment. However, that argument has been analyzed in exhaustive detail by a myriad of historians. While nativism was an important factor in the campaign for prohibition, this paper will focus more on the wartime themes of prohibition advocates, an under developed area in the prohibition and progressive historiographies.

²⁰ Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 2001), 91

In *A Time of Paradox: America since 1890*, historian Glen Jeansonne[2006] first defines and then situates the progressive era into its proper context in American history. Jeansonne agrees with earlier historians such as John Whiteclay Chambers and Richard Hofstadter that the progressive era was a reform movement that attempted to curtail political and industrial corruption. Jeansonne briefly touches on the difficulty of analyzing the progressive movement. Progressivism was a broad movement of reform that overlapped with and co-opted several other movements such as the birth of the modern feminist movement as well as the prohibition movement.²¹ Similarly many reformers worked within both movements such as the supporters of the Women Christian Temperance Union (W.C.T.U) who also campaigned for women's suffrage.

The recent trend in progressive era and gilded age scholarship has been to focus primarily on gender and class themes. Edward Blum [2004] has recently published a journal article exploring the role of Christian women during the religious revivals of 1875 to 1877. In his essay Blum explores the divisions between male church leaders and emerging feminist leaders such as Francis Willard. Blum contends that the awakening of this period was a moment of change for American women and that during this period, leaders such as Francis Willard began to focus not only on preaching the gospel but also on social action such as championing suffrage.²² Blum provides important insight into the shift that eventually led to the creation of groups such as the W.C.T.U. Jill Frahm[2004] has recently published an important article that explores gender themes during World War One. In "The Hello Girls: Women Telephone Operators with the American Expeditionary Forces during World War I" Frahm tells the story of American women

²¹ Glen Jeansonne, *A Time of Paradox: America Since 1890* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 13

²² E. Blum, 'Paul Has Been Forgotten: Women, Gender and Revivalism during the Gilded Age', *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 247-270.

working overseas during World War One. The “hello girls” were primarily white, well-educated upper-middle class women. Fraham explains that these young women were extremely independent and successful.²³ While Fraham’s article does not deal with prohibition directly, it does provide important insight into the role the war played in expanding the influence of American women. The same wartime conditions that enabled women to work overseas enabled similar women to passionately campaign for the ratification of the 18th Amendment. An important article that connects several themes relevant to progressive era scholarship is Jeanne Pitt’s [2004] “Breeders, Workers and Mothers: Gender and the Congressional Literacy Test Debate, 1896-1897.” Pitt explores the proposed 1896 literacy act that would have required all immigrants between the ages of sixteen and sixty to prove their literacy in either English or another acceptable language. Though the act passed both branches of Congress, ultimately it died when President Grover Cleveland vetoed it. Pitt contends that the popularity of the act within Congress highlights the xenophobic anxiety pervasive in Congress throughout much of the progressive era. Pitt’s article also explores important gender themes as it explains the link between the proposed literacy act and fear that immigrant women would not be able to raise proper American children.²⁴ Though Pitt does not explore the connections between this measure and the prohibition moment, many parallels exist. The success of the act within Congress shows that members of Congress were receptive of measures that placed restrictions on future immigration to the United States. Pitt’s article indirectly

²³ J. Fraham, ‘The Hello Girls: Women Telephone Operators with the American Expeditionary Forces during World War I,’ *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.3, no.3,pp.271-293

²⁴ J. Petit, ‘Breeders, Workers and Mothers: Gender and the Congressional Literacy Test Debate, 1896-1897,’ *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.3, no.1,pp.271-293

explains how conditions existed for the W.C.T.U to connect prohibition to an effort to “Americanize” immigrant women during the Great War.

Scholarship on the working class has also become an important aspect of progressive era historical literature. John P. Enyeart [2003] has recently published an important article comparing the competing approaches within the American labor movement during the progressive era. Enyeart contends that at least in the Rocky Mountain West, evolutionary and gradual socialists emerged in positions of power within the labor movement.²⁵ Jacob H. Dorn [2003] of Wright State University has recently published an important examination of Christianity within the broader American socialist movement. Dorn contends that contrary to conventional wisdom, Christians were an important part of the progressive era socialist movement. Dorn persuasively shows how some believed that Christian and socialist compassion could work together within the same moment. Specifically Dorn explores the connections between Eugene Debs and Christian reformers.²⁶ Though Dorn does not specifically examine the link between labor and prohibition, his article indirectly explains why some labor leaders supported prohibition. Robert Johnston [2002] published an important examination of the recent historical accounts of the progressive era. Johnston contends that accounts of the progressive era have become divided between historians with negative views of the xenophobic nature of the progressive movement and historians willing to admit that the progressive era accomplished several successful reforms.²⁷ While Johnston’s account of

²⁵ J. P. Enyeart, ‘Revolution or Evolution: The Socialist Party, Western Workers and the Law in the Progressive Era’ *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.2, no.4, pp.377-402

²⁶ J. Dorn, ‘In Spiritual Communion: Eugene Debs and the Socialist Christians’ *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.2, no.3, pp.303-325

²⁷ R.D. Johnston, ‘Re-Democratizing the Progressive Era: The Politics of the Progressive Era Political Historiography’ *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.1,no.1, pp.68-92

progressive era historical literature is fairly simplistic, it does explain the complicated nature of the era. Historians are still debating about the virtues of the era as well as whether the era can be viewed as progressive, almost one hundred years after its conclusion.

An examination of recently published literature on the progressive era and the gilded age reveals the fractured nature of scholarship on the era. Most scholars are focused on examining the gender and class themes of the era. Others scholars are still debating whether or not the movement can be viewed as a true progressive period. However, recent scholarly examinations of this era have generally glossed over the campaign for prohibition during the end of the progressive era. This paper builds on many of the current trends within progressive era literature. An examination of the W.C.T.U campaign for “Americanization” will explain how women prohibitionists attempted to ‘help’ immigrant women learn how to raise good ‘American’ children. Gender themes are an important element of this paper. This paper will also build on recent contributions to labor history during the progressive era by exploring the League’s attempt to argue that many working class Americans supported prohibition. The campaign for prohibition perfectly emblemizes the competing themes of progressive era literature. Women, working class and middle-class reformers all struggled to make sense of prohibition during a war that burdened many Americans. The Great War also limited the ability of many Americans to participate in democratic actions such as protests. This enhanced the influence of middle-class male reformers within the Anti-Saloon League and also made the League’s large printing press all the more important. It is within this

framework that this paper aims to contribute to both progressive era literature as well as examinations of the American home front during World War One.

An analysis of the relevant progressive era historiography situates the issue of prohibition squarely within the broader progressive reform movement.²⁸ An examination of the literature on the progressive era provides important context for the prohibition movement. This paper will attempt to build on the historiography of the progressive era to show that while prohibition was a part of the progressive movement, it was a complex issue that was ultimately successful in winning ratification in large part due to World War One. While progressive era themes of urban decay and xenophobia were present in the prohibition movement, dry advocates were not ultimately successful until they crafted a more inclusive message. The Great War provided dry leaders the ideal opportunity to move beyond divisive nativist rhetoric and craft a campaign centered in wartime unity and patriotic sacrifice.

The historiography of the prohibition movement can be divided into two different groups of histories. The first group focuses on the nativists tendencies of the prohibition movement while the second group concentrates more on the development of a dry political strategy. The traditional approach founded by historians such as Andrew Sinclair [1963] and James Timberlake [1963] was to view the subject through social and cultural history, explaining prohibition as part of a larger social movement. More recent trends in the historical literature on prohibition have been to focus on the political development of dry advocacy groups such as the Anti Saloon League. Historians such as K. Austin Kerr

²⁸ However, not all League supporters were true progressives just as not all progressives supported prohibition. As historian Austin Kerr has argued, some dry supporters such as League Legislative Director James Cannon were true progressives while many others such as Ernest Cherrington were not.²⁸ Divisions in League leadership will be discussed later in this paper.

[1985] have been instrumental in examining prohibition through the perspective of political history. However, neither approach has adequately explained how the League crafted and implemented a wartime campaign advocating total prohibition. This paper will contribute to the historical literature on prohibition by examining internal league documents as well as dry campaign material to explore the league's wartime campaign in greater detail. However, first it is important to explore the existing literature on prohibition.

Historian James Timberlake [1963] published one of the first broad histories of the passage of the 18th Amendment. Timberlake analyzes the dry movement from 1900 through 1920 arguing that the 18th Amendment was ratified largely because of Protestant preachers, a strong group of advocates that zealously fought to ban 'demon rum' throughout both the 19th and 20th Centuries.²⁹ However, Timberlake argues that in the early Twentieth Century the religious wing of the prohibition movement gained much needed support from both scientific and economic forces that began to illustrate the detrimental results of excess alcohol consumption. Timberlake persuasively argues that these three forces were mobilized by the Anti-Saloon League in their attempt to create a dry utopia.³⁰ Timberlake supports his conclusions by drawing on a wide array of sources ranging from medical journals, popular newspapers, magazines and Anti-Saloon League records. Timberlake's study is one of the seminal works of scholarship on the 18th Amendment. However, he largely glosses over the role World War One played in the ratification of the Amendment. Timberlake could have further examined the inner workings of the League to explain why their political advocacy was so successful.

²⁹ James Timberlake, *Prohibition and the Progressive Movement, 1900-1920* (Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 1963).

³⁰ Ibid

Historian and novelist Andrew Sinclair [1964] followed Timberlake and also published one of the definitive examinations of American prohibition in *Prohibition, the Era of Excess*, published in 1964. Sinclair argues that prohibition was part of a broader cultural war for the American soul. Prohibition was a natural response of God-fearing rural Americans against urban sprawl and crime. Sinclair elegantly argues, “The Eighteenth Amendment was one of the last victories of the Village pulpit against the factory proletariat, of the Corn Belt against the conveyor belt.”³¹ Because Sinclair, a British scholar, interprets prohibition as part of a broader struggle of rural American nativism versus the urban reality of the early 20th century, he glosses over the impact WWI had on the passage of the 18th Amendment. However many early prohibition historians such as Sinclair and Timberlake neglected to fully examine the War’s impact on the passage of the 18th Amendment. The insufficient examination of the War’s impact on the 18th Amendment is a minor criticism in an otherwise important landmark addition to scholarship on prohibition. In particular Sinclair does an excellent job using Anti-Saloon League records such as the Anti-Saloon League Yearbooks to reveal important insight into the League’s tactics and goals. Sinclair also includes an exhaustive examination of government records to show how the federal government as well as various state governments responded to pressures to create a national prohibition amendment. This paper will build on Sinclair’s scholarship. Nativism certainly played an important part in the prohibition movement, however the war and the League’s political advocacy were also an essential component in the ratification of the 18th Amendment. The amendment was not simply an inevitable result of Protestant nativism.

³¹ Andrew Sinclair, *Prohibition, the Era of Excess*(Boston Mass: Harper &Row Press,1964)p. 413

Jack S. Blocker Jr. [1976] correctly argues in *Retreat from Reform: The Prohibition Movement in the United States, 1890-1913*, that the prohibition movement was a middle-class reform movement. Building on the works of Sinclair and Timberlake's scholarship, Blocker Jr. explores the inner workings of prohibition advocacy groups during the beginning of the Twentieth Century. Blocker focuses on a critical time period for the American prohibition movement. He explains that the Anti Saloon League emerged successful because they formed new tactics of political advocacy. Instead of attempting to run a slate of their own candidates for elected office like the Prohibition Party did, the League simply attempted to use its influence to lobby members of Congress. Blocker explains that the League accomplished this by focusing its efforts on Congressmen in divided ridings where a political advocacy group could maximize its influence by controlling a small yet devoted block of voters.³² Blocker also explains that by 1913, the League transformed its mission from an organization focused on local prohibition to one advocating national prohibition. Blocker's work is a landmark piece of political history of the early actions of the Anti Saloon League. This paper will attempt to build on Blocker's important scholarship by exploring how the League carried out that plan in the years following 1913; specifically by implementing a ratification campaign that exploited home-front anxieties. The paper will show that the League's transformation into a national organization placed it in an idea position to carry out a wartime political campaign.

Historian Norman H. Clark [1976] argues in *Deliver Us From Evil: An Interpretation of American Prohibition* that prohibition was a result of the American

³² James S Blocker, *Retreat from Reform: The Prohibition Movement in the United States, 1890-1913* (Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1976), 228-229.

nativist reaction to a changing world. Clark contends that issues such as immigration and industrialization compelled many Americans into becoming prohibitionists.³³ In many ways, Clark's work is similar to Timberlake and Sinclair's work in that he argues that prohibition was a natural result of middle-class Anglo Americans trying to protect their world from industrialization. However, unlike those earlier studies, Clark expands his scholarship to examine the psychological impact of liquor as well as the broader drug culture emerging during prohibition. Unlike Blocker's scholarship, Clark does not thoroughly examine the political history of the League, but instead focuses on broader social and cultural issues. Clark, like Timberlake and Sinclair also attempts to cover a wide timeframe to showcase the evolution of the American prohibition movements. While these histories are important, this paper will focus on a narrower time frame and provide a more concentrated examination of the League's wartime campaign for prohibition.³⁴ Throughout this paper, political history will also be a stronger focus than in Clark or Sinclair's studies.

Historian K. Austin Kerr [1985] builds on James Blocker's work and argues the ratification of the 18th Amendment was a direct result of the successful lobbying efforts of the Anti Saloon League.³⁵ Kerr argues that the League changed the way political advocacy groups lobbied members of Congress.³⁶ Specifically, Kerr builds on Blocker's work to illuminate how the League tactically targeted vulnerable members of Congress and promised the support of their members and organization only if the Congressperson

³³ Norman H Clark, *Deliver Us From Evil: An Interpretation of American Prohibition* (New York: NY: Norton Press, 1976), 12-13

³⁴ While broad overviews of prohibition are important, it is also crucial to have a specific understanding of how the dry forces used events such as World War One to campaign for the 18th Amendment.

³⁵ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press,1985),11.

³⁶ Ibid

pledged to support dry legislation. Kerr, a historian at Ohio State University in Columbus Ohio, home of the League's archived records, has provided important insight into the inner workings of the League. In particular Kerr reveals how the League was successful with its fundraising efforts, critical to waging political battle against the well funded liquor lobby. While Kerr's scholarship is an important addition to the political history of the League, it glosses over the impact World War One had on ratification of the Amendment. Kerr argues that the war does play an important role in ratification; however, he neglects to explain how the League tailored its ratification campaign around the war. This paper will contend that the League used the war to further its own political agenda. Because most of the available primary documents from the Great War era are internal League records as well as newspaper articles, this paper will analyze the ratification campaign through the perspective of political history.

Historian, John J. Rumbarger [1989] is responsible for one of the most impressive works on prohibition in the landmark, *Profits, Power and Prohibition: Alcohol Reform and the Industrializing of America, 1800-1930*. In this compelling narrative, Rumbarger proposes that many elite corporate actors supported prohibition because they believed it would be a positive way to create more productive and responsible workers.³⁷ In fact, Rumbarger argues that prohibition was part of a bourgeois attempt to transform the working-class into more productive workers. Rumbarger also offers the theory that prohibition was part of a campaign to turn the working class into scapegoats for the negative results of industrialization, chiefly crime and poverty.³⁸ Rumbarger contends that elite corporate actors argued that as long as the working class was burdened by

³⁷ John J Rumbarger, *Profits, Power and Prohibition: Alcohol Reform and the Industrializing of America, 1800-1930* (Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 1989), XIII.

³⁸ *Ibid*, XIV.

alcohol, they would continue to degrade American cities. Rumbarger's scholarship is important because it reveals the complex nature of the prohibition movement. On the surface, prohibitionists claimed to be progressive reformers attempting to help the working class. However, Rumbarger contends this rhetoric did not match the reality of an organization funded by big business. Rumbarger is correct, large corporate donors did aid prohibitionists; however, the League also depended on small donations and the sale of its newspapers and magazines to raise enough money to combat liquor interests in a national campaign. Both wet and dry forces actively courted labor and union support and a section of this paper will focus on attempts to win working class support for prohibition. However, the broader aims of the prohibition movement as it relates to the working class will not be examined. A theoretical explanation for the ratification of the 18th amendment will be avoided in order to concentrate on providing a more detailed analysis of the League's wartime campaign for prohibition.³⁹

Legal Historian Richard Hamm [1995] presents a much more nuanced explanation of the passage of the 18th Amendment than other historians who focus on prohibition. Hamm uses legal records and government documents to reveal the legal strategy of Prohibition supporters such as the Anti-Saloon League. In particular, Hamm describes legal arguments made by dry advocates to justify prohibition in the courts. Hamm is most successful when he depicts the evolution of tactics by the Anti-Saloon League. Hamm argues that several legal victories motivated dry supporters to move away from championing prohibition on a state by state level to advocating for a definitive

³⁹ Also, as this historiography indicates, there already are an impressive number of historical narratives exploring the theoretical legacies of prohibition. While these studies are important, this paper will seek to contribute to the historiography by examining the campaign for prohibition through an analysis focused on the practical justifications for the amendment. This is an often neglected approach especially as it relates to prohibition and the Great War.

national amendment. Hamm persuasively contends that this shift in strategy resulted from the League's frustration with the slower, local approach to prohibition. Early legal victories indicated to League leaders that their lobbying efforts would be more successful in the halls of Congress.^{40 41}

Hamm is firmly in the same school of thought as Blocker Jr. and Kerr. All three historians argue that due to legal and legislative success from 1913 through 1915, the League transformed itself from an organization concerned with state and local prohibition to an organization advocating for national prohibition. Hamm also uses government records and personal writings to reveal how successful the Anti-Saloon League was in their lobbying efforts within Congress. Because Hamm is primarily interested in the legality of prohibition, he glosses over the impact World War I had on the passage of the 18th Amendment. Hamm's scholarship is one of the definitive legal histories of the 18th Amendment.

One of the most recent additions to the historiography of the prohibition movement is Ann-Marie E. Szymanski's [2003], *Pathways to Prohibition: Radicals, Moderates, and Social Movement Outcomes*. Szymanski, a political science professor at the University of Oklahoma, attempts to explain why the prohibitionists' local-option campaign was so successful. Szymanski argues that by attempting to promote prohibition on a local level, dry forces gained a foothold into areas across the United States.

⁴⁰ Richard F Hamm. *Shaping the 18th Amendment-Temperance Reform, Legal Culture, and the Polity, 1880-1920* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995)

⁴¹ This also indicates that the League realized they would be more successful lobbying elite political leaders than the entire American public. This could be used to argue that the League realized the American public was not very receptive of prohibition. However, this can never be more than educated speculation due to the lack of national polling on the subject. It must also be noted that throughout their internal documents, League leaders such as Cannon and Cherrington was skeptical about national prohibition until war broke out in Europe. This adds even greater weight to the argument that the war was a central factor in the ratification of the 18th Amendment.

Professor Szymanski argues that this increased the League's presence in several states, leading to national prohibition. In fact, Szymanski argues that the ratification of the 18th Amendment can be attributed in large part due to the success of the local-option campaign. This contention revises earlier historians such as Blocker Jr, who argues that the transformation of the League strategy from the local option to national prohibition was due to the failure of the local option. Szymanski states that almost the opposite was true. Instead of running away from a failed policy, the League attempted to use a successful policy as a building block for more sweeping, national reform. Both political historians provide a compelling case and both have valid points. By examining the ratification of the 18th Amendment on a state-by-state level, this paper will determine that states that already had large sections of dry areas were among the first to ratify the Amendment. However, this paper will also argue that one of the reasons the League focused its attention on national prohibition was the greater success in lobbying Congress than in passing local options on the state level.

The historiography of prohibition reveals two specific approaches to studying prohibition. Historians such as John J. Rumbarger, Norman H. Clark, Andrew Sinclair and James Timberlake have published important theoretical studies of prohibition. Historians such as John S. Blocker and K. Austin Kerr have approached prohibition through the perspective of political history and have been instrumental in explaining the dynamics of modern political advocacy. While both approaches are important this paper will situate itself alongside other political histories on prohibition in order to best explain the League's wartime campaign for prohibition.

It is fitting that one of the first histories published about the campaign to ratify the 18th Amendment was about the Women Christian Temperance Union, an organization that predated the League by over a decade.⁴² Helen Tyler [1949] has been credited with publishing the first complete history of the WCTU. In *Where Prayer and Purpose Meet: The WCTU Story*, Tyler crafts a simple narrative detailing the creation and evolution of the WCTU.⁴³ Tyler explains that the WCTU, one of the first national temperance organizations was formed by “gentle women in revolt.”⁴⁴ Tyler contends that because women were viewed as the chief guardians of the home during Nineteenth Century, they were the ones that most often dealt with the harmful effects of alcohol abuse.⁴⁵ The organization was a Christian one that often evangelized the gospel. It was also a charitable group that often aided the poor and abused. Tyler persuasively contends that unlike the League, the WCTU was not a single issue advocacy organization. The WCTU focused on promoting its agenda through several political battles; the promotion of women’s suffrage was always a cornerstone of WCTU efforts.⁴⁶ Tyler’s narrative correctly depicts the WCTU as a trailblazing organization that fought to improve conditions for women and their families. The work of the WCTU was honored when former WCTU President Frances Willard became the first woman to be honored with a stature in the famed Statuary Hall under the Capitol Dome in the United States

⁴² Helen Tyler, *Where Prayer and Purpose Meet: The WCTU Story* (Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press, 1949), 19

⁴³ It is important to note that Tyler was commissioned by the WCTU to draft the first history of the WCTU. This does bias her account though her contentions cited here are factually accurate.

⁴⁴ Helen Tyler, *Where Prayer and Purpose Meet: The WCTU Story* (Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press, 1949), 13

⁴⁵ This was a direct descendent of the earlier Republican Motherhood movement. For more on Republican Motherhood, consult: Eric Foner, *Give Me Liberty!: An American History, Vol. One* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 2009), 332

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 40

Congress.⁴⁷ Throughout her narrative, Tyler distinguishes the WCTU from League. Both were national dry organizations however the WCTU was more focused on charity and several political causes while the League was largely a single political advocacy organization focused solely on promoting prohibition. The WCTU also approached the campaign for 18th Amendment differently. The League focused on its printing press and lobbying efforts during the war. The WCTU focused on providing aid to soldiers and launched an “Americanization” campaign as part of its wartime dry advocacy.⁴⁸ While these issues will briefly be explored later in this paper as a point of contrast to League tactics, the WCTU will not be the primary focus of this paper; however it is indisputable that the WCTU played an important role in promoting both suffrage and prohibition.

In *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*, Joseph R. Gusfield analyzes the WCTU and the broader prohibition movement. Gusfield correctly explains that there was a link between the women’s movement and the temperance movement that dated back the mid 1800’s.⁴⁹ Gusfield also classifies the WCTU as a largely middle-class organization that united women against social and economic concerns of the progressive era. Gusfield contends that the success of the WCTU and the broader prohibition movement can be attributed to a victory of the “rural, Protestant American over the secular, urban, and non-Protestant immigrant.”⁵⁰ That the WCTU and the League were middle-class organizations rooted in rural America is almost impossible to dispute. However, Gusfield neglects to adequately explain how the Great War provided dry reformers with the ideal opportunity to promote prohibition.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 154

⁴⁸ Ibid, 84

⁴⁹ Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement* (Urbana Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1963),88

⁵⁰ Ibid, 110

Ian Tyrrell [1991] has published one of the most impressive and thorough examinations of the WCTU in *Woman's World, Woman's Empire: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in International Perspective, 1880-1930*. What makes Tyrrell's work so impressive is that he successfully explains how the WCTU attempted and largely succeeded at becoming an international political organization. Tyrrell explains how the WCTU managed to grow into an international organization from its small beginnings. Tyrrell also examines how the WCTU exported its gospel of social purity to all corners of the world. Tyrrell demonstrates how in many instances this became a form of cultural imperialism. While largely outside the scope of this paper, Tyrrell work is important because it demonstrates the far-reaching impact of organizations such as the WCTU.⁵¹

Historian Alison M. Parker [1997] explores the WCTU and its place in broader gender history in *Purifying America: Women, Cultural Reform and Pro-Censorship Activism, 1873-1933*. Parker is primarily concerned with explaining how both the WCTU and the American Library Association were organizations that favored censorship. Parker ably explains that the WCTU advocated an expansionary federal government that protected women and children from obscene materials. This led the WTCU to advocate what was essentially a “pro censorship” message. Though the focus of Parker's scholarship is on the efforts of the WCTU to enable the government to prohibit obscene material, her work does shed important light on the WCTU. Parker contends that the WCTU represented the views of middle-class American women throughout much of the progressive era. Parker also explains that the WCTU was a multifaceted advocacy group

⁵¹ The League also had a program for “world-wide prohibition”. This will briefly be touched on as part of the League's campaign to justify wartime sacrifices by ushering in a more righteous world following the war.

focusing on a myriad of issues that impacted middle-class women and children. Suffrage, censorship of obscene material, and prohibition were just three of a multitude of issues that the WCTU worked on throughout the progressive era. Importantly, Parker analyzes the WCTU's willingness to cede individual liberties to the federal government in exchange for legislation that attempted to protect middle-class home life from dangerous external forces such as alcoholism and vulgar literature. Parker's persuasively contends that the WCTU was more than just a 'temperance union.' It was an organization that advocated a broad agenda that attempted to improve the conditions of American middle-class women.⁵²

Studies of the American home-front during World War One are incredibly important to the subject of prohibition. Home-front scholarship provides vital insight into the mindset of Americans throughout the Great War. A proper understanding of the American home-front during World War One provides important insight into a society riddled with anxiety about the German adversary, soldiers returning home with venereal disease and the rationing of important resources such as coal and wheat.

Byron Farwell [1999] *Over There: The United States in the Great War, 1917-1919* and Robert H. Zieger's [2000] *America's Great War: World War I and the American Experience*, are all part of a renewed interest in American home-front studies and fit into larger social and cultural histories of the American home-front during World War One. Both focus only a small portion of their scholarship on prohibition and the ratification of the 18th Amendment. However, both do agree that The Great War provided

⁵² In part this helps to explain why the Anti-Saloon League is the focus of this paper, one focusing on the ratification of the 18th Amendment. While the WCTU played an important part in the dry cause, its attentions were often divided between its many causes where as the League was solely interested in promoting prohibition. The single issue wartime advocacy of the League will be the primary focus of this paper though WCTU efforts will be analyzed in various sections as well.

prohibitionists with the ideal conditions to ratify the 18th Amendment.⁵³ Traditionally, the 18th Amendment has been an after thought in American home-front studies, however this paper will attempt to specifically explain why World War One created such an ideal political climate to ratify the 18th Amendment. The League manipulated many of the same home-front anxieties discussed in these two works to further its political agenda.

Jennifer D. Keene [2000] has a recent addition to the historiography of the United States during World War One. By publishing *The United States and the First World War*, Keene has connected American social, cultural and military history into one important publication. Keene does more to connect the prohibition movement to the war than historians such as Farwell. Keene does an excellent job of demonstrating how prohibitionists were able to successfully manipulate wartime anxieties to further their own political cause. Keene contends that dry forces were able to use American soldiers as a rallying cry to gain momentum for the 18th Amendment. She suggests that Americans were anxious that conditions in the military might corrupt young Americans serving abroad.⁵⁴ This paper will attempt to expand on the work of Professor Keene to illustrate in greater detail how the League manipulated fears of French corruption of American soldiers. While Professor Keene provides a broad overview of the American home-front during World War One and briefly addresses the issue of prohibition, this paper will distinguish itself from earlier home-front studies by concentrating its analysis on prohibition in order to reveal how the dry wartime campaign for prohibition exploited wartime anxieties in order to promote its own political goals. Home-front anxieties

⁵³ Byron Farwell, *Over There: The United States in the Great War, 1917-1919* (New York, NY: Norton Press, 1999), 290

⁵⁴ Jennifer D Keene, *The United States and the First World War* (New York NY: Longman, 2000), 38.

played a crucial role in the ratification of the 18th Amendment. The League specifically tailored its campaign around wartime anxieties.

In a revised edition of the landmark *Over Here: the First World War and American Society*, historian David Kennedy [2004] explores the American experience throughout the period of the Great War. Specifically Kennedy explains that American entry into the war deeply divided the progressive movement. Kennedy also describes how the American government censored wartime dissent throughout the period. Kennedy's book provides important background into this period and provides insight into why a campaign such as the one led by the Anti-Saloon League could be so effective during World War One.

One of the most recent additions to American home-front studies is Christopher Cappozzola's [2010] *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen*. Cappozzola explores America volunteerism and the eventual rise of government power during the Great War and contends that a weak federal government needed to attract volunteers to help with the war effort. The US government deputized citizens to help check for draft dodgers. Eventually, deputized citizens spiraled out of control, leading to riots and acts of violence against minorities and Germans. The overzealous reaction of many "volunteer" citizens was used as justification for a government that expanded its policing capabilities throughout the war. Though this book glosses over prohibition's impact on the home-front it does explain that the war itself led many in the United States to question what it meant to be American. For many Americans, this meant permitting state expansion during a time of national emergency because the principles of sacrifice and group allegiance called for state expansion. This

explains why the League's wartime campaign was so effective. This paper will attempt to contribute to the field of American home-front studies by specifically exploring how the League's war-time campaign exploited American wartime anxieties as well as an environment of conformity in order to finally win national prohibition.

Chapter II: The Early Prohibition Movement

Though the focus is on the period from 1915 through 1918 it is also important to have a clear understanding of early prohibition movements. The prohibition movement had a long standing reputation of being a movement led primarily by upper middle-class Caucasian Protestant progressives.⁵⁵ The movement itself was firmly rooted in the Victorian belief that hard-work and personal restraint led to a more respectable social status as well as a more productive and righteous life. Throughout the movement's history, prohibitionists believed that they had a responsibility to lift the working class up out of the depths of despair.⁵⁶ The dry activists were convinced that it would be impossible to improve the conditions of daily life for the working class until the consumption of alcohol was prohibited. Thus, while the dry movement could easily be characterized as an attempt to impose bourgeois values on the working class, it was also a progressive movement that wanted to improve the quality of life for the working class. Prohibition was strongly linked to the women's suffrage movement. Many women actively participated in the Prohibition movement, even creating the Women's Christian Temperance Union, a national organization of women that attempted to aid in the efforts of the Anti-Saloon League.⁵⁷ Many women joined the prohibition cause in an attempt to protest against the saloon's destructive place in the lives of their families. In many ways it was the ideal cause for women to participate in because a husband's alcohol abuse directly impacted the stability of home life.⁵⁸ Similarly, many of the same progressive

⁵⁵ M.J. Heale, *Twentieth-Century America: Politics and Power in the United States, 1900-2000* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004), 64.

⁵⁶ Ibid

⁵⁷ Ibid

⁵⁸ Deborah G Felder, *A Century of Women* (Secaucus, NJ: Carol Pub Group, 1999)p. 5.

prohibitionists were active in the earlier abolition movement attempting to prohibit slavery in the United States during the Nineteenth Century.⁵⁹

With its roots in progressive reform, the dry movement strengthened when science turned against alcoholic consumption late in the Nineteenth Century. Despite the praise it received from the medical community through much of early American history, by the late nineteenth century scientists had begun to turn against the drink they had previously prescribed as a panacea to almost any ailment. As early as 1866, Sir Benjamin Bader Richardson, an English physician, published a report claiming that instead of warming the body, liquor cooled it and even paralyzed the nerves controlling the blood vessels of the body.⁶⁰ This would lead to a landmark study by Professor Emil Kraepelin that concluded that instead of being a stimulant, alcohol actually served as a depressant, thus harming productivity instead of increasing it.⁶¹ The medical community's about-face on the subject of alcohol was a critical turning point in the prohibition movement. It enabled the movement to expand from a campaign controlled by small town Protestants into a cause with mass appeal. It is certain that the medical community played an important role in creating the environment necessary for prohibitionists to thrive.⁶²

With the medical community gradually becoming supportive of prohibition, dry forces began to strengthen on the state level. It is important to have a proper understanding of this period. Few states have become as synonymous with the prohibition experiment as the mid-western state of Kansas, which is why no inquiry about

⁵⁹ M.J. Heale, *Twentieth-Century America: Politics and Power in the United States, 1900-2000* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004), 64.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 41

⁶¹ Ibid

⁶² James Timberlake, *Prohibition and the Progressive Movement, 1900-1920* (Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 1963)

prohibition in the wider United States can commence until the case of dry Kansas is first explored. In 1881, Kansas became the first state to pass state-wide prohibition, is in many ways indicative of the early prohibition movement as a whole.⁶³ Drys in Kansas were unapologetically religious in rhetoric and fervently devoted to political advocacy as a means of passing prohibition.⁶⁴ Kansas was an ideal place for the prohibition movement to attain success. It was the home state of several of the largest cattle towns such as Dodge City, Abilene, and Wichita, towns that housed saloons that stirred up what many prohibitionists viewed to be debauchery and violence.⁶⁵ The tradition of wild saloons collided with the kind of settlers Kansas was attracting. Kansas, a free territory, attracted many New England abolitionists that wanted to move west to take up the cause of fighting slavery. These abolitionists tended to be Methodists and other forms of Evangelicals who were inclined to support temperance. These settlers and their offspring connect the progressive abolition movement to the prohibition campaign. These early reformers migrated in such sizable numbers that the towns of Lawrence, Topeka, Manhattan, and Burlington were known as “Yankee towns”⁶⁶ Like a tornado resulting from high and low pressure colliding, the addition of New England reformers to a state riddled with infamous saloons resulted in a natural clash between wet and dry forces.

The campaign to ban liquor in Kansas was characteristic of many early prohibition fights. Radical Protestant reformers fought a fierce campaign against wet Germans and Roman Catholics.⁶⁷ This early divide between Protestant and Catholics

⁶³ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986)

⁶⁴ Ibid

⁶⁵ Ibid

⁶⁶ Ibid, 16

⁶⁷ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986), 60.

would remain a fault point throughout the prohibition. Later prohibition movements like the ones that will be studied in this paper did attempt to become rhetorically more inclusive. However, the prohibition movement would remain one led primarily by Protestants while the wet forces would continue to be predominantly Roman Catholic.⁶⁸ Because anti- German sentiment will be discussed later in this paper, it is important to note that Germans were even targets of the early prohibition movement because of their tradition of brewing beer. This is why the Great War made Germans the perfect target for prohibitionists. As the dry forces argued, when the United States entered the Great War, the long time rival of prohibitionists became the enemy of all Americans.

By 1890, Kansas voted on and ratified a state-wide prohibition amendment. The amendment carried 92,302 to 84,304. Counties tended to vote dry if they had a strong presence of Evangelical churches, Anglo-Saxon ancestry and were made up of small to-moderate sized towns.⁶⁹ Counties voting against the amendment tended to have a large Roman Catholic population base and/or a large population of German Lutherans. Voting returns in the Kansas prohibition election are important because they reaffirm beliefs about the early prohibition movement. The amendment, while officially a bipartisan effort, was decided largely on partisan lines. Republicans voted in favour of it while a large number of Democrats opposed it, further indicating the divisiveness of the early prohibition movement.⁷⁰ This manifests the limitations of the early prohibition movement. While it was possible for a rural Protestant movement supported by

⁶⁸ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press,1985).

⁶⁹ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986),60.

⁷⁰ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986),60.

Republicans to succeed in demographically friendly Kansas, such a movement was severely restricted nationally until it could provide broader appeal, as it did do in the early twentieth century. While prohibitionists successfully ratified a dry amendment in Kansas, they were much less successful in others parts of the United States, largely for the same reasons they were successful in Kansas. The early movement was a narrow movement of Republican, Protestant reformers. For the movement to have any kind of national appeal, it had become more inclusive (at least rhetorically) and needed to develop tactful national organizations.

With Kansas voting itself into the dry column late in the Nineteenth Century, it attracted many progressive reformers, such as the colorful prohibitionist, Carrie Nation. Carrie Nation was one of the most iconic reformers. Nation, characteristic of many early women prohibitionists, was a zealous Protestant. After moving around much of the United States, Nation finally settled in Kansas in 1900 only to be dismayed by the brass disobedience of state liquor laws.⁷¹ Nation quickly became a hero to the prohibition cause while routinely participating in violent actions against illegal bootlegger's warehouses and their supporters. Unlike later prohibitionists who will be the primary focus of this paper, Carrie Nation was not a polished political lobbyist. Nation was rather a rugged and sometimes violent political street fighter who condoned violence as a means to an end. In her book, *The Use and Need of the Life of Carry A. Nation*, she describes the necessary use of violence in biblical terms: "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the VIOLENT take it by force," which means that where the evil is aggressive, we must be

⁷¹ Ibid

more so, and take, compelling surrender by the determination never to yield.”⁷² Nation was convinced that she had a divine right to take down saloons, breweries and brothels by force. Nation’s religion is also particularly important. Like many early prohibitionists, Nation, a devout Protestant, believed it was her duty to save the nation from the sins of urban industrialization, crime and degradation that were turning the United States into a despicable nation. This fervent belief that she was fighting a battle for righteousness on Earth led Nation on a violent crusade against the saloons in her adopted home state of Kansas.⁷³

Nation, upset that the state-wide prohibition amendment in Kansas was not being properly enforced led her supporters on a campaign of vigilantism throughout Kansas. Nation routinely burned down liquor warehouses and saloons in Kansas. In her autobiography, Nation describes the violent campaign: “The smashing in Kansas was to arouse the people. If some ordinary means had been used, people would have heard and forgotten, but the "strange act" demanded an explanation and the people wanted that, and they never will stop talking about this until the question is settled.”⁷⁴ It was indeed strange for a woman to be leading such a violent crusade. Carrie Nation truly stirred up emotions of all kinds in both wet and dry forces. She was at the same time both a unique force in the early prohibition movement while also acting as a true representation of early prohibitionists. Her violent tactics set her apart from other leaders while her

⁷² Carry A Nation, *The Use and Need of the Life of Carry A. Nation* (General Books, originally published in 1905, re-released in 2010), chapter VIII.

⁷³ Ibid

⁷⁴ Carry A Nation, *The Use and Need of the Life of Carry A. Nation* (General Books, originally published in 1905, re-released in 2010), chapter X.

unapologetically religious rhetoric aligned her closely with early prohibitionists who relied on small Protestant churches to spread their reform message.⁷⁵

Nation was also representative of early prohibition leaders in that she was a woman who campaigned devoutly to improve conditions for women both at home and in the public sphere. Nation's main argument in support of giving women the right to vote centered around her belief that women were the guardians of virtue. In chapter twelve of her autobiography Nation argued: "In all ages woman has taken an active part in the defense of man. She is the best defender he ever had on earth, because she is his mother. True mothers think more of the interest of their children than of their own."⁷⁶ Nation argued that women have an innately selfless virtuous streak that makes them the ideal guardian of men. She attempts to explain why women should be given the vote, chiefly due to their inner virtue ensuring the most righteous candidates win elections. This she contends would help clean up the degradation prevalent in the United States during the early Twentieth Century. Later in chapter twelve of her autobiography she compels people to support women's suffrage because it is an essential part of progressive reform: "Free men must be the sons of free women. This land cannot be the land of the free or home of the brave, until woman gets her freedom and men are brave and just to award it to her. No man can have the true impulse of liberty and want his mother to be a slave."⁷⁷ Emancipation of slavery, prohibition and women's suffrage were all linked into the same progressive cause by advocates such as Carrie Nation.

⁷⁵ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986)

⁷⁶ Carry A Nation, *The Use and Need of the Life of Carry A. Nation* (General Books, originally published in 1905, re-released in 2010), chapter 12

⁷⁷ Ibid

Women were also the ideal enemies of the saloon. Many women viewed the saloons as destructive forces in their home lives. Saloons were sites where husbands would drink away precious family income. In chapter eleven of her autobiography Nation describes liquor as a force that causes much strife between the sexes. Nation argued that a husband is a man who provides and cares for his family, as much as it is in his power to do, but when he refuses and will not do this, he breaks his marriage vow and becomes his wife's enemy.⁷⁸ Nation continued to explain that this conflict between husband and wife is not a natural one but rather one that is caused by alcohol. Nation believed that saloons were driving a wedge between husbands and wives because they were preventing men from upholding their responsibilities as husbands and fathers.⁷⁹ Thus saloons were the enemies of both men and women through the break-up of families. Nation passionately described the impact of saloons on families by saying in her autobiography: "The home life is destroyed. Men and boys are taken from home at the very time they ought to be there, after their work is done. Families should gather in the evening to enjoy each other's society."⁸⁰ Thus the saloons and alcohol abuse were preventing families from becoming stronger. By spending time in the saloons, fathers were not upholding their responsibilities to both their children and wives. Nation also argued that saloons led men to frequent prostitution houses, causing even more friction between husbands and wives.⁸¹ Later prohibitionists such as the ones that will be the focus of this paper also attempted to exploit fears of alcohol consumption leading to greater incidents of

⁷⁸ Ibid

⁷⁹ Ibid

⁸⁰ Ibid

⁸¹ Ibid

prostitution. This was particularly effective during World War One when women on the home-front feared their husbands and boyfriends would become tempted by French prostitutes and bring back a venereal disease.⁸² Nation also foreshadowed another World War One plea for prohibition when she rebuked Germans. In her autobiography, Nation argued “It is said that Germans are the cruelest husbands on earth. Their beer gardens have taken the place of firesides. There are more insane and suicides in Germany than any nation on earth.”⁸³ Arguments about German cruelty and dependence on beer were clichés often used by prohibitionists to advocate for an elimination of saloons. These arguments were divisive and limited the depth of reform prohibitionists could attain in Anglo-Saxon areas of the United States. However in wartime, anti-German rhetoric became an acceptable form of patriotism. Condemning German brewers would take on a patriotic urgency during the war. Nation’s rebuke of Germans during peacetime shows that many of the same arguments used for decades by prohibitionists were simply more effective during wartime, masked as patriotic rhetoric. The League did not have to search too hard for arguments that supported wartime prohibition; dry advocates such as Carrie Nation used anti-German rhetoric decades earlier.⁸⁴

Nation is an important example of how influential women were in promoting prohibition. In fact, the support of women was a constant force throughout both the first and second waves of prohibition studied in this essay. The Women’s Christian

⁸² The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series XII, roll 77, Dr. James Cannon Jr and Dr. E.J. Moore, Report of Commissioners Appointed by the Anti-Saloon League of America to Make First Hand Study of the Conditions Surroundings Our Soldiers and Sailors in Great Britain and France with Special Reference to the Evils of Intemperance and Prostitution, Report to ASLOA Board of Directors, May 28th, 1918.p.9.

⁸³ Carry A Nation, *The Use and Need of the Life of Carry A. Nation* (General Books, originally published in 1905, re-released in 2010), Chapter 11.

⁸⁴ This again shows the impact of the Great War on the ratification. The same arguments used by decades by prohibitionists were not successful on a national level until they were attached to wartime patriotic necessity as well as wartime anxieties.

Temperance Union [WCTU] was the first truly national women's prohibition organization.⁸⁵ It had an extensive membership base representing all parts of the country and all ranks of life.⁸⁶ While the WCTU never became as well funded or as influential in Congress as the larger Anti-Saloon League, the WCTU did become an early and important ally of the temperance movement. Like Carrie Nation, many women in the WCTU believed it was their responsibility to protect the country from debauchery caused by saloons. In a 1915 speech to the Anti-Saloon League Convention in Atlantic City, Mrs. Florence D. Richards, President of the Ohio chapter of the WCTU, voiced this sentiment when she claimed "Now, I want to tell you this about the flag... The reason it is so good is because a woman made it. You know how much trouble George Washington had with the flag... He went to a woman about it. That woman was Betsy Ross."⁸⁷ Many women supporting prohibition viewed American women as the protectors of everything that was right with the United States. These women believed they were the guardians of American morals and thus they fought to ban the saloons.⁸⁸ Women also viewed prohibition as a way to earn the vote, which is why in her speech to the Anti-Saloon League 1915 Convention, Mrs. Richards proclaimed: "I want to say to you, brothers, that if you would just let us women help you a little at the ballot box, we would be sure that the job would be done right."⁸⁹ A diverse range of women from Carry Nation to Florence Richards joined the movement to offer themselves as guardians of the American moral compass. They used prohibition as an opportunity to win the right to vote. With dry

⁸⁵ In fact, the creation of the WCTU predated the founding of the Anti Saloon League. The WCTU held its first Convention in Cleveland Ohio on November 18th, 1874. (Tyler, 19)

⁸⁶ Deborah G Felder., *A Century of Women* (Secaucus, NJ: Carol Pub Group,1999)p. 5

⁸⁷ Anti-Saloon League of America. *Proceedings of the Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Westerville, OH: American Issue Press, 1915) p.214

⁸⁸ Ibid

⁸⁹ Ibid, p.209

leaders intent on winning the battle over prohibition on a state-by-state basis, women's organizations throughout the country made an impact on prohibition legislation. As guardians of the home, female prohibitionists were ideal spokespersons for the wasteful use of grain and coal during wartime. Housewives thus had extra credibility when they spoke out in favor of prohibition as an important part of wartime sacrifice.⁹⁰ It is important to understand the role women played in the prohibition movement, specifically early in the movement. While women like Carrie Nation and Florence Richards used different tactics, both women tried to connect prohibition to women's suffrage. Throughout the entire prohibition movement, many women remained steadfast supporters of efforts to prohibit alcohol.

Carrie Nation symbolizes the early roots of the prohibition cause in the progressive reform movement of the late Nineteenth Century. Many of the same reformers who believed liberty and freedom were an essential justification for emancipating the slaves also believed that prohibition would set the nation free from the shackles of the saloon. Carrie Nation once compared slavery to drunkenness going as far as to say: "I would rather have my son sold to a slave-driver than to be a victim of a saloon. I could, in the first case, hope to see him in heaven; but no drunkard can inherit eternal life."⁹¹ That quote is an extreme example of the symmetry in the progressive movement. Many of the same people that fought slavery believed the saloon to be the next great battle in a way to save humanity.⁹² These early reformers depended on

⁹⁰ Also, it is not merely a coincidence that both a prohibition and women's suffrage amendment were debate in Congress at the same time in December of 1917. Though not the main focus of this paper, it will be discussed later in the paper because it was an important development.

⁹¹ Carry A Nation, *The Use and Need of the Life of Carry A. Nation* (General Books, originally published in 1905, re-released in 2010), chapter 11

⁹² This is simply a reminder that many of the same reformers that once advocated freeing the slaves also ardently supported prohibition. It provides some context into the background of early prohibitionist. I am

advocates like Nation who used the same language to plea for women's suffrage. By studying the state of Kansas and Carrie Nation's often violent crusade to enforce prohibition in Kansas, the early prohibition movement is easily understood. Early prohibitionists were a loose coalition of middle-class Protestants reformers from small towns. They were many of the same people that led the fight to end slavery and would one day lead the call for women's suffrage. The rhetoric and actions of reformers were often divisive. They were a group that could never fully organize on a national level even if they were more successful on an organizational level.

These earlier prohibitionists eventually banded together to form a number of organizations that attempted to create a national prohibition campaign. The Prohibition Party (PRO) was one of the first and largest of the early dry organizations. While the power of the group ebbed and flowed through much of the Nineteenth Century, the organization ultimately was limited by its insistence to run a slate of candidates in national elections.⁹³ This greatly limited the PRO's ability to lobby the dominant political parties. The PRO never generated enough political impact to force the major parties to co-op their policies.⁹⁴ Founded in 1895 by a group of Ohio progressive Protestants, the Anti Saloon League of America attempted to learn from the mistakes of the PRO.⁹⁵ While the League copied much of the national structure of the PRO, it refused to field candidates for political office, instead it attempted to use its influence to support dry candidates within the Republican and Democratic Parties. Choosing to cooperate with the

not trying to make any casual link between prohibition and emancipation but rather I am attempting to indicate how fluid the early reform movement was. It also helps to explain how passionate these reformers were. They truly believed they were right about prohibition, just as they believed they were right about eliminating slavery.

⁹³ Andrew Sinclair, *Prohibition, the Era of Excess*(Boston Mass: Harper &Row Press,1964),83-84.

⁹⁴ Ibid

⁹⁵ Ibid

major parties instead of challenging them directly, the League maximized its political influence and became the vanguard of the prohibition movement by the early Twentieth Century. The Anti-Saloon League learned from the mistakes of these earlier prohibitionists and created the organization necessary to advocate for prohibition.

Chapter III: An Early Feminist, a Strategist and a Publisher

Throughout the long campaign for national prohibition several different leadership styles led the movement towards the 18th Amendment. Some leaders such as Frances Willard viewed prohibition as part of a larger struggle. Others such as James Cannon and Wayne Wheeler believed that the best way to accomplish prohibition was through coercion of public officials. A third group of dry leaders led by Ernest Cherrington believed that a large, ‘informative’ printing press could win enough public support to propel prohibition towards ratification. This section will attempt to briefly compare several important dry leaders. Each one of the leaders examined in this section was important to the dry movement for a myriad of reasons.⁹⁶

One of the most important leaders of the WCTU was Frances Willard. While only in her thirties Willard was one of a small handful of women that formed the WCTU in Fredonia, New York on December 22nd, 1873.⁹⁷ Just a few years later Willard ascended into the presidency of the WCTU.⁹⁸ Willard succeeded into turning the WCTU into a truly national organization with state branches throughout the United States.⁹⁹ Two issues Willard was most passionate about were prohibition and suffrage.¹⁰⁰ Willard led the WCTU into becoming a multi-issue advocacy group for women. Willard argued that prohibition needed the support of women in order to succeed nationally. This led Willard to argue in 1876 that women should have the right to vote on issues related to liquor.¹⁰¹

⁹⁶ For a more complete examination of dry leaders, consult Daniel Okrent’s, *Last Call* or K. Austin Kerr’s, *Organized For Prohibition*

⁹⁷ Helen Tyler, *Where Prayer and Purpose Meet: The WCTU Story* (Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press, 1949), 14

⁹⁸ *Ibid*, 52

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, 53

¹⁰⁰ Daniel Okrent, *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition* (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2010), 17

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*

Willard's suffrage advocacy grew in fervor when in 1879 she argued that women should be granted complete suffrage.¹⁰² By turning the WCTU into an organization that campaigned for both prohibition and suffrage Willard brought several well-known feminists leaders into the WCTU. Susan B. Anthony routinely appeared at WCTU conventions. Willard also appointed Lucy Anthony to a leadership position in the WCTU's lecture bureau.¹⁰³ In recognition of her leadership efforts Willard was chosen as the first president of the National Council of Women.¹⁰⁴ Willard's importance to the WCTU is difficult to dispute. She positioned the WCTU as a champion of middle-class American women. She turned the organization into a national powerhouse. Many aspects of the WCTU organization implemented by Frances Willard were copied by the Anti-Saloon League. For example, the League set up a national organization with state branches and regular conventions. The League however was better situated to advocate prohibition. Unlike the WCTU, the League, a predominantly male group had the luxury of being a single issue advocacy organization. The League also had the advantage of being a predominantly male organization; unlike the WCTU, League members had the right to vote in general elections. This enabled the League to focus on using its resources to throw the balance of power in close elections behind dry politicians. With women's suffrage not yet a reality, it is remarkable that Frances Willard was able to turn the WCTU into such an important national political group.

Throughout the course of League history analyzed in this paper, three men held important leadership positions within the organization. Wayne Wheeler was a loyal

¹⁰² Ibid

¹⁰³ Ibid

¹⁰⁴ Helen Tyler, *Where Prayer and Purpose Meet: The WCTU Story* (Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press, 1949), 58

devotee to the dry political cause. Wheeler, a graduate of Oberlin College, gradually worked his way up from loyal League volunteer to the important position of League legislative superintendent.¹⁰⁵ Wheeler believed the only way to accomplish prohibition was through coercive political advocacy; he was the main architect of League lobbying efforts. He focused on using the sizable League membership to control the balance of power in key Congressional districts. Throughout much of the debate over ratification, James Cannon served as Wheeler's chief lobbyist in Washington D.C. while Wheeler was responsible for the national lobbying campaign.¹⁰⁶

Unlike Wayne Wheeler, Ernest Cherrington was not a professional life long dry advocate.¹⁰⁷ Cherrington, originally a school teacher eventually became editor of a small town newspaper in Ohio.¹⁰⁸ In 1902 Cherrington became a paid staff member of the Anti Saloon League. Cherrington gradually worked his way up League hierarchy. The League needed someone with newspaper experience to run its burgeoning publishing company and selected Cherrington as editor of the *American Issue*.¹⁰⁹

Cherrington, Cannon and Wheeler had uniquely different approaches to dry advocacy. Wheeler and Cannon were staunch advocates of forceful political advocacy. They believed that the only way to accomplish prohibition on a national scale was through coercion and manipulation of politicians.¹¹⁰ Cherrington with a background in teaching and publishing believed in a different approach; he believed that education was

¹⁰⁵ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press,1985),121

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, 197

¹⁰⁷ This is to say that while Cherrington always supported prohibition, he did not always actively work for the cause of prohibition.

¹⁰⁸ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press,1985),121

¹⁰⁹ Ibid

¹¹⁰ Ibid, 214

the most important factor in winning support for prohibition.¹¹¹ Cherrington used the American Issue publishing company as a means to win support for dry causes. Wheeler believed that politicians had to be baited into supporting prohibition while Cherrington thought that the public just needed to read the facts about liquor in order to support prohibition.¹¹² While their approaches differed, both men were vital to League efforts to secure ratification of the 18th Amendment. Wheeler was one of the chief architects of League efforts within Congress and the various state legislatures.¹¹³ Cherrington's *American Issue* was used to motivate dry supporters into action and pacify opposition. The *American Issue* was Cherrington's attempt to showcase the League in the best possible manner to the world.

The focus of most scholarly examinations of the League has been on Wayne Wheeler. Historians such as K. Austin Kerr, Daniel Okrent and Peter Odegard have analyzed Wheeler's lobbying efforts. This paper will largely focus on Cherrington's work with the *American Issue*, League Yearbooks and other League propaganda tools.¹¹⁴ Wheeler's lobbying efforts in Congress were important but they required a brilliant propagandist like Cherrington to successfully push prohibition towards ratification. As chief of the American Issues Publishing Company, Cherrington was the chief architect of the League's wartime campaign for prohibition. Cherrington's wartime campaign framed the cause of prohibition as one necessary to the national war effort, this enabled Wheeler to most efficiently promote the 18th Amendment in Congress and various state legislatures. The two different approaches of Cherrington and Wheeler worked together

¹¹¹ Ibid

¹¹² Ibid

¹¹³ Ibid

¹¹⁴ The term propaganda is an important one. While Cherrington believed he was simply educating the public about prohibition, League information was propaganda, especially during the war.

during the ratification campaign to promote prohibition both publically and privately. Both men were indispensable to the League. It was not until after ratification that the relationship incinerated, culminating with Wheeler winning a battle for control of the League during the 1920s.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 214

Chapter IV: The League Evolves

For much of the early Twentieth Century the League was focused on carrying out a campaign to promote prohibition through the local option. The League eventually realized that the local dry option would never be successful until the entire nation went dry. This realization, along with various legal and legislative victories forced the League to reexamine its approach. Eventually the League decided to advocate national prohibition through the 18th Amendment. This section will analyze that evolution in League strategy.

The dry local option meant individual communities could vote to go dry. The League believed they could maximize their influence in targeted areas such as rural Protestant communities.¹¹⁶ The League hoped that by succeeding in targeted locations, support for prohibition would spread to areas that were previously hostile to the idea. In the short term, this strategy was largely unsuccessful. For instance, in California there were only five dry counties in California with a total state-wide dry population under 100,000, a small number in a state with a population nearing three million.¹¹⁷ The dry-option failed in part because prohibitionists realized prohibition was nearly impossible on a state level as long as the federal government allowed liquor shipments to be shipped through dry states due to inter-state commerce clauses in the U.S. constitution.¹¹⁸ While several states and many municipalities in every region of the country had gone dry by

¹¹⁶ Ibid

¹¹⁷ Gilman M. Ostrander, *The Prohibition Movement in California, 1848-1933*(Berkeley CA: University of California Press,1957)p.81

¹¹⁸ Richard F Hamm. *Shaping the 18th Amendment-Temperance Reform, Legal Culture, and the Polity,1880-192* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995)p.57

1910, it was impossible to enforce these regulations when prohibition was not federal.¹¹⁹ Because of this, dry forces shifted their strategy from a local, community, and state based strategy to one as a national lobbyist present daily in the halls of Congress and the Supreme Court.¹²⁰ National prohibition and the dry's movement greatest success, the Eighteenth Amendment, would be the ultimate fruition of this new national strategy. The Anti-Saloon league was the most effective national dry organization. By 1910, The National Anti-Saloon League had over forty state and territory leagues.¹²¹ The League also employed professional lawyers and lobbyists. Their purpose was to spread the gospel of prohibition in both the halls of Congress and the courtroom of the Supreme Court. The Anti-Saloon League shifted their strategy from an outright ban of liquor to regulating it out of existence. Prohibitionists benefited from good timing, because by 1910, the evolving economy, increased immigration, and urbanization all contributed to increased prostitution and fuelled natives' anxieties.¹²² This contributed to a public that was more receptive to the concept of national prohibition than ever before.¹²³ Americans turned to regulation to shield them from the increased perception of a lawless society that was losing its way. Congress also grew favorable to prohibition.

By 1912, Congress became controlled by Democrats, a party that had a strong rural southern wing, a group predisposed to support prohibition. Rural Americans had a long history of being more supportive of prohibition than their urban counterparts.

However, because earlier prohibitionists aligned themselves with the Republican Party,

¹¹⁹ Of course, in many ways the failure to enforce the dry-option foreshadowed later failures to enforce the 18th Amendment.

¹²⁰ Richard F Hamm. *Shaping the 18th Amendment-Temperance Reform, Legal Culture, and the Polity, 1880-192* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995),58.

¹²¹ Ibid,133

¹²² Ibid,195

¹²³ This is not to say that the overall public began to support prohibition, however, certainly the movement gained support in the middle and upper classes of the American public.

these rural Southern Democrats were not always allies of the prohibition movement. However, with the League's non-partisan stance, these rural southern Democrats became much more supportive of prohibition.¹²⁴ Under a Congress dominated by rural forces, legislators would pass the most important prohibition legislation since the Wilson Act. The Webb-Kenyon Act passed by Congress in 1913 finally outlawed interstate liquor shipments into dry areas.¹²⁵ Unlike previous legislation, dry forces played a critical role in getting the Webb-Kenyon Act passed. The dry press pressured readers to write or visit their representatives and urge them to support the bill. The Anti-Saloon League brought almost one hundred speakers to testify before congressional committees. The dry lobby was so strong that one Congressman denounced the League as "a clever and persistent lobby."¹²⁶ This persistent lobby played an important role in getting the Act passed. After being passed and then vetoed by President Taft, the bill was finally passed into law when Congress overrode President Taft's veto. The bill prohibited "The shipment or transportation of any spirituous... or other intoxicating liquor into any state that prohibited liquor sales."¹²⁷ This was an important success for the prohibition movement because it validated both state-wide prohibition and federal lobbying efforts. The Webb-Kenyon Act revealed that the path towards national prohibition would lead through Congress. After the Webb-Kenyon Act, the League was confident that its lobbying clout was strongest in the halls of Congress where it could target vulnerable Congresspersons in swing ridings.¹²⁸ By 1913, it became clear that a strong lobbying effort that focused on

¹²⁴ Peter H Odegard *Pressure Politics; the Story of the Anti-Saloon League*(New York: Octagon Books,1966)

¹²⁵ Richard F Hamm. *Shaping the 18th Amendment-Temperance Reform, Legal Culture, and the Polity, 1880-192* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995)p.195

¹²⁶ Ibid,217

¹²⁷ Ibid

¹²⁸ Ibid.

individual members of Congress could effectively pass national prohibition. After the Webb-Kenyon Act, the Anti-Saloon League and their allies began to push for national prohibition to be accomplished through the halls of Congress

By 1914 with the Anti-Saloon League preparing to establish a national campaign for prohibition an army of dry advocates had to be trained. The League distinguished itself from earlier prohibition campaigns not just in its efforts to maintain its nonpartisan status but also in its successful attempts to create a national dry network of amateur activists.¹²⁹ ¹³⁰ In 1914, the League executive committee drafted and distributed a memorandum that they hoped would create a legion of informed anti-liquor activists. The letter amounted to a beginners' manual for amateur activists.¹³¹ A national network of people supportive of prohibiting liquor existed. With this memo, the League hoped to turn that network into a potent force. This directive titled "Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be Held in the Several States" instructed members how to carry out a national political campaign on the local level. This campaign was pivotal in that it positioned the League to carry out its forthcoming national campaign for prohibition. It also demonstrated how the League was able to establish itself as the model for successful national advocacy.

The Special National Prohibition Campaign (SNPC) had four main objectives with the first being the goal of raising twenty-five million dollars for what would become

¹²⁹ While it is true that the WCTU was also a national organization of dry activists, they never reached the depth of influence as the Anti-Saloon League, in part because of funding but also because they closely cooperated with the Anti-Saloon League.

¹³⁰ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985).

¹³¹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be held in Several States, 1914,2.

the successful national campaign for the 18th amendment.¹³² The national League sent further memorandum informing individual speakers how to best ask the audience at League events for donations. The League informed speakers: “Do not Beg, but so put up the proposition that the people who do subscribe [donate funds] will feel that it is a privilege to have a part in the great fight.”¹³³ The League attempted to use this campaign to disseminate ownership in the prohibition movement through fundraising. People were to believe that by donating to the cause, they were buying a stake in the prohibition machine. It was also hoped that after donating money, supporters would feel committed to the cause, thus turning them into loyal foot soldiers in crusade for prohibition.¹³⁴ This tactic is still used by fundraising campaigns of advocacy groups and political campaigns. While the League did not invent these methods, they did carry them out with ruthless efficiency.¹³⁵ Speakers were trained on how to “discreetly” ask for cash to be dropped directly into a collection basket.¹³⁶ Half of the funds secured during this campaign were to be directed to the national office, with the other half being distributed to the state branches.

While it is difficult to know for certain how successful the League was in its fundraising efforts during this special campaign due to complicated financial management, the campaign was certainly successful.¹³⁷ On average quarterly income

¹³² Ibid

¹³³ Ibid,5

¹³⁴ Ibid

¹³⁵ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985).

¹³⁶ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X rolls 1-3, Suggestions to Speakers created by Executive Director of the Anti Saloon League, 1914,8.

¹³⁷ League finances were often complicated by the fact that monies were often changing hands between state and national organizations as well as uncertain bookkeeping practices by the League’s financial department.

doubled from the start of this campaign in 1914 through the successful ratification of the 18th Amendment.¹³⁸ The League dramatically increased its fundraising capabilities during this important five year campaign. This once again reveals the prohibition movement to be one grounded in affluence. However, the movement also depended on unique ways to raise funds from working class families as will be demonstrated later in this paper through an exploration of the League's American Issue Publishing Company.

The second main objective of the "Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be Held in the Several States" was to spread the goals of the national campaign for prohibition into cities and towns throughout the United States.¹³⁹ In many ways this was the League's way of channeling the most successful elements of its local-option campaigns into a national one. The League hoped that by creating activists in locations throughout the U.S., it would be creating an environment already receptive to prohibition before the national amendment ever cleared the halls of Congress. The League hoped to accomplish this by teaching the local activists how to hold town-hall meetings, distribute favorable literature created by the league and establish the need for national prohibition by having local supporters highlight how liquor was harming their home communities.¹⁴⁰ This created the ideal conditions to not only ratify the 18th Amendment but it also situated the League to exploit wartime anxieties due to an already existing network of trained volunteer activists.¹⁴¹ The supporters were well

¹³⁸ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, League Financial Records, 1914-1918.

¹³⁹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be held in Several States, 1914,2.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid,2

¹⁴¹ This is not to suggest that the League in any way anticipated World War One. However, it is clear that the League created the kind of national organization that could opportunistically take advantage of any

versed in campaigns geared around exploiting anxieties. Those tactics were part of campaigns that hoped to spread fear and apprehension of saloons. Despite the tactic of using local supporters to spread national goals, the third objective of the SNPC was to make sure that each state branch maintained its own local identity.¹⁴² The League had the foresight to understand that a campaign crafted in Ohio based on legislation drafted in Washington D.C. would not necessarily be effective equally in each state throughout the country. Thus the league hoped to give each state branch enough latitude to leave their imprint on a national campaign. This is important because ratification of the amendment required the League to provide national guidance and organization, however, it could not appear to be a bloated national organization. World War One allowed the League and dry supporters to circumvent the difficult waters of crafting a national campaign around local identities. Wartime anxieties were omnipresent throughout the United States during 1917 and 1918.¹⁴³

The fourth and final goal of the “Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be Held in the Several States” was to transition the prohibition movement into a more geographically diverse and secular one. Specifically the memorandum states that another objective of the campaign “is to reach the millions of people who do not attend regular church meetings and who do not hear the state League speakers from year

national or international conflict. In a political sense, the League was fortunate that World War One enabled them to take full advantage of a national, non-partisan advocacy organization.

¹⁴² The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be held in Several States, 1914,2.

¹⁴³ Without World War One the League would have had a much more difficult time crafting a national campaign for prohibition in a nation where local issues can complicate national ones. The war enabled the League to craft a national campaign without spending so much time focusing on local issues that were not too important during wartime. While the current plan being discussed is from 1914, this indicates how much easier the plan was to implement following American entry into the Great War. Something the League could not have foreseen in 1914 but benefited from by 1918.

to year.”¹⁴⁴ The League estimated that prior to this campaign, its literature and advocates only reached about one in sixteen Americans.¹⁴⁵ In order to succeed nationally, the League understood that it had to broaden the scope of its campaign to reach beyond the traditional rural, middle-class, Protestant reform network. Once again the war helped the League accomplish this goal. The public was hungry for information during the war and was receptive of League literature informing them of how their husbands and sons were being tempted by the evils of alcohol abroad.

The League hoped to accomplish its four objective by conducting a series of special presentations and speeches in locations throughout the United States. The plan aimed to hold “special meetings in every village, town and city of [each] state, with several such meetings in each large city.”¹⁴⁶ It is important that the League conducted these meetings in all areas, not just ones previously supportive of dry legislation. This was part of the League’s goal of reaching beyond its traditional base. The goal was not necessarily to win over a majority of people. The League was simply attempting to raise as much money possible while recreating its image as a more inclusive organization. This is not to suggest that the League attempted to court racial minorities. The League continued to be a primarily white, Protestant organization; however, by 1914, it was trying to increase its presence in urban areas and it targeted secular Americans.¹⁴⁷ At these events the League created a line-up of speakers that included League personnel,

¹⁴⁴ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be held in Several States, 1914,2.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid

¹⁴⁶ Ibid,3

¹⁴⁷ It is impossible to know for certain the races and religions of the people that attended these urban meetings because the league did not keep track of such internal demographics. The important aspect of this is that League leaders understood that they had to increase their presence in the cities where their popularity had long been marginal at best.

pastors and secular community leaders.¹⁴⁸ The League wisely used its network of existing community leaders to accomplish this goal, depending on its allies to use their contacts to attract a large audience to these events. In these tactics, modern political advocacy was starting to develop. Like direct mailing, the League constantly created a database of loyal supporters and even those inclined to support their cause such as church leaders.¹⁴⁹ This enabled them to attract large audiences to these events. At these events, the league asked attendees to sign five-year subscription cards that enabled the League to broaden its database of support.¹⁵⁰ Even if a person was simply attending a League event for the first time, by signing a subscription card they were permitting the League to send them a constant barrage of literature. By simply donating “any amount” to the League during these events, supports would be receiving complementary five year subscriptions to League publications such as *The New Republic* and *The American Issue*.^{151 152} This shows that League magazines and newspapers were primarily geared towards spreading League information rather than solely raising funds for the League.¹⁵³ This enabled them to disseminate information rapidly during their campaign to ratify the 18th Amendment. It also situated them to become conveyors of wartime anxiety during the war. The League had no way of knowing for certain in 1914 that a World War was on the horizon that

¹⁴⁸ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be held in Several States, 1914,2.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid,4.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid

¹⁵¹ Ibid,6.

¹⁵² This is not the same *The New Republic* as the one founded by Croly and Lippmann.

¹⁵³ Though the two did go hand and hand as the League sold advertising spots in these publications and could command a higher rate by demonstrating increased subscription rates. Almost everything the League did was geared around simultaneously raising funds while also spreading their message. It again demonstrates the intelligent strategy of this early advocacy group.

would help their cause. They were fortunate that the United States entered the World War exactly as the five-year campaign made the League stronger than ever before.

A wise, efficient strategy can only go so far and towards the end of 1915 the Anti Saloon League started to understand the daunting challenges of a national prohibition campaign. In a letter from Ernest Cherrington to League legislative director, James Cannon, Jr., Cherrington mused about the problems facing the League. Cherrington complained that the prohibition movement stalled in Congress because of the strategy of liquor advocates.¹⁵⁴ The successful strategy of the wet forces in Congress was to delay and redistrict.¹⁵⁵ Because the U.S. constitution requires a two-thirds vote for amendments to successfully pass through Congress, the liquor lobby focused its strategy on maintaining just enough support to keep a third of Congress in their corner. In particular, the wets honed in on the most populous northern states: New York, Pennsylvania, Missouri, New Jersey Indiana, Ohio, California, Massachusetts and Illinois.¹⁵⁶ The liquor lobbyists understood that as long as they maintained a baseline of support in the largest, northern industrial states, they could effectively stave off prohibition in the short term. The League believed that the strongest support for its cause came from southern or rural and agrarian states such as Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon and West Virginia.¹⁵⁷ This reveals several different congruities between the earlier prohibition and the more successful movement led by the League in the Twentieth Century. Despite forming a more rhetorically inclusive national

¹⁵⁴ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X rolls 1-3, Rev James Cannon to Ernest Cherrington, March 26th, 1915,1.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid

¹⁵⁶ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X rolls 1-3, Rev James Cannon to Ernest Cherrington, March 26th, 1915,4.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid

organization, the League still had difficulties persuading people in northern, industrial states with large urban populations to support their cause. This suggests that a year into the League's five-year plan, they were struggling to gain a foothold in the industrial north. This also explains that working class northerners were still skeptical of a movement predominantly led by Protestant reformers attempting to prohibit the consumption of alcohol. Specifically, the League believed that the liquor lobby controlled thirty-five out of forty-three Congressmen from New York, nine out of twelve Congressmen from New Jersey, twelve out of sixteen from Massachusetts and seven out of eleven from California.¹⁵⁸ With this level of support in the nation's most populous states, wets were almost guaranteed that they could prevent dry forces from gaining two-thirds support in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives was the source of most of the league anxiety because it felt confident in its ability to win two-thirds support in the Senate.¹⁵⁹ This again strengthens the argument that by the middle of 1915, the League was still struggling to break through in the industrial North.¹⁶⁰ Because the House had large urban delegations, it was the branch that most concerned the League.¹⁶¹

The second part of the liquor lobby's strategy was to redistrict. The liquor forces hoped to use their urban base in the House of Representatives to defeat national prohibition until 1920, at which time it hoped redistricting could effectively kill national prohibition.¹⁶² Specifically Ernest H. Cherrington worried that "a movement is rapidly

¹⁵⁸ Ibid

¹⁵⁹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X rolls 1-3, Rev James Cannon to Ernest Cherrington, March 26th, 1915,5.

¹⁶⁰ Andrew Sinclair, *Prohibition, the Era of Excess*(Boston Mass: Harper &Row Press,1964)

¹⁶¹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X rolls 1-3, Rev James Cannon to Ernest Cherrington, March 26th, 1915,5

¹⁶² Ibid,1

developing in each of the dominant political parties to stave off the submission of a constitutional amendment...until after the reapportionment of 1920, when the liquor men hope by working through certain leaders of both parties...to insure more than one-third of the congressional districts being against prohibition.”¹⁶³ While it is impossible to tell for certain whether or not the liquor advocates would have killed prohibition by delaying it and then using gerrymandering to kill any future dry amendments, the fear forced the League into a sense of urgency. Cherrington believed that his organization only had until 1920 to pass an amendment through Congress. This made the League’s five-year plan even more important. It also again demonstrates how important the war was to ratification of the 18th Amendment. For the purpose of the dry lobby, the timing of the war could not have been any more fortuitous. The war created an ideal environment for the prohibitionists during what they believed to be their final window of opportunity to pass national prohibition.

Throughout 1915 the League could not have foreseen the eventual impact of the Great War on domestic political issues and was scrambling to find ways to circumvent the liquor lobby’s hold on at least one third of the United States House of Representatives. Ernest Cherrington, Wayne Wheeler and James Cannon struggled to craft a new strategy to win support in Congress. A particularly contentious idea was whether or not to break the League’s longstanding policy of being a nonpartisan organization. In fact Article two of the League’s Constitution stated “The League pledges itself to avoid affiliation with any political party...and to maintain any attitude of strict

¹⁶³ Ibid

neutrality not directly and immediately concerned with the traffic in strong drink.”¹⁶⁴

Ultimately, Wheeler, Cannon and Cherrington agreed that the League could only be successful by remaining non-partisan. The League managed to make tremendous inroads in the rural South in part because it was a non-partisan organization unlike earlier dry groups that aligned themselves with the reform wing of the Republican Party.¹⁶⁵

However, the League did attempt to become more active in party politics without actually siding with one party over the other in non prohibition issues. The League hoped to force both parties to craft propositions making prohibition part of both national party platforms; the league also hoped to nominate dry congressional candidates within both parties.¹⁶⁶

Specifically League Leaders hoped that by planting supporters in important party committees, the League could insure that both parties adopt dry provisions during their national conventions.¹⁶⁷ However this strategy was unsuccessful in part because League leaders could never agree on what exactly constituted partisan involvement into political campaigns.¹⁶⁸ This severely impeded the success of the five year plan and left the league scrambling to find ways to win support in the House of Representatives before 1920.

Though the League’s five year plan was not immediately successfully, ultimately it formed the foundation of the League’s successful campaign for the ratification of the 18th Amendment. The evolution of League strategy from the local option to national advocacy enabled it champion the 18th Amendment.

¹⁶⁴ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X rolls 1-3, Rev James Cannon to Ernest Cherrington, March 26th, 1915,7

¹⁶⁵ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986)

¹⁶⁶ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X rolls 1-3, Rev James Cannon to Ernest Cherrington, March 26th, 1915,11.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press,1985)

Chapter V: The Liquor Lobby Fights Back

Throughout much of 1916, the League was struggling to successfully carry out its grand plan for national prohibition. League financial records indicate that its five-year plan was successfully raising its funds to record levels.¹⁶⁹ However, the League still could not break the liquor lobby's hold on at least a third of Congress. While the liquor lobby's financial support of Congressmen opposed to prohibition was important, arguments used by wet lobbyists also were successful. The liquor lobby had two main arguments that received a measured amount of support. Brewers and other liquor interests prophetically argued that prohibition could not be enforced even if it was ratified. During an address delivered at the Convention of the United States Brewers Association in Atlantic City in June of 1909, the Brewers Association made this claim: "For a law that is not operative or enforced... is not only equivalent to no law, but is worse than no law, because it breeds in the best of men a contempt for all law, and because it places a premium upon fraud, and blackmail, and corruption."¹⁷⁰ The liquor lobby warned that national prohibition would fail, and that its failure would create a more dangerous and corrupt society. Brewers warned that it would fail because, as Percy Andreae claimed in a 2 June 1910 edition of *Leslie's Weekly*: "Men do not give up their habits in obedience to a mere fist of the law."¹⁷¹ Brewers went even further, claiming that not only would prohibition fail, but that it would also bring with it new corrupt public figures. Wets warned that corrupt enforcement figures would profit by receiving bribes from illegal

¹⁶⁹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, League Financial Records, 1914-1918.

¹⁷⁰ Percy Andreae. *The Prohibition Movement in its Broader Bearings Upon Our Social, Commercial and Religious Liberties: Addresses and Writings of Percy Andreae* (Chicago, ILL: F.Mendelsohn Press, 1915),79-80.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid*,126

bootleggers.¹⁷² While this argument almost perfectly predicted the ultimate failure of the 18th Amendment, it appears to have been restricted to areas in the industrial, urban North. Due to the League, prohibition was succeeding in the small rural areas where they were able to pass dry-option legislation.¹⁷³ The liquor lobby however only had to appeal to the one third of the population already in its corner, and to those people, this was a successful line of argument.

The liquor lobby's second main line of argument was based in the belief that prohibition violated individual liberty. In a 1915 publication about personal liberty, anti-prohibition activist Percy Andraea warned, "Because most of those ... are content to leave the defense of their liberties to their neighbor... the result is that everybody's business becomes nobody's business, and the most important duty devolving upon the individual citizen is sadly neglected by all."¹⁷⁴ Andraea was explaining that prohibition was only possible because regular citizens did not care enough to defend their own personal liberties. Andraea also wrote that national prohibition was a way of punishing the many for the sins of a few, saying in 1915: "But the real fact is that the addiction of some men to over-indulgence in drink... is used as alleged evidence that [all men should be forbidden from drinking] thus reducing every human being to the level of those few who have no power of self- control."¹⁷⁵ Andraea believed that it was unfair to punish all men for the crimes of a minority of men. These arguments about fairness and individual liberty, much like arguments about the government's alleged inability to enforce national

¹⁷² Ibid

¹⁷³ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986)

¹⁷⁴ Percy Andraea. *The Prohibition Movement in its Broader Bearings Upon Our Social, Commercial and Religious Liberties: Addresses and Writings of Percy Andraea* (Chicago, ILL: F.Mendelsohn Press, 1915),316-317.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid,309

prohibition, were enough to appeal to the devoted base support of the liquor lobby; however World War One almost nullified the effectiveness of these arguments. The bulk of the liquor lobby's argument against prohibition revolved around distrust of the government and the need to put individual liberty ahead of collective sacrifice. These arguments were enough to stymie the League during peacetime, but once the United States entered the war in Europe, these same arguments crippled brewers.

During wartime, what mattered most was collective support in order to present a united front, one capable of coming together to win the war. Arguments about individual liberty lost their credence. Many Americans made wartime sacrifices that extended from the kitchen into their personal beliefs about the limitations of government. Americans willingness to sacrifice personal liberties during wartime also heightened the importance of the campaign for the 18th amendment because it connected the movement to Cold War restrictions on personal liberties as well as the American Patriot Act passed during the Twenty-First Century American war on terrorism. World War One also eliminated the effectiveness of the liquor lobby's insistence that the federal government could not be trusted to enforce national prohibition. During wartime, the public looked to the government for protection and guidance and held much less skepticism of its actions. Furthermore, questioning the federal government during wartime made the liquor lobby vulnerable to accusations that they were unpatriotic and even supportive of the German war effort. Many of the same arguments used so effectively to prevent prohibition for decades would be used to defeat the brewers during wartime. Arguments used by both the wet and dry lobbies made the campaign for the 18th Amendment the ideal representation

of how wartime anxieties can be used to manipulate the public into supporting a domestic political agenda.

Chapter VI: A Window Opens as a Trench Widens

Throughout much of 1917 with the League's window of opportunity before 1920 redistricting quickly closing, the prohibitionists began to realize that the burgeoning war in Europe was their best opportunity to pass national prohibition. League leader Purley A. Baker bluntly stated in a memorandum titled "The Next and Final Step" that "the policy of the Anti-Saloon League ever since its inception has been to go just as fast and just as far as public sentiment would justify."¹⁷⁶ However with American entry into World War One on the horizon, the League understood that they had an opportunity to ensure that public opinion move rapidly in their favor. The National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America held in Washington D.C. from December 10th through the 13th of 1917 presented the League with the ideal opportunity to connect the cause of prohibition to the war effort, while also explaining why the amendment had to be urgently ratified in order to help win the war. The group generally held conventions every other year in an attempt to bring advocates from all over the United States together for one, central gathering¹⁷⁷. The League's conventions were a way for the League top brass to unveil and justify its current strategies to promote the prohibition movement. The conventions often featured passionate speeches. These speeches were designed to both motivate loyalists and grab headlines that might win over neutrals not attending the convention. It is not a coincidence that the League decided to meet a few blocks from the U.S. Capitol. Earlier in the year, the U.S. had entered the war, and the League sensed that the time to

¹⁷⁶ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, Purley A. Baker, The Next and Final Step, 1.

¹⁷⁷ Anti-Saloon League of America, , *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN:S.E. Nicholson,1918),1-13.

pass national prohibition had arrived.¹⁷⁸ The 1917 Convention held in Washington D.C. was thus a venue for the League to make an urgent plea to Congress to introduce a national dry amendment.

The war affected the convention even before it began as the League had to move the convention from Convention Hall, to the Metropolitan Church. The Convention Hall was needed for war duties.¹⁷⁹ It was fitting that a convention that would become defined by proclamations of patriotic sacrifice would have to move its venue in order to accommodate the war effort. These sources are important because they shed light on the arguments many Americans heard during the campaign for prohibition. Even if the League Convention largely attracted only an elite audience of supporters and members of Congress, speeches at the Convention and published League reports were routinely covered by the mainstream press. For example, the *Washington Post* published several extensive articles covering speeches made during the League's 1917 convention such as a major article on the speech made by William Jennings Bryan.¹⁸⁰ It is evident that League speeches were widely covered by the press and thus present in the homes of many Americans.

However, this kind of scholarship does have limits. The campaign for prohibition took place in an era before widespread public polling was conducted.¹⁸¹ It was incredibly difficult to measure public opinion before the development of modern polling practices. The 18th Amendment itself was never directly voted on by the public so it is impossible

¹⁷⁸ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 185.

¹⁷⁹ Anti-Saloon League of America, , *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN: S.E. Nicholson, 1918), 14.

¹⁸⁰ "Drys to Have Lobby", *The Washington Post*, December 7th, 1917, pg. 11.

¹⁸¹ Even modern polling has its difficulties and complications.

to definitively know how the nation felt about the amendment. Also, it is difficult to know the effectiveness of League wartime arguments due to the fact that the American public never directly voted on the amendment.¹⁸² In part because of these limitations this paper employs a top-down approach focusing on speeches and documents of elite actors, starting with an exploration of the League's 1917 Convention. It is also important to note the primary concern is an explanation of how the war was used by prohibitionists to advocate for national prohibition. The main arguments of the brewers were rendered largely ineffective because of World War One. Due to the war's impact on their central line of argument, brewers and liquor interests toned down their public campaign throughout the war, focusing instead on legal and political stall tactics. This is another reason why this paper focuses on the public arguments of the League, because during wartime, League arguments were likely the most vocal.¹⁸³

The convention attracted over 2,500 prohibition activists from all fifty states and territories.¹⁸⁴ According to convention transcripts, "Protestants, Catholics and Jews" were all represented at the convention.¹⁸⁵ This was prominently featured in both the League's Yearbook as well as its Convention report from that year.¹⁸⁶ It is significant that the League went out of its way to publicize the supposed religious diversity of the convention because it was long believed to be an organization led by middle-class Protestants.

¹⁸² Even letters to the editors are difficult to view as independent, neutral voices in the prohibition debate. Many letters to the editors of the nation's largest newspapers simply restated the talking points of both wet and dry activists. Thus it is possible and in certain instances likely that the activists made sure to encourage supports to write letters to the editors, thus even these sources can not be viewed as true bottom-up sources. League evidence does suggest that leaders urged supporters to write letters of support to both local elected officials as well as newspaper editorial boards. Such as in : Tell Your Congressman What to Do, *The American Issue*, April 28th, 1917.p.2.

¹⁸³ However, this paper will explore the arguments used by allies of the brewers such as labor leaders, Congressmen and certain newspapers.

¹⁸⁴ Anti-Saloon League of America, , *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN:S.E. Nicholson,1918),14.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid

¹⁸⁶ Ibid

During the war in an effort to gain mass support for the 18th Amendment, the League made a concerted effort to broaden its support by including Americans of every religion. While earlier League conventions were characterized by Protestant “fire and brimstone” lectures¹⁸⁷, this convention did more than just advertise the diversity of its audience. This program focused predominantly on wartime unity pushing religious rhetoric to the background. Religion was still an essential aspect of the League’s program, however throughout the Convention, Protestant ministers made up a majority of speakers, these preachers used the podium to rally a wartime nation behind prohibition. Attempting to craft a campaign for prohibition that was at least more rhetorically secular, the League made four wartime themes the focus of its message.¹⁸⁸ The League argued that the 18th Amendment was necessary in order to aid the domestic war effort, eliminate the threat alcohol posed to soldiers and create a better society after the war. The League also criticized German breweries.

Any doubt about the focus of the convention was answered when the first resolution passed reaffirmed the League’s loyalty and devotion to the war effort.¹⁸⁹ The rest of the resolution contained many of the patriotic themes that would characterize the wartime focus of the League’s efforts to pass prohibition. The resolution emphasized the League’s desire to connect national prohibition to the war effort. The resolution

¹⁸⁷ Ibid

¹⁸⁸ Again, this is not to suggest that League membership became more ethnically diverse during their wartime campaign. However, the point of this section is to establish that at least rhetorically, the League was attempting to showcase its openness. In all likelihood, the League was probably attempting to become just inclusive enough to avoid any potential backlash towards a movement led predominantly by the white, rural, middle-class. Again, it is impossible to determine the actual ethnic composition of League membership. As has been stated, all know for certain is that many League leaders were white, rural, middle-class Americans. Previous histories on prohibition such as the ones published by Timberlake and Sinclair shed light on the ethnic composition of League leaders.

¹⁸⁹ Anti-Saloon League of America, *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN:S.E. Nicholson,1918), 16.

protested: “the use of foodstuffs in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors at home.”¹⁹⁰

¹⁹¹The waste of precious grain in order to make alcoholic beverages was a persistent theme throughout the 1917 convention as well as the League’s campaign to pass prohibition from 1917 through 1918. The resolution went as far as to contend that while the Americans were sacrificing their sons to the war effort, they were no longer willing to sacrifice civility in order to appease opponents of prohibition: “While the people of this country are willing to give freely...our sons to the winning of this war, we cannot agree to lay the sobriety and the virtue of our manhood as a sacrifice upon the altars of drunkenness and vice.”¹⁹² Sacrifice was a key theme throughout the League’s wartime campaign. For League supporters, the war meant more than just potentially losing their sons to sniper fire, it meant they deserved greater political clout, and they intended to use that influence to pass national prohibition.

While members of the League were willing to sacrifice their sons to the war effort, they were not willing to send them overseas simply to become corrupted by the influence of alcohol. Throughout the League’s campaign for the 18th Amendment, members argued that prohibition was necessary to protect the soldiers at home and abroad. The League argued that, if a soldier went to the front completely free of influences of alcohol, he would be more likely to resist temptation abroad. Thus the League and its supporters argued that prohibition was as necessary as proper armor and rifles. The League’s resolution went as far as to urge the government to take diplomatic measures necessary to protect soldiers abroad. The resolution urged: “the adoption of

¹⁹⁰ Ibid

¹⁹¹ Part of the following section was part of a paper turned in by this author for history 696H, a graduate course at the Wilfrid Laurier University.

¹⁹² Ibid

such regulation for the army and navy outside of the United States...as will give our men abroad equal protection [from alcohol] to which they have in the cantonments and naval bases of our own country.”¹⁹³ It is difficult to surmise whether or not this represented a genuine fear by League supporters that soldiers would return home following the war corrupted by liquor or if the League was cleverly trying to use home-front anxiety to further its political cause. Regardless, the League routinely argued that the only way to ensure soldiers returned home alive and in good mental and physical condition was to pass national prohibition.

Reverend A.C. Bane, the first speaker of the convention, summarized much of the Convention’s wartime advocacy in his opening remarks. Bane allotted most of his time to connecting the League’s desire for a national prohibition amendment to wartime necessity. He touched on all four of the League’s wartime messages. Most prominent was the message of wartime sacrifice. Bane specifically claimed that: “the liquor traffic is reducing America’s productive power by one-third while our coal operators, and ammunition makers are pleading with the government for Prohibition...as absolutely necessary to enable them to provide the coal and munitions to win the war.”¹⁹⁴ This was part of a concerted effort by the League and its supporters to connect wartime production needs to the elimination of alcohol. The League understood that the divisive religious and ethnic rhetoric that fueled the early Prohibition movement would not be enough to amass the broad coalition necessary to pass Prohibition on a national scale. This is likely why

¹⁹³ Ibid

¹⁹⁴ A.C. Bane, “Response to the Address of Welcome” (speech, Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti Saloon League of America) in *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN:S.E. Nicholson,1918), 22.

the 1917 Convention focused more on issues of national unity and patriotic necessity than on race and religion prominent in earlier conventions.¹⁹⁵

The second theme of the League's wartime message was fueled by fear of what the League believed to be the German menace. The League routinely attempted to connect liquor interests to the German enemy present in the trenches of Europe. A.C. Bane declared that: "The breweries of this country are German owned and operated; are hot-beds of pro-German sentiment akin to treason; are utterly un-American to the core."¹⁹⁶ It was important for the League to clearly establish the breweries as pawns of the German army; this enabled the League to argue that the fight over prohibition was in fact another front in the war. Bane argued that money earned from the sales of beer was being funneled back into Germany and was used to kill Americans.¹⁹⁷ While such sensationalist rhetoric was never demonstrated to be factually accurate, it was very successful. The Convention delegates, including many members of Congress erupted in applause when Bane suggested that German owned breweries were being used to harm Americans. Such aggrandizement is likely most effective in wartime when the public is already controlled by wartime anxieties.

While the vilification of German brewers was a central theme, a third key argument throughout the convention, and present in Bane's opening speech, was the threat liquor posed to American soldiers both at home and abroad. The League argued that alcohol abuse was a systemic problem that afflicted young men early in life and

¹⁹⁵ Anti-Saloon League of America, *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Thirteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Harrisburg PA: S.E. Nicholson, 1910).

¹⁹⁶ A.C. Bane, "Response to the Address of Welcome" (speech, Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti Saloon League of America) in *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN:S.E. Nicholson,1918), 23.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, 23-24

followed them to the trenches of Europe. As Bane argued, “we have failed during past years to forbid liquor to the generation of young men from whom we must now choose our soldiers...from their own drink habits.”¹⁹⁸ Bane contended that simply banning a soldier’s alcohol consumption would not solve the problem of a drunken military because many American soldiers already had alcohol problems developed during their youth and unlawful German brewers were: “surreptitiously selling drink to soldiers in every army camp in America...and inciting the soldiers to break it[the law], thereby weakening our defense and fighting force.”¹⁹⁹ Once again this sensationalist wartime rhetoric played on the fears of the American public. It is also important to understand that the League made sure to persistently attach the wartime necessity of prohibition to the scourge of alcohol consumption. Implicit in all these League arguments is that following the war there would be a need for a strong and able bodied fighting force that could resist the debilitating impact of alcohol. Thus prohibition would be necessary long after the war.

The League’s desire for a lasting prohibition was evident in its attempts to argue that, following the war, an improved society would form around the elimination of alcohol consumption. The League contended that the necessary sacrifice would be rewarded following the war, as the world would emerge into a bright utopian future.²⁰⁰ A.C. Bane alluded to this in his final remarks, poetically declaring that prohibition would, “make victory certain for our arms, to assure our own and humanity’s freedom, and to establish the world’s greatest democracy upon a moral and social foundation.”²⁰¹ The ideal that prohibition would help win the war and usher in a new era of utopian

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, 21

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, 21

²⁰⁰ Ibid, 23

²⁰¹ Ibid, 24

democracy was present throughout the League's campaign for Prohibition.²⁰² Throughout Bane's opening Convention speech the League's four chief arguments, advocating for what would become the 18th Amendment, were clearly outlined in a sensationalist fashion that would stoke wartime fears and insecurities.

Following A.C. Bane's speech was an important address by Congressman Alben W. Barkley. While the wartime arguments used by Congressmen to promote Prohibition will be explored later in this paper, it is important to first establish the significance of Congressman Barkley's remarks to the Convention. The mere fact that Barkley, one of the most powerful members of Congress, a subsequent Senate Majority Leader and Harry Truman's Vice President took time out of his schedule during wartime to attend and address the Anti-Saloon League Convention reaffirmed the League's importance.²⁰³ Throughout his speech Barkley prophetically promised the immediate passage of the 18th Amendment in Congress.²⁰⁴ Following Barkley's address, J. Sidney Peters, Commissioner of Prohibition in Virginia proceeded to describe how League lobbying tactics influenced members of Congress, pointing out that: "Dr. Cannon, at the head of your forces at the last session of Congress, sent out 900 telegrams one day."²⁰⁵ The League was a sophisticated national organization that was capable of the kind of mass mobilization that could have been used by the U.S. Army. These efforts were amplified throughout wartime.

²⁰² K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 185.

²⁰³ Polly Ann Davis, Alben W. Barkley, *Senate Majority Leader and Vice President* (New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 1979).

²⁰⁴ Alben W. Barkley, "Address" (speech, Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti Saloon League of America) in *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN: S.E. Nicholson, 1918),30.

²⁰⁵ J. Sidney Peters, "The Third House" (speech, Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti Saloon League of America) in *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN:S.E. Nicholson,1918), 45.

Throughout the first half of 1917, the Anti-Saloon League urged its supporters to plea for prohibition in order to aid the American war-effort.²⁰⁶ The Anti-Saloon League's newspaper *The American Issue*, routinely urged its readers to write to their Congressperson in order to explain the connection between Prohibition and wartime success. In the April 28th edition, the League explained how every American had a patriotic duty to personally lobby on behalf of Prohibition. The editorial titled "Tell Your Congressmen What to Do," explained that, "actual war conditions make necessary emergency legislation against liquor...kindly wire or write your Congressmen at once respectfully urging them to act promptly on the following measures."²⁰⁷ The editorial urged readers to explain to their Congressmen how prohibition was vital to the war effort by detailing the four themes present throughout the League's convention.²⁰⁸ This shows the direct link between the Convention and the League's broader campaign to link Prohibition to the war. By 1915, *The American Issue* had a circulation of over eight million.²⁰⁹²¹⁰ Throughout the war years in an effort to avoid accusations of hypocrisy, while advocating a campaign of sacrifice, the League cut the number of *American Issue* copies it produced each year in order to claim that it was doing its part to conserve resources. The League had a circulation rate for *The American Issue* of roughly six

²⁰⁶ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 185.

²⁰⁷ Tell Your Congressman What to Do, *The American Issue*, April 28th, 1917.p.2.

²⁰⁸ Ibid

²⁰⁹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, role1, Ernest H. Cherrington Papers, December 1915.

²¹⁰ While we do have a broad idea of the proclaimed circulation rate of *The American Issue*, it is impossible to know for certain the whether or not only League supporters subscribed to *The American Issue* or if the subscribers were a broader cross-section of the population. It is likely that most subscribers were League supporters however it is also entirely likely that those supporters distributed *The American Issue* at community events and to neighbors and friends that were not necessarily League supporters. The paper was after all intended to be a propaganda tool to spread support for the cause of prohibition.

million and sixty thousand throughout the war years.²¹¹ This was still an impressive number during the war years and the League argued that the number of readers of the newspapers were actually dramatically higher than six million because often individual churches and other organizations would subscribe to *The American Issue* and share editions with its members.²¹² Many readers responded by writing their Congressperson, similar to the letter writing campaign cited in several 1917 Convention speeches.²¹³ This explains why powerful members of Congress respected the political prowess of the League enough to address the League's Convention with glowing remarks of praise. These letter campaigns also help to explain why so many members of Congress used the war as their justification for supporting the 18th Amendment.²¹⁴ The reality of the political situation was that the League was already powerful before the war. Once its members combined their political power with wartime anxieties, they became a political force that members of Congress could not ignore.

Perhaps the most exciting speech of the Convention was given by former Democratic Presidential Candidate and Woodrow Wilson's first Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan.²¹⁵ Bryan was an ardent supporter and fundraiser for the League. He traveled the United States on behalf of the League, giving speeches and lectures on

²¹¹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, role1-3, American Issue Publications Annual Report to Board of Directors of the Anti Saloon League.

²¹² It is also important to note that the League published several other publications such as the *American Patriot*, *New Republic* and *Scientific Temperance Journal* however *The American Issue* had the largest circulation rate and will be used as the primarily focus of league publications for the purposes of this paper.

²¹³ The League did not keep track of how many letters were sent Congress as a result of this campaign.

²¹⁴ House Debate on Proposed Prohibition Amendment, 65th Congress., 2nd Sess., December 17, 1917, 428-459.

²¹⁵ Gerald Leinwand, *William Jennings Bryan: An Uncertain Trumpet* (Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007), 101.

prohibition throughout the country.²¹⁶ He routinely explained why Prohibition was necessary to aid the war effort.²¹⁷ At the League's 1917 Convention, Bryan devoted his speech to connecting Prohibition to the war, touching on all four of the pillars of the League's wartime plea for Prohibition. Bryan argued that men on the home front were also important to the war effort, and for the United States to win the war, the men at home had to: "furnish the food to feed the fighters and make the ammunition for the fighters' use."²¹⁸ Bryan persuasively argued that the men still at home during the war had to make bullets and grow grain for the soldiers rather than consume beer that directly took grain off the plates of soldiers and indirectly put bullets into the hands of the German enemy by using wartime profits to aid the Germans.²¹⁹ This message attempted to play on the guilt of men still at home into supporting Prohibition as a way to do more for their peers fighting abroad.

The most important aspect of Bryan's speech was his attempt to fan the flames of wartime anxieties on the home-front. Bryan directly played on the fears of Americans on the home-front by explaining how liquor was leading to the degradation of American soldiers in Europe. He told the story of an American boy who was charged, convicted and ultimately hanged for murdering a seventeen year old French girl.²²⁰ Bryan declared the boy's only excuse was that he was under the influence of liquor at the time. He then passionately proclaimed: "Here is an American boy who... offered to give his life for his flag in a foreign land... his blood is heated by liquor and he dies in disgrace-while the

²¹⁶ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 208.

²¹⁷ Ibid.

²¹⁸ William Jennings Bryan "Address" (speech, Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti Saloon League of America) in *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN: S.E. Nicholson, 1918), 68.

²¹⁹ Ibid

²²⁰ Ibid, 69

man who made him a criminal [liquor interests] goes on making other criminals to die in disgrace like that boy!”²²¹ This remark led to vociferous “applause and shouting” by the crowd gathered to listen to Bryan speak.²²² The story told by Bryan exploited wartime fears that soldiers would travel to Europe and become corrupted by evil forces such as liquor. It is likely not an accident that Bryan told the story of a soldier who killed a French woman, attempting to manipulate fears of American women about what their boyfriends and husbands might be doing while stationed in Europe. The story told by Bryan also foreshadowed the League’s forthcoming gender and class based campaign that targeted working class French women. This was part of a concerted strategy by the League to take advantage of wartime anxieties. *The American Issue* routinely focused on issues relevant to soldiers and alcohol. For example, in the March 31 1918, edition of *The American Issue*, the League’s newspaper published six articles and a cover story detailing the war’s impact on the soldiers.²²³ The League’s usage of its *American Issue* newspaper will be explored in greater detail later in this paper, especially its use of cartoons that attempted to align its political cause with the war effort.

The League’s Convention went even further to exploit wartime fears about the temptations facing soldiers in Europe when Reverend J.D. McAlister told the story of his 18 year old son serving in France.²²⁴ McAlister proudly described his son as a strong, patriotic young man who fervently desired to serve his country. He contended that his son only had one reservation about traveling to France to fight the Germans: the temptations

²²¹ Ibid

²²² Ibid

²²³ “Editorial”, *The American Issue*, March 31st, 1918.

²²⁴ J.D. McAlister “Up From The Depths” (speech, Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti Saloon League of America) in *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN:S.E. Nicholson,1918), 109.

that awaited vulnerable soldiers.²²⁵ While under normal conditions he would have no trouble resisting temptations, his son worried that he, “would come out [of the trenches] dirty, muddy, lousy, cold, my brain faint, my heart sick...I will come out staggering-a half man.”²²⁶ The young man worried that, in a state of war induced delirium, he could be susceptible to the temptations that awaited G.I.s in France. So as not to leave anything to the imagination, McAlister detailed the temptations that his son feared, such as: “the seductive smiles of a woman or the outstretched hand with the ready bottle of wine [that] says ‘Come on boy, and let down for a while and restore your balance.’”²²⁷ This story told by McAlister was a clear example of the League’s early attempts to manipulate fears on the home-front. The story attempted to win support for Prohibition by relating bottles of wine, a specifically French alcoholic beverage with a tempestuous French woman. The message was that Prohibition had to be passed in order to prevent soldiers from getting drunk and bringing back venereal diseases. If the logic in such a line of argument was highly questionable, the League never rationally explained why domestic prohibition would prevent foreign alcohol consumption by soldiers, especially considering that soldiers were already prohibited from consuming liquor while on duty.²²⁸ Nonetheless, such irrational, sensationalist rhetoric with the goal of fear mongering was successful during wartime due to the public’s already heightened sense of nervousness.

The 1917 Anti Saloon League Convention was similar to a party convention a few months before a presidential election. The convention was about many different things

²²⁵ Ibid,110

²²⁶ Ibid, 112

²²⁷ Ibid

²²⁸ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press,1985), 206-208.

such as organizing members for the difficult campaign ahead. Most importantly, the convention hoped to communicate the League's closing arguments for national prohibition. The League wanted the American public to see it and the cause of prohibition as a patriotic necessity. The League also wanted to use the opportunity to align their opponents in the liquor community to German enemies. The League's 1917 Convention set the stage for its' wartime campaign for total prohibition.

Chapter VII: Congress Listens

Just a few days following the League's convention, debate on the proposed Prohibition Amendment began on the floor of the House of Representatives. The League understood that the House of Representatives would be less receptive to prohibition than the Senate because of its large urban delegations as well the previously discussed brewers dependence on support from the delegations of large, northern industrial states.²²⁹ The League hoped its wartime campaign would break the liquor lobby's hold on a third of the House membership. The debate further supports the argument that the war was used as the chief justification for the Prohibition amendment. Opponents of the 18th Amendment in Congress used many of the same arguments of individual liberty used by the brewers. These arguments were much less effective in wartime than they were during peacetime. Supporters of the 18th Amendment however adopted their message to the war, using many of the same wartimes present throughout the League's 1917 Convention.

Congressman Philip P. Campbell of Kansas gave one of the most emotionally stirring speeches during the debate. Campbell justified his support of Prohibition by connecting his vote to the war effort. Like a lot of the wartime rhetoric, Campbell described the moment as: "a big time in the history of mankind."²³⁰ Congressman Campbell proceeded to explain that sacrifice due to the need to increase wartime efficiency was a key reason to support Prohibition, emphatically saying to the American public: "You have a son: he is in the trenches to-day... You want him supplied with the best arms, with the best ammunition that the soberest men can make. You do not want

²²⁹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3, Plan for Special National Prohibition Campaign Proposed to be held in Several States, 1914,5.

²³⁰ House Debate on Proposed Prohibition Amendment, 65th Congress., 2nd Sess., December 17,1917,433.

him supplied with deficient arms and ammunition made by men; under the influence of liquor.”²³¹ Campbell was explicitly arguing that unless prohibition was passed, the lives of American soldiers could be in jeopardy. According to Campbell and those who made similar arguments, the lives of soldiers could not be trusted to a drunken workforce, the government had to intervene to protect the G.I.²³² This argument is also implicitly classist, subtly attacking the working class, implying that, left to their own freedom, the workers would report to work drunk and thus impede the nation’s war effort.

Sensing political opportunity to exploit the arguments of Congressman Campbell, Congressman Joseph Walsh rebuked his colleague from Kansas for putting his own personal politics above the war effort saying: “He[Campbell], sir, would win this war, but he would not win the war, nor would he support the men who are fighting for the war if, perchance, they are going to shoot a rifle containing ammunition that has been made by a man who drinks liquor!”²³³ To a measured extent, both sides were trying to advance their cause by using the war as justification for their position. Congressman Walsh proceeded to condemn those such as Campbell who attempted to divide the public during wartime.

²³⁴ In response to the criticism of Congressman Walsh, Congressman Patrick Daniel Norton, a Republican from rural North Dakota wryly accused opponents of the 18th Amendment such as Congressman Walsh of trying to obstruct the facts of the liquor trade and of hiding behind complex philosophical arguments about self liberty. Norton chided those opponents of prohibition: “have unquestionably missed their calling... Their arguments in this debate is evidence that they would make marvelously great camouflage

²³¹ Ibid

²³² Ibid

²³³ Ibid

²³⁴ House Debate on Proposed Prohibition Amendment, 65th Congress., 2nd Sess., December 17, 1917, 433.

artist. They are wasting their time and talents here in Congress when they might be making our German enemies across the sea believe molehills are mountains and that broomsticks are 20 in cannon.”²³⁵ Even Norton’s playful attempt to dismiss the wets as “camouflage artists” was turned into a wartime metaphor.

World War One was not the only issue debated on the House floor, the impact of prohibition on labor was a contentious issue throughout the debate in the House. Democratic Congressman Lunn from the Northern industrial state of New York strongly opposed the amendment in part because he argued that it would harm the American laborer. Lunn poetically evoked Abraham Lincoln in his speech to the floor on the House of Representatives arguing: “Following the advice of the great Lincoln, that the first consideration in all legislation-not the second, but the first consideration in all legislation should be for labor and not for capital. And on that basis I intend to oppose this national prohibition amendment.”²³⁶ Even arguments about prohibition impacting labor were laced with patriotic rhetoric during wartime. Supporters of the 18th Amendment were not willing to concede that laborers were opposed to prohibition. Ohio Republican John G. Cooper attempted to refute Lunn’s testimony by arguing: “There is at this time an effort being made by representatives of the liquor interests to give the impression that the labor unions of the country are opposed to the prohibition of the liquor traffic... There are many labor organizations that do not oppose prohibition of the liquor traffic, and a goodly number of them have gone on record as being opposed to the Saloon.”²³⁷ Cooper then proceeded to name several organizations such as Brotherhood of Locomotive

²³⁵ Ibid, 453

²³⁶ Ibid, 432

²³⁷ Ibid, 428-429

Engineers.²³⁸ The issue of labor's stance on prohibition will be explored later in this paper however it is important to note that Congressman's Cooper's strategy was representative of the League's campaign to silence labor opposition to prohibition. The League hoped that by pointing out unions that supported prohibition they would defeat any notion that labor was uniformly opposed to the 18th Amendment. The war also complicated the issue because labor was viewed as a wartime necessity, thus making it difficult for them to fully oppose political measures such as prohibition.

Supporters of the Prohibition Amendment were nonetheless the most devoted to grounding their arguments in wartime rhetoric. Congressman Melville C. Kelly, a member of the Progressive Party framed his support of the Amendment as part of an attempt to justify the sacrifice of the war by creating a better world after the war. Kelly argued that: "The adoption of this amendment today will be a pledge of moral progress to the world. It will be preparation for the day when America stands guarding a world set free."²³⁹ League activists, Members of Congress, and supporters of the 18th Amendment justified their dry position by tying Prohibition to a post-War world led by a strong and morally progressive United States, freed from the chains of intoxicants. Congressman Thaddeus H. Caraway from rural Arkansas argued: "'For one I shall vote for this amendment. I shall vote for it because of the crimes it has bred. The sorrow and the want it has caused. I shall vote for it to make the world better for women and children now living and for those yet in the womb of time."²⁴⁰ The argument used by Caraway is possibly the most important one used in Congressional debate because it established the need for a permanent prohibition. If the only justification for prohibition was that it was

²³⁸ Ibid

²³⁹ Ibid, 438

²⁴⁰ Ibid, 431

vital to the war effort to prohibit the production of alcohol, Congress could have easily passed a temporarily measure and closed debate on prohibition. However, supporters of the 18th Amendment argued like Caraway did that prohibition would create a better world for future generations, thus in order for the world to be a better place long after the war, prohibition had to be permanently written into the constitution. This again is essentially a wartime theme because prohibitionists believed that the only way to justify the great loss and sacrifice of World War One was to ensure that the world exited the world a better place. Reformers hoped that the need to justify the sacrifice of the war would lead to the ratification of the 18th Amendment, a move that would permanently break Americans free from the shackles of alcohol.

Other supporters of the 18th Amendment used many of the same wartime sacrifice arguments used by the League during its 1917 Convention. Congressman Addison T. Smith from rural Idaho argued: “I am heartily in favor of this resolution...Because of the scarcity of coal the public schools have been closed in some of the Eastern Cities... yet the chimneys of the breweries throughout the United States, where prohibition is not in effect are belching forth the smoke from thousands of tons of coal that are being burned to manufacture beer.”²⁴¹ These arguments about the wastefulness of brewers were part of a broader campaign to connect prohibition to wartime sacrifice. This line of argument also enabled the prohibitionists to use wartime anxieties to support their cause. Even worse than schools being shut down was the implication that by wasting resources in alcohol production, soldiers on the front were being deprived of necessary resources. This made the wartime sacrifice argument all the more effective and increased the urgency on which the amendment was pursued its supporters.

²⁴¹ Ibid, 442

Surprisingly, throughout the entire debate in the House, the only time the League was directly mentioned occurred when opponents of Prohibition addressed the floor. Congressman Clifton N. McArthur of Oregon berated the League for its persistent lobbying efforts in wartime. McArthur contended, “The Anti Saloon League... so insistent in demanding the passage of this amendment... have assumed a grave responsibility. They [the League] are going too fast and too far at a time when their energies might be better spent in constructive movements.”²⁴² This demonstrates once again that the League’s lobbying efforts were difficult to ignore. Some opponents, like McArthur, asserted that such tactics were unacceptable during wartime. One other Congressman, Small of North Carolina, also publicly criticized the League for its overzealous efforts.²⁴³ This backlash against the League was limited, only these two members of Congress criticized the League during the House debate.

A tactic of Congressmen opposed to the 18th Amendment was to argue that prohibition was a state’s rights issue and not one the federal government should decide. Congressman Warren Gard, a Democratic Congressman from the urban industrial city of Dayton Ohio argued that: “I think it the 18th Amendment] removes from the States the police power given to the States by the Constitution... We contend that the States should have the right to determine whether the States and the people of the States are best served by prohibition or by regulation.”²⁴⁴ This line of argument was also used by other opponents of prohibition in Congress. Congressman John Small from North Carolina argued: “I am opposed to this amendment because it proposes to take away from the states an essential right of local self government. It proposes to impair the police power

²⁴² Ibid, 440

²⁴³ Ibid, 435

²⁴⁴ Ibid, 428

of the states.”²⁴⁵ Much like many of the arguments used by brewers, the effectiveness of the state’s rights argument was also negated during wartime. With the United States entrenched in war, dry leaders argued that debates over constitutional philosophies was luxury many Americans could not afford. Furthermore, in wartime when the nation is united against a common adversary, the public is more willing to cede states rights to the federal government if it is viewed as part of the war effort. This is why the League’s campaign of wartime sacrifice was so important; it made sure to connect the war effort to national prohibition. This negated the impact of previously useful arguments such as states rights and individual liberty. This once again reveals how the federal government can use both wartime unity and wartime anxieties to gain more power and become a subversive force.

Meanwhile, supporters of the League and Prohibition defended their allegiances by reciting the same wartime message that was so prevalent during the League’s 1917 Convention. Congressman Barkley of Kentucky, a featured speaker at the League’s Convention, defended Prohibition as a necessary measure to support the war effort. Throughout his impassioned plea for the Amendment, Barkley touched on all four of the key wartime themes of the League’s convention. Barkley first attacked Germany, contending that Germany was, “the cruelest, most brutal military nation in the history of the world.”²⁴⁶ Then he moved on to the key theme of wartime sacrifice, stating that: “We have asked the housewife to waste nothing that can be utilized in feeding the world, Yet enough foodstuff goes into the manufacture of intoxicating liquors to feed 7,000,000

²⁴⁵ Ibid, 435

²⁴⁶ Ibid, 459

people each year,”²⁴⁷ After castigating brewers for their ties to Germany and their wasteful production, Barkley turned his attention to the theme of the well being of soldiers abroad. He reminded Congress that laws were passed to make it illegal to sell intoxicants to soldiers because, “we know that the use of liquor makes unsteady the nerve and inaccurate the aim of those who fight for humanity.”²⁴⁸ Once again, the argument was made that liquor was an impediment to a strong military and since alcohol could not be tolerated by the army, it should also be banned at home while the domestic army was busy producing the necessary goods to protect soldiers abroad. Congressman Barkley ended his address by referring to the key theme of justifying the sacrifice of war by creating a better world following it. Barkley characterized the war as one, “which we are engaged [in] for the principles of democracy and civilization.”²⁴⁹ The world had to emerge from the war a more free and democratic place. That would only be possible by defeating alcohol at home while beating the Germans in the trenches of Europe.

Congressman Barkley’s speech as well as those by other dry supporters in Congress, explain how significant the war was in the introduction and ultimate ratification of the 18th Amendment. In order to explain their votes in favor of Prohibition, members of Congress used the same wartime themes employed by the League. Debate in the Senate will not be analyzed in this paper largely because it mirrored the debate in the House. The Senate, due to its large presence of seats from predominantly rural states, was more inclined to support prohibition, thus the debate was slightly less animated.

After a few days of procedural posturing, both branches of Congress voted on the prohibition amendment. The 18th Amendment exceeded the two-thirds constitutional

²⁴⁷ Ibid

²⁴⁸ Ibid

²⁴⁹ Ibid

requirement in the House by only eight votes, passing 282-128.²⁵⁰ One day later on December 18th, the vote in the Senate was less contentious, voting in favor of the amendment. The Senate passed federal prohibition by a vote of forty-seven to eight.²⁵¹ The voting in the House indicates that the dependable northern, industrial, urban block of wets almost held up strong enough to defeat the amendment.

²⁵⁰ “House Votes for Dry America”, *Chicago Daily Tribune*, December 18th, 1917, pg.1.

²⁵¹ It is difficult to know for certain why there were so many non-votes in the Senate. Possibly Senators on both sides were afraid of the political consequences of voting for or against the amendment so they decided not to vote. Or simple transportation issues could explain the vote. It is difficult to know for certain.

Chapter VIII: The 18th Amendment, Organized Labor, the Working Class and Science

The voting results indicate the importance of the working class on the 18th Amendment. It is clear that the main opposition to the amendment was based in the industrial north. If the liquor interests could have effectively mobilized the working class behind their cause, it is possible that they could have defeated the amendment. There was indeed some strong labor opposition to the amendment, led by Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor (AFL). Gompers toured the country speaking passionately against the amendment. In a speech to the hearing before a joint session of the New York State Legislature on February 26th, 1918, weeks after the Amendment was sent to the states for debate, Gompers directly challenged prohibitionists saying: “the haters of the organized labor movement, those who have been most hostile to it, and those who are the greatest oppressors of the workers, are supporters- strong, staunch supporters- of the Prohibition Movement.”²⁵² This accusation was fair and well founded because many elite businessmen did support the prohibition movement both publically and privately through financial aid.²⁵³ It is largely on this point that John J Rumbarger contends that prohibition was an attempt by the bourgeois elite to transform the working class. While this contention is well founded, it is muddled by intent. Rumbarger argues dries were attempting to transform the working class for their own selfish motives. Others, like historian K. Austin Kerr present a much more complicated

²⁵² “Labor and the Law United, In Opposition to National Prohibition Amendment, Excerpts From a Hearing before the New York State Assembly”, *New York Times*, March 13th, 1918, pg.8.

²⁵³ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985).

picture in which rather than transforming the working class, prohibitionists were trying to reform the working class.^{254 255 256}

Many working class leaders adamantly opposed prohibition. In Massachusetts the Boston Central Labor Union (BCLU) adopted a measure condemning their legislatures that supported the prohibition amendment in Congress.²⁵⁷ Michigan miners protested the prohibition amendment as well as state wide prohibition.²⁵⁸ It is clear that in the industrial North, opposition to the amendment was present in many of the unions. However, this opposition was also rendered less effective by the war effort. There were less young men of drinking age at home than ever before, thus it was more difficult to publically demonstrate opposition to this measure. The working class men still on the home front were too busy working overtime to contribute to the war effort to have either the time or energy to show their opposition to the amendment. Because of this there was no groundswell of opposition to the amendment within the working class. Those in the working class opposed to the 18th Amendment, mainly labor leaders, showed their disdain for prohibition by publishing official statements declaring their opposition to the amendment as was done in Boston by the BCLU.²⁵⁹ This again shows the impact the War had on prohibition. With so many young men fighting abroad and the working class tirelessly fueling the war effort at home, educated middle-class reformers and Protestant preachers were the ones with both the time and the means to fight for a political cause

²⁵⁴ The debate boils down of prohibitionists being either selfish elites or idealistic paternalists. In all likelihood, they were probably a bit of both.

²⁵⁵ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985).

²⁵⁶ John J Rumbarger, *Profits, Power and Prohibition: Alcohol Reform and the Industrializing of America, 1800-1930* (Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 1989),

²⁵⁷ "Condemns McCall's Prohibition Stand", *Boston Daily Globe*, April 8th, 1918, 13

²⁵⁸ "Michigan Miners Do Not Like Prohibition", *Boston Daily Globe*, April 15th, 1918, 7

²⁵⁹ "Condemns McCall's Prohibition Stand", *Boston Daily Globe*, April 8th, 1918, 13

during wartime. This is yet another example of how the war created conditions favorable to passing national prohibition.

The war also helped to invalidate the arguments used by elite labor. Much like wets in Congress and within the brewing industry, labor contended the 18th Amendment would infringe on individual liberty. This argument was less effective in wartime when the general public was more willing than ever to cede individual liberty to the government in order to help the war effort. Labor leaders like Gompers persistently argued that the 18th Amendment was an unconstitutional attempt to regulate the private lives of American citizens. Gompers also argued that the working class was giving their blood, sweat and tears to the war effort, and so workers should not be punished for their sacrifice by having their personal habits regulated by the federal government.²⁶⁰ While persuasive in peace time, during the war when all Americans believed sacrifice to be part of their daily routine, Gompers' argument was less effective. *The Atlanta Constitution* published an editorial on February 28th, 1918 titled "Gompers and Booze" that represented the dry response to criticisms of prohibition by labor forces. *The Atlanta Constitution* first attempted to personally criticize Gompers by claiming that his opposition to prohibition was harming the war effort by diverting his attention from labor's output during wartime. The editorial claimed: "Surely the leader of organized labor in this country, especially in a time like this when so much in the way of national safety is dependent upon labor, is not acting in a manner intended to strengthen labor or to help the government."²⁶¹ Critics of Gompers contended that his time would be better

²⁶⁰ "Labor and the Law United, In Opposition to National Prohibition Amendment, Excerpts From a Hearing before the New York State Assembly", *New York Times*, March 13th, 1918, pg.8.

²⁶¹ "Gompers and Booze", *The Atlanta Constitution*, February 28th 1918,pg.8

spent ensuring labor's contribution to the war effort rather than opposing a political cause. The editorial implied that patriotic Americans would silently go about their daily tasks, refusing to protest an amendment intended to improve America's ability to wage war.²⁶² This was a very effective wartime strategy. Labor leaders can be susceptible to allegations of a lack of patriotism during wartime.

For its part, the League avoided directly challenging big labor instead attempting to highlight laborers that supported prohibition. In a June 15th 1918 article titled "Winning the Labor Vote" in *The American Issue*, John F. Cunneen explicitly stated that allegations of worker opposition to the 18th Amendment had to be countered with "an educational campaign" showing that workers supported the amendment.²⁶³ The League followed Cunneen's advice by routinely publishing articles in its newspaper highlighting labor support for prohibition. In a July 27th feature article in *The American Issue*, the League told a story of a Seattle shipyard's affinity for milk and ice cream. The article attempted to refute the argument that by taking beer away from laborers, they would become discontented and less productive.²⁶⁴ The article argues that workers in a dry Seattle shipyard joyfully traded beer and liquor for milk and ice cream.²⁶⁵ Workers supposedly consumed 4,000 cones every day. Milk was also popular according to the article because the "work exacts a heavy toll on physical strength and these workers find milk...[to be] an element that puts pep and vigor into them."²⁶⁶ The article claimed that milk consumption increased sixty percent in the twelve months since going dry. The

²⁶² Ibid

²⁶³ "Winning the Labor Vote", *The American Issue*, June 15th, 1918

²⁶⁴ "Milk- Drinking Shipyard Workers of Seattle..." *The American Issue*, July 27th, 1918.

²⁶⁵ Washington passed a form of state-wide prohibition prior to the ratification of the national amendment: Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1918)

²⁶⁶ "Milk- Drinking Shipyard Workers of Seattle..." *The American Issue*, July 27th, 1918.

article went as far as to say that “the best thing that ever happened to the Seattle shipyard worker was the passage of the [state-wide] Prohibition law and the substitution of milk for beer.”²⁶⁷ Depictions of workers trading beer for milk, cheerfully consuming ice cream after a long, hard day of contributing to the war effort presented a comforting image to Americans during the war. Whether or not there was any legitimacy to it is beside the point, during wartime with anxieties running rampant, middle-class Americans likely wanted to believe it to be true. It was a cheerful image in an otherwise stressful period.

Division within the working class movement helped the League argue that many American workers supported prohibition. Notably, early in the prohibition movement, various heroes of the working class opposed the liquor trade. Socialist leader and biographer of Karl Marx John Spargo, as well as Eugene V. Debs attacked the liquor trade as allies of capitalism. Both men also claimed that liquor corrupted human potential. Even black union organizer A. Philip Randolph argued that prohibition would bring decreased crime rates to the cities and higher wages to the workers. Randolph even contended that prohibition would be beneficial to black communities.²⁶⁸ The Industrial Workers of the World even claimed that liquor was the enemy of the working classes, a poison that continually was used to exploit workers.^{269 270}

The League also attempted to highlight labor leaders who supported prohibition. In a December 23rd, 1916 edition of *The American Issue*, the League showcased a story of Colorado labor leaders that supported prohibition. J.W. Sanford of the Cigar Makers’

²⁶⁷ Ibid

²⁶⁸ Daniel Okrent, *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition* (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2010), 75

²⁶⁹ This paragraph is not to suggest that a majority of union leadership supported the Amendment, most did not. However, there was certainly some in the working class that supported prohibition. This is supported by most examinations of prohibition such as the ones conducted by Rumbarger, Kerr and Okrent.

²⁷⁰ Daniel Okrent, *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition* (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2010), 76

Union explained that under state-wide prohibition in Colorado “Local conditions here were never better and all are working.”²⁷¹ William C. Thornton, President of the Denver Trades and Labor Assembly stated: “I voted against Prohibition in this state. I am now irrevocably opposed to the saloon... The saloon has gone and gone forever and most of us do not want it back. It never did anybody any good and has done untold harm. The labor movement has not been set back by Prohibition.”²⁷² The goal of the League was to avoid attacking opposition labor leaders like Gompers directly but rather showcasing supportive labor leaders. This strategy can be explained by the fact that during wartime, criticisms like the ones by the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* rendered Gompers line of argument ineffective. However, the League was still afraid of widespread opposition within the labor movement. Instead of instigating laborers, it tried to win them over by publishing testimonials of laborers supportive of prohibition. Furthermore, with many laborers overseas fighting trench warfare, the League targeted their families still on the home-front. The League attempted to win over working class wives in several ways. The League’s main strategy was to spread wartime fears of soldiers returning home with Venereal Disease due to their indiscretions while under the influence of alcohol, which will be discussed later in this paper. The League also attempted to show working class wives on the home-front how much of their husbands paychecks were likely going to saloons. In an article titled “What Becomes of the Pay Checks?” *American Issue* writer A.W. Perkins highlighted a study that supposedly examined how income was spent in working class families before and after saloons were made illegal in one small town. Perkins claimed that after saloons were prohibited, twice as much weekly income was

²⁷¹ “Prohibition Helps Union Labor in Colorado”, *The American Issue*, December 23rd, 1916.

²⁷² Ibid

spend on groceries, meat, hardware, clothing, coal, furniture and insurance.²⁷³ While this supposed study can not be validated, it did communicate to working class families how much better their quality of life could be if their husbands did not frequent saloons.

All of the tactics used by the League and its supporters hoped to silence worker opposition to prohibition. Because the public never directly voted for the amendment, the League never actually had to win over a majority of working class voters. Instead, the League had to pacify workers and their families just enough to prevent wide-spread demonstrations in opposition to prohibition. The League feared that state legislatures would be less inclined to support the 18th Amendment if workers violently opposed the measure. Fortunately for the League, World War One made it incredibly difficult for the working class to uniformly mobilize in opposition to prohibition.

During the war, scientific arguments about the dangers of liquor became less important than wartime reasons justifying prohibition. The scientific communities' condemnation of liquor was a major aspect of the prohibition movement since the beginning of the Twentieth Century. In a 1908 address that was representative of those given by dry scientists of that era, Dr. T.D Crothers stated what he believed were the great dangers of alcohol. Crothers explained that "Alcohol in any form, taken into the body as a beverage, is not only a poison, but produces other poisons."²⁷⁴ Dr. Crothers went on to claim that "moderate or extreme use" of alcohol led to "functional and organic symptoms of derangement."²⁷⁵ Dry doctors went even further. M.D. Ellis M. Allen claimed in a 1908 edition of the *American Practitioner and News* that "The alcoholics

²⁷³ "What Becomes of Paychecks", *The American Issue*, April 21st, 1917.

²⁷⁴ Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1908), 17.

²⁷⁵ Ibid

manifest the least resistance to every type of infectious disease.”²⁷⁶ The Anti-Saloon League routinely published reports that listed the many ill effects of alcohol, such as the claim that “Alcoholic beverages... destroy the power of blood clot”²⁷⁷ Other scientific charges made against alcohol by the League was that it “kills seeds, is a poison, prevents decomposition, not provided free in nature, not found in any food and creates thirst.”²⁷⁸ Dry forces routinely used scientific scare tactics as a means of winning over new support. However, these arguments were never enough for prohibitionists to win a national campaign for prohibition. During their wartime campaign for the 18th Amendment, the League used these arguments much less prominently, instead focusing on issues of wartime anxieties. *The American Issue* and *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbooks* extensively published the medical arguments condemning liquor. However, during the war, these stories were pushed to the back of League publications, creating more prominent space for wartime stories.²⁷⁹ This again shows that the League believed the key to winning national prohibition was through promoting a wartime campaign revolving around exploiting wartime anxieties.

²⁷⁶ Ibid, 23

²⁷⁷ Ibid, 18

²⁷⁸ Ibid, 23

²⁷⁹ In both the League’s 1918 Convention transcript as well as its 1918 Yearbook, there were fewer scientific arguments against prohibition and such arguments were pushed to the back of these publications from more prominent positions in earlier editions.

Chapter IX: Exploiting Wartime Anxieties

The League's effort to connect Prohibition to wartime anxieties continued as the 18th Amendment was debated on the state level. Just a few short months after the Convention, the League sent a special team to Europe to examine the temptations facing American troops abroad. For nearly three months during the pivotal campaign for ratification, the League sent two of its senior officials, Dr. James Cannon Jr, Chairman of the League's influential Legislative Committee and Dr. E.J. Moore, Assistant General Superintendent of the League, to Europe.²⁸⁰²⁸¹ Cannon and Moore were expected to "make a first hand study of the conditions surrounding our soldiers and sailors with special reference to the evils of Intemperance and Prostitution."²⁸²²⁸³ This reveals the extent of the League's attempts to use the War as justification for the 18th Amendment. The League routinely focused on the links between alcohol abuse, dangerous conditions in the trenches and sexual deviance. It is clear that by focusing on the behavior of American fighting men abroad, the League was winning support at home, which explains why so much energy went into focusing on American troops.²⁸⁴

²⁸⁰The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series XII, roll 77, Dr. James Cannon Jr and Dr. E.J. Moore, Report of Commissioners Appointed by the Anti-Saloon League of America to Make First Hand Study of the Conditions Surroundings Our Soldiers and Sailors in Great Britain and France with Special Reference to the Evils of Intemperance and Prostitution, Report to ASLOA Board of Directors, May 28th, 1918.

²⁸¹ Both men held PhDs and were referred to as doctors though neither were practicing physicians.

²⁸² The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series XII, roll 77, Dr. James Cannon Jr and Dr. E.J. Moore, Report of Commissioners Appointed by the Anti-Saloon League of America to Make First Hand Study of the Conditions Surroundings Our Soldiers and Sailors in Great Britain and France with Special Reference to the Evils of Intemperance and Prostitution, Report to ASLOA Board of Directors, May 28th, 1918.

²⁸³ A careful examination of League's 1918 and 1919 Yearbook indicate that the League continually bombarded the public with articles connecting intemperance to prostitution. Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1918),

²⁸⁴ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series XII, roll 77, Dr. James Cannon Jr and Dr. E.J. Moore, Report of Commissioners Appointed by the Anti-Saloon League of America to Make First Hand Study of the Conditions Surroundings Our

The very fact that the League was willing to send two of its senior officials to the front while so many of its resources were being used to campaign for ratification demonstrates how crucial the war was to its strategy for ratification. The reception Cannon and Moore received while in Europe also revealed again how influential the League was. In the middle of a world war, the U.S. Ambassadors to France and Great Britain [Sharp and Page] as well as General John J Pershing, Commander-in-Chief of the American Expeditionary Force, and Vice-Admiral William S. Sims, Commander of the U.S. Naval forces in Europe all either met personally with the League's envoy or at the least sent lengthy memoranda detailing their views about the threat of alcohol to American soldiers.²⁸⁵ Following a six week tour of over twenty cities in France and Great Britain, including London, Manchester, Southampton, Edinburgh, Paris, Chaumont and Bordeaux, the League's representatives finally returned home and published an eighteen page report right in the middle of the League's precarious efforts to win support for the 18th Amendment in states such as California and Illinois, long opponents of Prohibition.²⁸⁶

The report published by the League focused heavily on issues of prostitution. The opening section concentrated on the temptation of French prostitutes. The report contended: "street walkers, women of easy virtue swarm after all soldiers... but especially after the Americans because they are newcomers and because they have more money."²⁸⁷ The League, with these fixed findings hidden under the name of a special commission, whether consciously or not, was fanning the flames of anxiety on the home-

Soldiers and Sailors in Great Britain and France with Special Reference to the Evils of Intemperance and Prostitution, Report to ASLOA Board of Directors, May 28th, 1918.p.3.

²⁸⁵ Ibid,2

²⁸⁶ Ibid,3

²⁸⁷ Ibid, 3

front. Its leaders were specifically demonizing both French women and working class women. However, they disguised such assaults on class, gender and national identity as essential wartime criticisms, necessary to protect American troops. The opening section of the report went so far as to condemn the French for allegedly furnishing troops with, “medically inspected women...for the army, that the soldiers may not be deprived of their sexual indulgences.”²⁸⁸ This is another example of this report using the sexual immorality of troops to raise concern on the home-front. It also reveals the League’s persistent American exceptionalism. Throughout the report, the League’s envoys contended that American soldiers were more noble and resistant to immorality than soldiers from other nations. The report specifically described the French as immoral and French women as tempestuous vixens. It was repeatedly asserted that the venom of alcohol rendered American soldiers defenseless against such evil women.²⁸⁹

The report was not entirely negative; it attempted to show that, with certain steps, morality could be regulated, once again promoting American exceptionalism. The report claimed that, with the help of strong teams of physicians and regulation, “there is less venereal disease in the American Expeditionary Force than in any other equal number of men in the world.”²⁹⁰ This was attributed in part to the upstanding morality of America’s military forces as well as the commanders’ insistence that the military take every step possible to ensure that alcohol be kept away from American soldiers. The report contended that temperance was the only true way to safeguard from the spread of venereal disease from French women to American troops arguing “Intemperance and

²⁸⁸ Ibid,8

²⁸⁹ Ibid

²⁹⁰ Ibid

Prostitution are twin sisters. They usually go hand in hand.”²⁹¹ By connecting sexual immorality and fears of troop behavior abroad to alcohol, the League was further demonizing alcohol during the time the 18th Amendment was being debated on the state level.

Importantly, the report provided the American public with the option of choosing between two very different societies. On one end was American democracy, shining brightly on a hill, guiding the world towards a more perfect humanity.²⁹² The report described the United States as a morally pure nation where parents raised upstanding young men who shunned moral degradation. Central to the image of this society was the fact that Americans were in the process of turning back the evil forces of alcohol. The United States was presented as an almost utopian nation.²⁹³ At the other end of the spectrum, France was described as a dystopia, a country where: “intoxicants are sold practically everywhere...down to the smallest country villages. They are sold in restaurants, hotels, grocery and provision shops.”²⁹⁴ Naturally, the report connected this constant exposure to alcohol to the moral impurity that was supposedly so prevalent in France. The report went as far as to contend that France had a long history of being a morally adulterated nation, that “the literature and life of France [has been morally corrupted by intoxicants] in every possibly way” from “the days of the Medicis de Pompadours to the present time.”²⁹⁵ What is possibly most remarkable about this report is that the Germans are hardly ever mentioned; it is the French who come across as the antagonists in America’s great struggle to lift the world up from the depths of despair.

²⁹¹ Ibid,9

²⁹² Ibid

²⁹³ Ibid

²⁹⁴ Ibid,3

²⁹⁵ Ibid,9

This is explained by the report's portrayal of two different societies, one a dry American nation and the other, an intoxicated French one. The report explicitly stated that, because of their "change in environment"²⁹⁶ American soldiers were on the front line a war of gunfire with the Germans and also a war over morality with the French. The report infers that the American public was part of both fights, specifically the latter. If Americans did not rally behind the 18th Amendment and finally ban all alcohol consumption, the morally reprehensible conditions facing American G.I.s in France could follow the troops home. The report was as much about warring civilizations as it was about the conditions faced by American troops in Europe.²⁹⁷

The report fit within one of the League's key themes of their wartime Prohibition campaign, that in order to justify the sacrifices of the war, the public had to ratify prohibition to create a more perfect humanity following victory. The report contended, "There must be, there will be as one great result of the war a greater sense of responsibility for the eradication of sexual immorality and venereal disease."²⁹⁸ This is further evidence of the league attempting to link the cause of domestic prohibition to victory in Europe. According to the League, without political victories and an improved home-front, victory in Europe would have been for naught. The report explicitly argued that the human toll had to lead to a more morally pure nation, arguing: "the slaughter of the innocents, will give way to intelligent, helpful instruction concerning the most fundamental fact of life."²⁹⁹ According to the report, there was a need to emerge from the war as a leading international example of moral righteousness. Because of this, the

²⁹⁶ Ibid

²⁹⁷ Ibid

²⁹⁸ Ibid

²⁹⁹ Ibid.

government had to regulate a morally pure nation freed from the shackles of intoxicating liquors and ably protected from the threats of sexual transgressions.

The Cannon and Moore report was first presented to the Anti-Saloon League Board of Directors in late May of 1918 and then promptly condensed and edited into a political sermon published in the League's 1918 Yearbook.³⁰⁰ That League executives quickly edited this report and published it during the final stages of their effort to ratify the 18th Amendment again testifies to the importance of the wartime themes in the campaign for Prohibition. Convention speeches, newspaper articles in League publications, and even official League reports all coaxed support for Prohibition by preying on home-front anxieties. A nation unified by wartime uneasiness is exactly what the League needed to ratify the 18th Amendment. Required to win support in two-thirds of states, it was not enough for the League to rely on traditionally supportive, Protestant states like Kansas and Oklahoma. The League had to broaden its support into more ethnically diverse states such as California and Illinois, states with long traditions of growing grapes for wine and bottling beer.³⁰¹ The war presented the ideal opportunity to accomplish this and the League successfully crafted a wartime message that first united broad support and then motivated Americans into action by spreading wartime anxieties.

³⁰⁰ Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1919).

³⁰¹ "Prohibition Marches On", *The New York Times*, January 10th, 1919, pg.10

Chapter X: The League Makes America Laugh

An examination of cartoons appearing in *The American Issue* from 1915 through 1919 reveals an artistic representation of the League's changing campaign themes from that era. Before American entry into World War One appeared eminent, the League and its cartoons focused on traditional arguments against liquor such as its negative effects on families. A cartoon featured prominently in the *American Issue*'s Christmas edition from December 23rd 1916 showed a meek little boy whispering, "Just stop Daddy from drinkin' for me and ma's present" into the ear of Santa Clause. Santa was sitting on a box labeled, "help the kiddies".³⁰² This cartoon was a seasonal depiction of many early League cartoons criticizing alcohol's supposedly harmful impact on families. This was a lingering rallying cry for prohibitionists from the days of Carrie Nation. By 1916, the League was also attempting to create a sense of inevitability to national prohibition. This was also evident in its cartoons. A November 25th 1916 *American Issue* cartoon depicted a tired old man representing a dispirited alcoholic, sitting besides a sign that read, "85 per cent of the United States is Dry".³⁰³ Another cartoon published on December 30th of 1916 featured Father Time painting a map of the United States in white paint that was supposed to represent prohibition.

However, as war in Europe become more of a certainty and the League crafted a wartime campaign for prohibition, it soon created a whole new series of cartoons geared around exploiting wartime anxieties. These cartoons represented all four of the League's wartime themes previously discussed in this paper. A majority of cartoons during the League's wartime campaign focused on the issue of sacrifice and

³⁰² Caroon, *The American Issue*, December 23rd, 1916.p.1

³⁰³ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, November, 25th, 1916

doing one's part for the national cause. One cartoon published in *The American Issue* in April of 1918 featured a barrel that was supposed to represent "our national food supply." Above the barrel was a sign that read, "food will win the war, don't waste it!"³⁰⁴ At the bottom of the barrel was a giant hole with water representing the American food supply gushing out. In a pool of waste besides the barrel was a message reading, "criminal waste of grain by manufacture of alcoholic beverages."³⁰⁵ The message was clear, production of alcohol was wasting grain and harming the American war effort. Another cartoon published in August of 1918 also depicted the importance of grain to the American war effort. This cartoon had a title of "Uncle Sam, The Great Provider." Below the title was a stout Uncle Sam with an arm full of grain looking down at the outstretched hands of "Belgium", "France" and "England." This cartoon was once again supposed to signify the importance of grain to the war effort. The implicit message was that by wasting grain in the United States, European allies would starve. The League argued that brewing beer was a destructive waste of food supplies.³⁰⁶ This point was cemented in a September eleventh cartoon from 1918. Under the title of "Famine", Uncle Sam was depicted heroically ripping a bag of grain from an overweight brewer and delivering it to an emaciated soldier.³⁰⁷ These cartoons revealed that a central focus of the League's wartime campaign was a demonization of the beer industry's wasteful practices.³⁰⁸ The League argued that grain was a priority to the war effort, thus all wasteful production of beer had to cease immediately.

³⁰⁴ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, April, 27th, 1918, p.1

³⁰⁵ Ibid

³⁰⁶ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, August 10th, 1918

³⁰⁷ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, September 11th, 1918

³⁰⁸ While these cartoons were highlighted in this section, they are only small representation of dozen's of cartoons arguing that brewers wasted precious grain.

Possibly the most dramatic cartoon dealing with wartime sacrifice appeared in the August 17th 1918 edition of the *American Issue*. The cartoon had the title of “A reminder of last winter” which was supposed to evoke memories of the hardships Americans went through during the previous winter. Below the title was a father with his two school aged children. The family was standing outside the locked gates of the childrens’ school. A sign on the fencing read “school closed, no coal.”³⁰⁹ The daughter pointed to a distant brewery, with clouds of dark smoke flowing out of its active factory pipes. Outside the brewery was a sign: “brewery, our output: demoralization, degradation, destruction.” The daughter then asked her father, “Papa, why is the brewery running and the school closed?”³¹⁰ This cartoon revealed just how ruthless the League’s wartime campaign for prohibition was. The League attempted to demonize the brewers at any cost, even if it meant forcing the public into a false ultimatum, booze or schools. These cartoons were examples of the League’s efforts at exploiting wartime anxieties with regard to the issue of national sacrifice. With a circulation of at least six million, these cartoons commanded a sizable wartime audience.³¹¹

The League’s theme of alcohol contributing to harmful conditions for soldiers in Europe was also present in its editorial cartoons. One such cartoon published on May 5th of 1917 was featured prominently on the front page, above the fold. The cartoon had the title of, “The Traitor in the Ranks!” and showed a battle line of American soldiers standing ready for battle. However, there was one soldier dressed in all black with no visible face. The soldier, appeared unable to stand upright and was wearing an iron

³⁰⁹ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, August 17th, 1918

³¹⁰ Ibid

³¹¹ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, role1-3, American Issue Publications Annual Report to Board of Directors of the Anti Saloon League.

weight around his chest entitled, “Booze”. He was also holding a canteen with Xs on it.³¹² The cartoon was likely intended to signify the harmful influence of alcohol on American soldiers. Its central argument was that booze was contaminating the ranks of American servicemen.³¹³ Another cartoon showed an American soldier, with a tag attached to his leg that said, “American fighting strength.” The American was held up by a German brewer. The brewer was saying, “Here’s courage go lick der enemy!” Another German soldier in the background then saluted the drunken American.³¹⁴ The cartoon’s main argument was that German brewers were proudly corrupting and harming American soldiers by making them dependent on German beer. The cartoon argued that beer was an important weapon of the German war machine as well as a detrimental force on the American army.³¹⁵

In order to justify prohibition as a permanent measure, the League argued that prohibition would make the world a better place following the war. This theme was also depicted in League cartoons. One such cartoon was published on the front page of the January 4th, 1919 *American Issue*. The artful cartoon titled, “The New Suitor”, featured a man in a suit with a globe for a head. The man was depicted charming a pretty young woman with “Miss. Prohibition” written on her skirt. The captions of the cartoon read, “We are going to get along fine.”³¹⁶ This was supposed to represent the League’s belief that world wide prohibition would become a reality following the end of World War

³¹² Cartoon, *The American Issue*, May 5th, 1918

³¹³ In all likelihood the black clothes on the soldier was intended to signify death though this is impossible to know for certain.

³¹⁴ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, June 1st, 1917

³¹⁵ Again, this was just one of many cartoons depicting the harmful impact of liquor on American servicemen. More were not discussed in order to avoid repetition.

³¹⁶ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, January 4th, 1919

One.³¹⁷ Another *American Issue* cartoon showed Uncle Sam handing a hickory stick to a man representing “the rest of the world.” Standing besides the man was a befuddled little man that was supposed to represent the liquor interests. Uncle Sam told the man representing the world to smack the little man with the stick because, “it worked fine in my wood-shed.”³¹⁸ This represented Americans leading the world into a new era of prohibition.

Possibly the most dramatic cartoons appearing in the *American Issue* attempted to propagate anti-German hysteria by connecting the German enemy to the American brewing industry. One such cartoon appeared in the June 22nd, 1918 edition of the *American Issue*. The cartoon titled, “His natural refuge”, depicted an angry dragon with “enemy spy” written on it, jumping out of a saloon and biting Uncle Sam in the hip.³¹⁹ This cartoon attempted to connect the saloon to the Germany enemy while implying how such a union was hurting the American war effort. A more direct cartoon appeared in the September 29th 1917 edition of the *American Issue*. This cartoon titled “Happy Days!” portrayed a table full of German generals gleefully drinking beer. One German general proposed a toast to the German American brewers who he claimed were doing all of the German dirty work for them by wasting so many American resources on producing beer.³²⁰ A final cartoon published towards the end of the war with the title of, “In times of War Prepare for Peace”, featured an overweight German-American brewer. The brewer wore a German military hat and held an American flag that was dripping blood.³²¹ The

³¹⁷ Anti-Saloon League of America. *Proceedings of the Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Westerville,OH: American Issue Press,1915) p.209

³¹⁸ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, January 9th, 1918,p.1

³¹⁹ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, June 22nd, 1918

³²⁰ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, September 19th, 1917

³²¹ Presumably to connect American casualties to the beer industry

brewer then said, “I sacrificed my all during the war- my country called- now I ask that my old glory be returned and my right to murder and poison be unquestioned henceforth!”³²² This cartoon was important for several reasons. It represented the League’s argument that the German-American brewers were harming the American war effort. The cartoon also pleaded with the American public to be as stern with brewers during peacetime as they were during wartime. Another cartoon published during the summer of 1917 was one captioned, “Kaiser’s Best Friend in the United States”, depicted an overweight German-American brewer cheerfully drinking a giant jug of beer with a massive grin on his face.³²³ The cartoons described represent only a small fraction of League cartoons that attempted to connect the German adversary to the liquor business. The League featured the majority of these cartoons on the front page of its flagship *American Issue* publication, signifying the important role they played in the League’s wartime campaign.

³²² Cartoon, *The American Issue*, August 10th, 1918

³²³ Cartoon, *The American Issue*, July 28th, 1917

Chapter XI: Anti German Hysteria and Americanization

The *American Issue* regularly published stories that derided the connection between German-Americans and the German adversary. On May 25th 1918, the *American Issue* published an article titled, “Race War Stirred by German Agents”. This was a venomous story that alleged German American spies were attempting to stir up race riots in the American south. The story claimed that the killing of Hampton Smith, a Georgia farmer, was directly related to “Hun agents” working secretly among “the negroes.”³²⁴ Importantly, this story did more than just agitate racial anxieties and anti-German hysteria; it attempted to direct wartime hysteria towards the liquor industry. The article proclaimed, “in addition to working upon racial prejudices, the Hun agents are making liberal use of liquor to dissipate and degenerate the minds of unsuspecting blacks.”³²⁵ This was a clear example of how the League attempted to promote prohibition by contributing to anti-German hysteria.³²⁶ Another brazen attempt to use anti-German hysteria to promote its political cause appeared in the March 2nd 1918 edition of the *American Issue*. This article titled, “Treason Factory Output”, argued that German-American brewers were part of a German scheme to sabotage the American war effort on

³²⁴ “Race War Stirred by German Agents”, *The American Issue*, May 25th, 1918

³²⁵ Ibid

³²⁶ It is also an obvious example of how the League occasionally used race to promote its agenda. A focus of the article is on the attempts of German agents to use liquor to “corrupt” the minds of black Americans. Throughout the campaign for prohibition, the League walked a fine line between attempting to appear inclusive while also stoking inflamed anxieties during wartime. League leaders clearly attempted to win support in urban areas by portraying the dry movement as an open and inclusive one. However, articles such as this one also periodically appeared in League publications. Since the focus of this paper has not been race relations within the prohibition movement, this paper can not make any wide-sweeping allegations about race relations within the League during this era except to say that these articles appeared to be an exception rather than a rule. For the most part, League publications appeared to focus the vast majority of its anger towards brewers and Germans and generally glossed over issues of racial divides in order to appear to be more inclusive. However racial issues as well as rural-urban divide within the dry movement was an important issue. Kerr and Okrent provide important insight into this subject. Both claim that there was a constant tension between the desire of leaders to appear more inclusive while also appealing the rural roots of the movement. Okrent describes this in convincing detail (Okrent,69-70,86,90)

the home-front. The article claimed that “Every German who left the “Faderland” was expected to hold two allegiances, one to his native land and one to the country of his adoption.³²⁷ If there was a conflict between these, allegiances to the Faderland came first.”³²⁸ The article proceeded to allege that German-American brewers, loyal first to their native Germany, financed Germany espionage efforts on American soil. The article also claimed that German-American brewers were attempting to help the Kaiser by slowing the American war-effort.³²⁹ The article contended that brewers were responsible for the “decreased output of coal by one-third” and that by wasting important resources brewers single handily brought “munitions factories to a standstill.”³³⁰ Refusing to spare any hyperbole, the article asserted that, “suffering” women and children were starving during the “dead of winter” due to grain shortages while brewers were permitted to gleefully waste “grain and sugar”.³³¹ Another article appeared in the *American Issue* on April 4th, 1918, and was sarcastically titled, “Brewery Patriotism.” This article alleged that due to food shortages, hop growers in Oregon were anxious to turn their land into farms used to grow grain.³³² However, German-American breweries refused such requests and forced the Oregon farmers to continue using the land for the cultivation of hops. The article cynically questioned, “What care these German brewers if the world is facing starvation and looking to America for relief!”³³³ The article explained that German brewers were proudly slowing down American grain production in order to increase their profits and harm the American war efforts. Another article published on June 2nd 1917

³²⁷ “Treason Factory Output”, *The American Issue*, March 2nd, 1918

³²⁸ Ibid

³²⁹ Ibid

³³⁰ Ibid

³³¹ Of course, none of these allegations could be confirmed, however by simply making these charges, the League was spreading wartime hysteria.

³³² “Brewer Patriotism”, *The American Issue*, April 4th, 1918

³³³ Ibid

titled, “Liquor Men Anxious To Increase Waste”, directly asserted that German-American brewers were actively tampering with the American war effort by using grain, sugar and coal to produce beer.³³⁴ These articles were examples of the League’s determined plan to promote a connection between the German enemy and German-American brewers. Articles similar to the ones described above were routinely featured in the *American Issue* during the war years. These articles attempted to demonize brewers by connecting them to the German adversary. In the process, articles like the ones examined above likely contributed to the anti-German hysteria of the war years.

The anti-German delirium of the war years has been well documented by previous historians such as Christopher Cappozzola, David Kennedy and Jennifer D. Keene. Home-Front historian Byron Farwell contends that anti-German hysteria appeared in many forms on the American home-front during the Great War. Many Americans with German names were molested and sometimes even lynched. Several towns with German names changed them. Berlin, Maryland changed its name to Brunswick. A myriad of schools banned the teaching of German. Even the “Hun music: of Bach and Wagner were banned from several American opera houses.³³⁵ . Anxieties about Germany were not exclusive to humans, even owners of German shepherds were suspect until the breed’s name was temporarily changed to “police dog” and in certain places dachshunds were stoned.³³⁶ Anti-German hysteria was perverse and wide-ranging during the war years. Historians such as Faith Jaycox [2005] contend that political organizations such as the

³³⁴ “Liquor Men Anxious To Increase Waste”, *The American Issue*, June 2nd, 1917

³³⁵ Byron Farwell, *Over There: The United States in the Great War, 1917-1919* (New York, NY: Norton Press,1999), 124-125

³³⁶ Ibid

Anti-Saloon League exacerbated anti-German sentiment.³³⁷ A careful examination of the League documents and publications such as the ones examined above reveal just how determined the League was to exploit wartime anxieties about German Americans and the brewing industry. The League took advantage of a nation ripe with fear in order to opportunistically promote its own political agenda. The League understood that the war provided a convenient way to demonize brewers and finally prohibit production of alcohol.

The Women's Christian Temperance Union complimented League campaign themes and tactics throughout the final push for prohibition. The WCTU lacked the powerful printing press that the League operated.³³⁸ However, the WCTU did have an active and passionate membership base. The WCTU attempted to use its legion of volunteers to promote prohibition through community service. The WCTU campaign perfectly aided the League's campaign. The League ran a campaign with two central aims, pacifying the general population while persuading lawmakers.³³⁹ It was a campaign that largely targeted elites. However, the WCTU operated a campaign that focused its attention on individual communities. The WCTU attempted to promote prohibition by advocating temperance in the household through various charitable efforts.³⁴⁰ This paper's state by state examination of the 1918 campaign for prohibition will reveal how the League and the WCTU had different yet complimentary approaches to temperance.

³³⁷ Faith Jaycox, *The Progressive Era* (Facts on File Inc, 2005), 465-466

³³⁸ K. Austin Kerr, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985), 149-150

³³⁹ *Ibid*, 185-211

³⁴⁰ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series III, roll , Women's Christian Temperance Union, President's Address to the 1917 WCTU Convention in Washington D.C.

The WCTU played an essential part in developing a race based, wartime campaign to “Americanize” immigrants and racial minorities. This campaign had the motto of “Many nations, one people.”³⁴¹ The stated goal of the campaign was to create a patriotic service agency that would teach immigrants to effectively contribute to the war effort.³⁴² However the movement was part of the broader progressive desire to improve minorities by turning them into ‘proper’ Americans.³⁴³ The WCTU argued that it was absolutely essential to “Americanize” immigrants and minorities in order to create a more efficient and loyal home-front during the Great War. WCTU President Anna Gordon explained in late 1917 that women could “help service our nation at this crucial hour by helping its millions of aliens within our borders become good citizens.”³⁴⁴ The WCTU also hoped that its “outreach” efforts would win support for prohibition among immigrants and racial minorities.³⁴⁵ Implicit in this program was that the WCTU believed that racial minorities and immigrants needed to learn how to become good Americans. The WCTU campaign of Americanization was carried out on a state by state level. The methods used by WCTU members to “Americanize” minorities varied greatly throughout the states. For the most part the Americanization program appeared to be harmless charity. In Montana the WCTU planted gardens and assisted in canning and drying garden products for “foreign children.”³⁴⁶ In Michigan, the WCTU encouraged immigrant families to attend night school. In Connecticut the WCTU taught sewing to “15 nationalities.” In California the WCTU “found home for Mexican girls.”³⁴⁷ However,

³⁴¹ Ibid,142

³⁴² Ibid

³⁴³ Ibid

³⁴⁴ Ibid

³⁴⁵ Ibid

³⁴⁶ Ibid, 143

³⁴⁷ Ibid

while charity was a main focus of this WCTU campaign, the organization also attempted to indoctrinate immigrants as well. While aiding the immigrant communities, the WCTU routinely passed out literature which expounded the virtues of prohibition. While the stated goal of this program was to help enable immigrants to contribute to the American war effort, the WCTU also hoped to use this program to win support for prohibition.³⁴⁸ Even throughout the war years, the progressive era desire to ‘improve’ races was part of the campaign for prohibition. However it is important to note that the League did not conduct a campaign similar to the WCTU Americanization crusade. For the most part, as has been discussed earlier in this paper, the League attempted to downplay racial issues during its wartime campaign for prohibition. Instead the League focused its campaign heavily on wartime themes.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁸ Ibid, 142

³⁴⁹ This is not to say that the League was an open, tolerant organization. However, the League simply tried to downplay issues of race in order to focus on issues such as wartime patriotism that served to unite, rather than divide the public.

Chapter XII: The 18th Amendment at the State Level

The Anti-Saloon League finalized prohibition at the state level in much the same way they did in Congress, through progressive rhetoric and successfully soliciting lawmakers. Because the U.S. constitution allowed for amendments to pass by simply receiving a two-thirds vote in both the halls of Congress and the state legislatures, it was possible for the Anti-Saloon League to lead the Amendment to ratification without ever having to directly defend prohibition on the ballot. This constitutional reality made winning the prohibition fight much easier for dry forces.³⁵⁰ However, because dry forces were forced to succeed in two-thirds of all state houses, they were required to broaden their support and win campaigns in a diverse range of states. To accomplish this, the League once again depended on wartime rhetoric to gain enough public support to force state legislatures into action. The Anti-Saloon League also received early endorsements of popular governors who in turn promised to shepherd the prohibition amendment through state legislatures. This paper will now examine how the 18th Amendment was debated and ultimately ratified in states throughout the United States.

In many ways California was the ideal battleground for the effort to ratify the 18th Amendment. It was a large state with characteristics that seemed to favor both wet and dry forces. The built-in demographic difficulties for prohibition in California were hard to ignore. The state was the most urban state in the west, with 61.8 percent of its population living in urban centers. Estimates indicated that throughout much of the late nineteenth century, San Francisco had many times more saloons in proportion to its

³⁵⁰ Gilman M. Ostrander, *The Prohibition Movement in California, 1848-1933*(Berkeley CA: University of California Press,1957)p.81.

population than any other city including New York and Chicago.³⁵¹ For most of its history California had resisted every attempt at state-wide prohibition. Prohibitionists routinely focused on crime, which they claimed was caused by lawless saloons in the major California cities. Those saloons were staples of their trade and were off-limits to being closed down. Even by 1917, when prohibition was becoming a national movement, California still had seventy-one breweries and 157 distilleries that produced over seventeen million gallons of distilled spirits every year.³⁵² California did have a dry local option which meant individual communities could vote to go dry. By 1917 there were only five dry counties in California with a dry population under 100,000, a small number in a state with a population nearing three million.³⁵³ However, dry forces in California had a secret weapon: the Great War. In 1917 alone, 9,716 bushels of grain were used by distilleries in California. Dry forces claimed that over thirteen million gallons of potentially useful food materials were used in the distillery process in 1917 alone.³⁵⁴ Prohibitionists claimed that this was an example of the wasteful use of resources during wartime. In a 1918 publication, the Anti-Saloon League claimed that the money used to buy three beers a day could instead have been used to buy “1 barrel of flour, 50 pounds of sugar, 20 pounds of corn starch, 10 quarts of beans, 3 bushels Irish potatoes, 10 pounds of rice, 3 Twelve-pound turkeys, 10 pounds of mixed nuts.”³⁵⁵ Dry forces made an effort to focus on the wasteful aspects of alcohol use. The war leveled the playing field

³⁵¹ Gilman M. Ostrander, *The Prohibition Movement in California, 1848-1933*(Berkeley CA: University of California Press,1957)p.81.

³⁵² Ernest H. Cherrington (ed) *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform.* (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America,1918),151.

³⁵³ Ibid

³⁵⁴ Ibid

³⁵⁵ Ibid,46

in California, turning a state that had a long history of being hostile to prohibitionists into one that under the right circumstances could conceivably ratify the 18th Amendment.

However, the liquor lobby was determined to fight the prohibitionists in California. Having learned from previous misadventures, wets in California decided to ignore many of the arguments proven ineffective during wartime. The liquor interests in California decided to craft their campaign along economic lines rather than arguing about individual liberty. Specifically, the liquor interests warned that prohibition would devastate the California economy by destroying the vital grape growing industry. Supporters of the wine industry claimed that prohibition would destroy 170,000 acres of production land in California at an economic cost of 150,000,000 to California farmers.³⁵⁶ Supporters of the wine industry claimed that in wartime, this kind of waste would be unpatriotic and detrimental to the war effort. In a letter to the editors of the *Los Angeles Times* winery advocate H.B Eakins claimed: “The United States has been called upon to not only finance its cost of the war but to furnish the cash sinews for all the Allies. In view of such a stupendous task, there must be no waste; no portion of this great country has the right to destroy the productive growth of 170,000 acres of fertile land.”³⁵⁷ H.B Eakins proceeded to claim that prohibition would be unpatriotic saying that prohibition would: “not be good business, it is not common sense, nor is it patriotic in any meaning of the word.”³⁵⁸ Examining the prohibition debate in California reveals a shift in the arguments used by opponents of prohibition. Wets were forced to abandon earlier arguments about individual liberty and protection from an abusive federal government because those arguments were rendered ineffective by a public more trusting

³⁵⁶ “Prohibition vs. War Needs”, *Los Angeles Times*, May 19th, 1918, III14

³⁵⁷ Ibid

³⁵⁸ Ibid

of the government as the war went on. In the place of those earlier, ineffective arguments was a new wartime campaign. Wets tried to argue that prohibition would actually harm the war effort.

Prohibitionists swiftly took aim at the new pro-war liquor campaign. Dry supporters claimed that the wine industry did not aid the war effort. Complaining about the wastefulness of alcohol was a key argument used to win over people not so easily persuaded by moral arguments for prohibitions. Dry advocates claimed that such a waste was detrimental to the war effort. The key to the dry campaign in California was the support of popular Governor William D. Stephens. Stephens was a tireless advocate for national prohibition and he more so than any other public official in California led the campaign for the 18th Amendment in the state. California's Governor used the war effort as his justification for supporting the Eighteenth Amendment. In a 1918 press release, Governor William D. Stephens said: "With our nation at war the elimination of the saloon becomes a patriotic as well as an economic necessity. I am positively and wholeheartedly in favor of closing the saloons in California... I favor the national amendment now before the states for ratification."³⁵⁹ The Governor's endorsement was the archetypal prohibition defense in California. According to dry forces, with a war effort going on the wastefulness of saloons could no longer be tolerated. Thus Governor Stephens, when speaking about wartime sacrifice, said: "The war has brought to us a full realization of the wastage of human and material resources through the saloon and the liquor traffic."³⁶⁰ In an earlier speech, Governor Stephens went as far as to proclaim: "Since the beginning

³⁵⁹ Ernest H. Cherrington (ed) *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1918), 100.

³⁶⁰ Ibid

of the War there has been a tremendous stirring of public conscience...and a desire so to regulate and promote both private and public efficiency and thus aid in winning speedy victory.”³⁶¹ Amendment supporters like Stephens equated being a good American patriot and winning the war with banning alcohol on the home front. This shows how the dry movement evolved from the cause of rural Protestants to one where slick politicians from large cities talked about prohibition in the name of national sacrifice. Governor Stephen’s campaign for prohibition also manifests the war’s impact on public sentiments. Because of the war, a popular governor could unapologetically claim that the seizure and ultimate elimination of an entire sector of the economy was necessary to the American war effort. Because of wartime anxiety, a popular governor running for re-election could claim that the government had every right to do what it deemed necessary to aid the war effort. This once again reveals just how wartime anxieties can be exploited by public officials and used as justification to commandeer individual liberty and rights previously held to be sacred, like the private consumption of alcohol.

The two largest national dry organizations approached the campaign for prohibition very differently in California. The focus of the League’s California campaign was its lobbying efforts within the California legislature. A careful examination of League expense reports from 1918 reveal that the largest League expense was payroll; a large portion of the payroll consisted of professional lobbyists as well as secretaries that promoted prohibition in every corner of California.³⁶² These lobbyists advocated the necessity of the 18th Amendment to both state legislatures and private citizens. Importantly, the League lobbyists ran the dry efforts in Sacramento. League lobbyists

³⁶¹ “Win the War’ Slogan Adopted by the Governor”, *Los Angeles Times*, September 18th 1918, 11

³⁶² The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series XIII, roll 4, League Financial Records, 1914-1918

were responsible for continually keeping track of how many state legislatures supported prohibition. The League actively targeted opponents of prohibition in the California State Legislature.³⁶³³⁶⁴ The League used its sizable printing press and membership base to attempt to control the balance of power in marginal legislative districts.³⁶⁵³⁶⁶ A strong, efficient printing press was important in large states such as California. The printing press enabled the League to reach large numbers of Californians rapidly and competently. It also made it possible for the League to communicate important messages to its membership without having to traverse a large geographic area. For example, just days before the California state legislative elections, the League disseminated pamphlets informing supporters of who they should vote for in the elections.

Another large expense for the League in California was exorbitant dry rallies held throughout the state. For these events the League would pay a speaker such as William Jennings Bryan to fly into California and promote prohibition to a large audience. The League often had to rent costly venues for these rallies, another large expense. One such rally took place in Fresno on February 4th, 1918. Supporters of the League from all over the state traveled to Fresno to participate in workshops and listen to dry speakers.³⁶⁷ The goal of these large meetings were to motivate League members to travel back to their

³⁶³ “Dry Majority at Sacramento”, *Los Angeles Times*, November 14th 1918, I2

³⁶⁴ Ibid.

³⁶⁵ “Legislature Goes Dry”, *Los Angeles Times*, November 7th, 1918, I3

³⁶⁶ It is impossible to know how successful these League efforts were in terms of actively swaying elections. Many candidates supported by the League won seats in the Legislature. However, without exit polling it is impossible to know for certain while Californians voted the way they did. However, the mere threat of a third-party advocacy group such as the League influencing close elections likely was enough to win the support of several California legislators.

³⁶⁷ “Prohibitionists Meet At Fresno Today”, *Los Angeles Times*, February 5th, 1918, I8

communities and advocate for prohibition as efficiently as possible.³⁶⁸ The League operated on a large scale in California, organizing large meetings, bringing speakers into California and constantly lobbying state legislators.³⁶⁹ This kind of campaign was primarily focused on winning over elite politicians.

The League campaign was complimented by the smaller scale, more personal campaign conducted by the WCTU. While the League crafted a wartime campaign that revolved around large rallies and venomous rhetoric, the WCTU carried out a generally more positive, charitable wartime campaign. For example, in Southern California the WCTU distributed 4,200 “comfort bags” to soldiers stationed in that part of the state.³⁷⁰ The WCTU also distributed food such as grape juice to Southern California families in need. The WCTU gave away bibles to servicemen leaving for Europe.³⁷¹ This was intended to show the positive ways the California grape crop could be used.³⁷² The W.C.T.U also preached in churches throughout the state and worked with Sunday school programs within the state.³⁷³ While the larger, well funded League fought prohibition in the halls of the state legislature, the WCTU advocated for prohibition in homes and churches. While the League galvanized the public by spreading anxiety about what soldiers were doing in Europe, the WCTU attempted to comfort soldiers returning home. The two campaigns allowed prohibitionists to reach both elite politicians and ordinary citizens. The two organizations also promoted a wartime campaign that attempted to both

³⁶⁸ A second purpose of these meetings possibly was to intimidate state legislatures by organizing a large display of support for prohibition.

³⁶⁹ In many ways it was a mechanic, impersonal campaign. However, it was a necessary campaign because the fate of prohibition in California would be determined by elite politicians rather than ordinary Californians.

³⁷⁰ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series III, roll , Women’s Christian Temperance Union, Efforts for Soldiers, 143

³⁷¹ Ibid

³⁷² Ibid, 181

³⁷³ Ibid

exploit and ease wartime anxieties. The League attempted to scare the home-front into supporting prohibition while the WCTU tried to show the public that Christian charity was also an essential aspect of the dry movement. In California these different approaches worked together to best promote prohibition in the private and public spheres.

The final fight over the 18th Amendment in California took place in the ballot box and the newspapers. Staunch prohibitionist Governor Stephens won his reelection by a wide margin in a landslide, thus ensuring that the head of California's government would continue to tirelessly campaign for the Amendment in California.³⁷⁴ In other elections throughout the state, prohibitionists did what they were best at, maximizing the impact of their organization by targeting swing ridings. For example, prohibitionists supported Republican dry candidate R.W. McKeen in the Fifteenth district in an election in which he won by only 500 votes.³⁷⁵ In the Fifty-First district, prohibitionists supported S.L. Strother in an election that he narrowly won by 150 votes.³⁷⁶ Long before exit polling was developed it is impossible to know for certain why both candidates were able to win such close elections yet both wins are emblematic of dry political tactics. While organizations like the Anti Saloon League were well funded and had relatively large membership banks compared to other national advocacy groups, they still only led a small fraction of the electorate. However by targeting candidates in divided districts that often had close, contested elections, the League was able to maximize its influence and hold the balance of power in many swing ridings. Following the result in state-wide elections throughout California, the *Los Angeles Times* claimed "Ratification of the

³⁷⁴ "Stephens is Re-Elected Governor by a Large General Majority", *Los Angeles Times*, November 6th 1918, 11.

³⁷⁵ "Legislature Goes Dry", *Los Angeles Times*, November 7th 1918, 13.

³⁷⁶ Ibid

proposed national bone-dry amendment by the next California Legislature was believed to be assured tonight by returns which virtually made certain the election of two state Senators endorsed by the Anti-Saloon League.”³⁷⁷ This once again shows the impact of the League, credited by the *Los Angeles Times* for its efforts in statewide elections. It also demonstrates the belief that following statewide elections in November of 1917, ratification of the 18th Amendment began to feel inevitable in California.

Despite or possibly because of the belief that prohibition was inevitable in California following the November 1917 state-wide elections, both sides sprinted down the stretch with violent fervor and a hint of desperation. Wet forces began taking out ads in California’s largest newspapers claiming that national prohibition would lead to a Communist uprising in the United States. In a *Los Angeles Times* advertisement titled “Will Bolshevism Come with National Prohibition?” opponents of the 18th Amendment claimed that: “National prohibition will compel a spy system similar to that of the overthrown Czar...”³⁷⁸ These advertisements appear to have never been taken very seriously because the League and other prohibitionists simply ignored them, never attempting to directly refute their accusations.³⁷⁹ Dry forces mounted their own last minute scare campaign, continuing to associate German brewers with the German enemies. In an editorial in early 1919 titled “Booze and Brisbane Busted” the *Los Angeles Times* wrote the post-mortem for liquor by saying: “When social psychologists study the facts in the case to find out why [the 18th Amendment was ratified by so many

³⁷⁷ Ibid

³⁷⁸ “Will Bolshevism Come with National Prohibition?”, *Los Angeles Times*, January 13th, 1919, I4.

³⁷⁹ Though it does possibly explain why prohibitionists were so careful to show that many workers favored prohibition. The League and its allies were clearly worried about preventing any perception that the working class was overwhelmingly opposed to the 18th Amendment. However by the time wets started this ad campaign, dries already seem to have convinced many Americans that labor was not completely opposed to national prohibition. Thus, this wet scare tactic appears to have been too little, too late.

states]...It will be found that the doom of booze was written the day that the American public learned that the brewers were allied with Hearst, Brisbane, the German-American alliance and other pro-Hun and anti- American institutions.”³⁸⁰ This paper has already established that prohibitionists attempted to exploit wartime anxieties about the German enemies by linking German brewers to the German adversary in the trench. Furthermore, dry supporters attempted the polarizing, ‘you are either with us or against us’ message prevalent in so many wartime political campaigns. In an early 1919 editorial *The Los Angeles Times* claimed, “The American citizen is a fair man or woman. He knows that there are two sides to most questions...but he knows there are not two sides to patriotism...and the question was asked: Are you for America or are you against this country?”³⁸¹ *The Los Angeles Times* proceeded to contend that breweries and their German American allies were against America and had to be stopped. This kind of extreme rhetoric connects the prohibition movement to other political attempts to use wartime anxieties as a means to encroach on individual liberty and personal freedoms.

The new California legislature did not wait long to ratify the 18th Amendment. On January 10th, 1919 California became the twenty-fourth state to ratify the Eighteenth Amendment when its state legislature passed the measure.³⁸² The Amendment only passed the California State Senate by a vote of 24-15, making it the closest ratification vote in the west.³⁸³ Among the first thirty-six states to support the Eighteenth Amendment, only Illinois had a closer vote in favor of the amendment.³⁸⁴ This

³⁸⁰ “Booze and Brisbane Busted”, *Los Angeles Times*, January 18th, 1919, II4.

³⁸¹ *Ibid*

³⁸² Gilman M. Ostrander, *The Prohibition Movement in California, 1848-1933*(Berkeley CA: University of California Press,1957).

³⁸³ *Ibid*

³⁸⁴ *Ibid*

demonstrates just how difficult geography and demographics were to overcome. California, a large state dominated by urban centers with a fair amount of non-Protestants and a large farming industry that produced millions of dollars worth of wine each year was never going to be fertile ground for prohibitionist. This is why California was one of the most important states in the Union for the prohibition debate. Liquor interests were unlikely to find a state that offered them so many demographics and economic advantages as in California. If the wet forces were able to defeat the Amendment in California, opposition could have spread and delayed ratification just long enough for it to be defeated following the war. However, the dry campaign in California ultimately proved too much for wets to overcome. With a popular Governor, a timely and powerful war time message of patriotic unity and a friendly series of newspapers, prohibitionists were able to overcome unfavorable demographics to win the fight for prohibition in California. In such a close vote, the League's ability to target swing ridings by influencing close elections impacted the final vote for prohibition. League political tactics and a wartime campaign geared around exploiting public anxiety tilted California into the dry column.

Much like California, Massachusetts provided wets with several demographic advantages. It was another large, industrial state that showed previous resistance to widespread prohibition. However, Massachusetts unlike California also had a tradition of progressive reform.³⁸⁵ This made Massachusetts an ideal battleground state for both wet and dry forces. Massachusetts was also important because of its status of a large eastern state. The *Springfield Republican* mused that success in Massachusetts could “strengthen

³⁸⁵ Robert Smith Bader, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History* (Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986).

the prohibition cause...if it were demonstrated in an important eastern state like Massachusetts really had a tangible popular majority of support in it.”³⁸⁶ The theory held that success in Massachusetts would cause other eastern states to fall like dominos into the dry column.

However, liquor forces focused their tactics on forcing a public vote on the 18th Amendment in Massachusetts. They aimed to force the prohibitionists to win a statewide vote on prohibition rather than successfully lobbying the state legislature. For their part, prohibitionists passionately fought any state-wide referendum on the prohibition amendment in Massachusetts. Some prohibitionists such as Miss Eugenia B. Frothingham speaking at a church meeting claimed: “corrupt interests always profit from straw votes.”³⁸⁷ The Council for National Prohibition routinely ran ads campaigning against any potential referendum. In one newspaper ad prohibitionists claimed that any referendum: “would be without meaning and without effect. It is an invasion and a deception.”³⁸⁸ However, this shows that the prohibitionists clearly feared the outcome of any state-wide prohibition vote. It is likely that dry forces understood that they did not have the majority support of voters in Massachusetts. Because of this it is tempting to conclude that prohibition was ratified only because of a constitutional system that allows an amendment to be introduced and ratified without a direct public vote. While the constitutional system aided the prohibition movement it is overly simplistic to conclude that the 18th Amendment was ratified simply because of constitutional maneuvering. If this was the case, more amendments would have been introduced and ratified throughout American history. Amendments require years of effort and loyal campaigning from

³⁸⁶ “Prohibition and the People”, *The New York Times*, February 18th, 1918,10.

³⁸⁷ “Speakers in Churches Urge Dry Amendment”, *Boston Daily Globe*, February 18th 1918, 9.

³⁸⁸ “Gov. Whitman Calls Prohibition Referendum Dishonest”, *Boston Daily Globe*, March 20th 1918,1

lobbyists. They also require a spark in a keg of dynamite to get through Congress and into the state legislatures. The Great War provided lawmakers with the sense of urgency that is so often missing from constitutional questions. However, a certain amount of luck was also involved in the process. Supporters of prohibition were able to kill any measure that would create a statewide prohibition referendum by only a few votes in a narrow vote in the Massachusetts legislature, thus ensuring that the state lawmakers would get the final say on the 18th Amendment in Massachusetts.³⁸⁹

While the procedure was the same in every state, the public fight over prohibition was a unique fusion of national issues and local concerns in states throughout the United States. The war and wine growers dominated the prohibition debate in California. In Massachusetts, the debate over ratification revolved around traditional themes of the prohibition movement, mainly the church and the working class. In late January 1918, teamsters met in Massachusetts to protest the amendment. Firemen, engineers and coopers joined with bartenders, brewery workers, cigar makers and waiters to protest the Amendment.³⁹⁰ This eventually led to the powerful Boston Central Labor Union to officially vote to oppose the prohibition amendment and bar any member from using the name of the union in any public address or letter stating support for the Amendment. The union claimed “the amendment is economically, politically, industrially and patriotically wrong.”³⁹¹ While the majority of organized unions in Massachusetts were opposed to the amendment, very little was done to turn that opposition into action. There were no mass demonstrations or boycotts. Instead the Unions drafted official letters stating their disapproval of the Amendment. The strength of labor unions resides in their membership

³⁸⁹ “Ratifies Dry Amendment”, *The New York Times*, March 27th 1918, 4.

³⁹⁰ “Liquor Trade Employees to Fight Prohibition”, *Boston Daily Globe*, January 28th 1918,5.

³⁹¹ “C.L.U is Opposed to Dry Amendment” *Boston Daily Globe*, February 4th 1918, 3.

and in public demonstrations. Without such public displays of anger, the unions were not able to frighten legislatures into opposition of the Amendment. This is another example of the Great War impacting the prohibition movement without being present rhetorically. With their power to strike diminished and with able body men fully engaged in either the trenches of Europe or the factories of the big cities, there was very little opportunity for organized labor to publically oppose the 18th Amendment in the manner necessary to successfully defeat it. This again emphasizes how vulnerable the working class can be during wartime to intrusive action that restricts personal liberty.

Middle-class reformers unlike the working class had more time to publically demonstrate their feelings on prohibition and in Massachusetts they used that opportunity to push the movement forward. Unlike other states like California, there was not a single popular lawmaker leading the campaign for prohibition. Prohibitionists in Massachusetts relied on its traditional base of support, church reformers, to lead the movement to victory. The association of Universalists Christian Churches formally endorsed the work of the Anti-Saloon League in Massachusetts in late January of 1918.³⁹² The League sent members to churches across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to rally support for the amendment. One speaker, Robert Luce speaking at the South Congressional Church in Boston claimed that people from all classes supported prohibition arguing that only the rich liquor interests opposed prohibition: “It is the rich not the poor who oppose the removal of this curse.”³⁹³ Members of these churches responded by sending wires stating their support for the amendment to their Congresspersons as well as their local

³⁹² “Universalists Indorse National Prohibition Work”, *Boston Daily Globe*, January 30th 1918, 10.

³⁹³ “Speakers in Churches Urge Dry Amendment”, *Boston Daily Globe*, February 18th 1918, 9.

representatives in the state legislature.³⁹⁴ Debate over prohibition in Massachusetts was in many ways reminiscent of the old prohibition movement. Dry forces in Massachusetts were led by church going Protestant reformers while the wets were led by urban labor forces.

Both the League and the WCTU were active in Massachusetts. The League, just as it did in California focused on lobbying the Massachusetts legislature and organized large scare rallies.³⁹⁵ The League also distributed a massive amount of literature such as the *American Issue* throughout Massachusetts. The WCTU just as it did in California focused soothing wartime anxieties. Among other things, the superintendent of the Massachusetts WCTU operated a large house at Ayer Cantonment for soldiers. This was a place where servicemen could safely relax, seek comfort and Christian guidance.³⁹⁶ Once again these two organizations operated complimentary campaigns for prohibition.

The debate over the 18th Amendment in the Massachusetts State Legislature took place on March 26th, 1918 and lasted for a contentious two hours. Prohibitionists packed the Legislature's gallery with supporters who routinely cheered and jeered in order to get the point across. The crowd in the gallery got so boisterous that the Speaker of the House in the Massachusetts Legislature had to repeatedly warn the crowd to maintain order.³⁹⁷ After the debate, the State House voted in favor of the 18th Amendment by a margin of 145 to 91.³⁹⁸ The Massachusetts Senate then voted in favor of ratification by a margin of

³⁹⁴ "Ministers Wire Weeks to Work for Prohibition", *Boston Daily Globe*, February 26th 1918,10.

³⁹⁵ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series XIII, roll 4, League Financial Records, 1914-1918

³⁹⁶ The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series III, roll , Women's Christian Temperance Union, Efforts for Soldiers, 183

³⁹⁷ "House 145 to 91 For Prohibition", *Boston Daily Globe*, March 27th 1918,1.

³⁹⁸ Ibid

27 to 12 and by April of 1918, Massachusetts was in the dry column.³⁹⁹ Massachusetts was possibly the most important state to ratify the 18th Amendment. Prior to Massachusetts ratifying the Amendment, previously only small states or southern states had ratified the Amendment. Massachusetts, the first large northern state to ratify, showed the nation that the 18th Amendment could be successful in every state and region throughout the United States. Even opponents of prohibition appeared to understand the significance of ratification in Massachusetts. The *New York Times*, a paper that largely opposed prohibition stated on April 4th, 1918: "Ratification of the prohibition of the amendment by the Massachusetts Legislature is a considerable dry triumph."⁴⁰⁰ *The New York Times* proceeded to explain the importance of ratification in Massachusetts by explaining that Massachusetts has shown the rest of the nation that a populous, industrial state in the north can support the prohibition amendment.⁴⁰¹ Prohibitionists enthusiastically declared Massachusetts to be an important victory that would lead to the ultimate success of the 18th Amendment. Robert A. Woods, Chairman of the Council for National Prohibition declared: "The action of Massachusetts as the first great manufacturing and cosmopolitan state to endorse the amendment must have very great influence throughout the country and will...be influential in deciding the action...the action of a group of states necessary to secure the final result."⁴⁰² Massachusetts was an important battleground for the prohibition and as dry advocates predicted, following

³⁹⁹ "Prohibition Amendment up Today", *Boston Daily Globe*, March 28th 1918, 14.

⁴⁰⁰ "A Dry Victory", *The New York Times*, April 4th 1918, 12.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid

⁴⁰² "Will Affect Other States, Says Leaders" *Boston Daily Globe*, April 3rd 1918, 2.

victory in Massachusetts, other northern industrial states began to fall into the dry column.⁴⁰³

Washington State also had built-in demographic impediments to prohibition. Unlike many western states, Washington was predominately urban, with fifty-three percent of its population living in urban areas.⁴⁰⁴ However, much like Arizona and Texas, the Washington State Legislature passed a “bone-dry” state law prohibiting “importation, receipt, possession, sale or manufacture of liquor.”⁴⁰⁵ This greatly increased the likelihood of passing federal prohibition in Washington. Washington’s active women’s temperance community also helped spread the dry gospel. In a 1915 speech by Seattle Rev. Adna W. Leonard given to the Anti-Saloon League convention in Atlantic City New Jersey, Leonard praised Washington women for helping the prohibition movement. Rev. Leonard told the Anti-Saloon League that, “It would not be fair to omit any reference to the great work done by the women of the state of Washington... There is no doubt about the fact that the state of Washington could not have been voted dry had it not been for the work... of the women.”⁴⁰⁶ Leonard also explained the parallels between the women’s suffrage movement and women’s active participation in the prohibition movement. Just as it did in California, the WCTU distributed comfort bags to soldiers and their families throughout Washington. These comfort bags also included literature that proclaimed the benefits of prohibition. The WCTU also donated over 1,100 bandages to the military to

⁴⁰³ Peter H Odegard, *Pressure Politics; the Story of the Anti-Saloon League*(New York: Octagon Books,1966).

⁴⁰⁴ Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform.* (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America,1918)

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 319

⁴⁰⁶ Anti-Saloon League of America. *Proceedings of the Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Westerville,OH: American Issue Press,1915) p.185

help injured soldiers. Women undertook an active and important part in passing the Eighteenth Amendment. The WCTU was also active in Washington.

Washington prohibition supporters also managed to attach prohibition to a growing belief that certain races of people had to be protected from evils in order to become better Americans; the belief in racial improvement was important in the Pacific North West where many Asian immigrants settled. In that 1915 speech to Anti-Saloon League Convention, WCTU member Adna Leonard claimed: “What is to be the character of that part of the country to which the multitudes will come? Shall we leave it to the saloon to give them their first lessons in American citizenship? Or shall we bid them welcome into a sober and industrious nation?”⁴⁰⁷ This was used as a progressive reason to support prohibition and was a powerful dry tool in both the South and North West.⁴⁰⁸

Also improving the odds of its passing was the public support of Washington Governor Ernest Lister. While speaking in favor of the amendment in 1918, the Governor said: “The results of prohibition have been so beneficial, that whenever opportunity has been presented so that an expression of the people could be obtained, it has shown a steady and marked increase in the number of those favoring the elimination of the saloons.”⁴⁰⁹ While the statement was factually inaccurate, in many states that had repeat prohibition votes, voter opposition increased; having the boastful support of a popular governor helped seal prohibition’s fate in Washington.⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid, 180

⁴⁰⁸ The belief that certain races of people had to be shielded from the saloon was also popular in Oklahoma, where people argued prohibition was necessary to “improve” the Indians.

⁴⁰⁹ Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1918) p. 108

⁴¹⁰ Ibid

Just months before it passed the legislature in 1919, Washington Governor Lister promised victory saying: “There is no question in my mind but that at the next session of our legislature the constitutional amendment providing for national Prohibition will be promptly ratified.”⁴¹¹ The Governor was right and on 13 January 1919 the Eighteenth Amendment was ratified by a unanimous vote of 42-0 and 82-0 vote in the Senate and Lower State House.⁴¹² Much like in California, Prohibition in Washington overcame demographic disadvantages because of an effective behind-the-scenes campaign by the Anti-Saloon League, as well as a public campaign by Governor Lister that focused on the progressive, “positive” elements of prohibition, namely that it reduced crime and brought increased productivity to areas where it was ratified. Justifications for ratifying the 18th Amendment were different in states throughout the United States. Ratification in Washington was in many ways the prototypical representation of the kind of American exceptionalism that writers such as Timberlake and Sinclair argue was the root cause of the 18th Amendment. While this was the public justification of the Amendment in states such as Washington, it was certainly not the public justification for ratification of the amendment in other states. It is difficult to make sweeping statements about ratification. The movement adapted to conditions in each individual state. The only constant was that every state had an active branch of the Anti Saloon League and every state was a part of the war effort which is why those two factors were so significant in the ratification of the 18th Amendment.

The western state of Arizona was another state that had built-in demographic roadblocks to prohibition. However, fortunately for dry forces, on 1 January 1915

⁴¹¹ Ibid,109

⁴¹² Peter H Odegard, *Pressure Politics; the Story of the Anti-Saloon League*(New York: Octagon Books,1966)

Arizona passed state-wide prohibition making it an ideal candidate to pass federal prohibition in 1918.⁴¹³ Staying true to their national tactic of lobbying for the amendment privately in the state legislatures, dry advocates allowed the supportive Arizona Governor to publically champion federal prohibition. In a public press release during the 1918 debate over federal prohibition, Arizona Governor George W.P. Hunt claimed that under prohibition in Arizona, “Crime and insanity, seemingly, have been greatly reduced.”⁴¹⁴ After explaining how prohibition reduced public debauchery, the Governor continued to argue the typical Anti-Saloon League point that prohibition led to a prosperous, more productive society, stating: “I would feel justified in making the assertion that the suppression of the sale and general use of intoxicants in this state has resulted in a higher measure of prosperity and well-being for the vast majority of the people than prevailed prior to the enactment of the Prohibition law.”⁴¹⁵ This is representative of the prohibition rhetoric of the era; gone were the moralistic lectures of earlier eras. By 1918, everything was about public safety and wartime productivity. The message worked in Arizona, and the state legislature passed the Eighteenth Amendment on 24 May 1918, becoming the twelfth state in the nation and fifth in the West to pass prohibition. The Eighteenth Amendment passed the Arizona State Senate by a unanimous 17-0 vote and by an overwhelming 29-3 vote in the lower state house.⁴¹⁶ Pressure politics worked perfectly in Arizona. The case of Arizona also supports the primary thesis of scholar Ann-Marie Szymanski. The local-option as well as the state option made it easier to pass national

⁴¹³ Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1918)

⁴¹⁴ Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1918)99.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid

⁴¹⁶ Peter H Odegard *Pressure Politics; the Story of the Anti-Saloon League*(New York: Octagon Books, 1966)p.175

prohibition.⁴¹⁷ While states such as Arizona might have been sites of passionate debate over the 18th Amendment, dry forces already controlled sources of power in the state and were able to railroad the amendment through the state legislature with little opposition.

The ratification campaign in some states was a mere formality. The Anti-Saloon League's strategy for ratifying the Eighteenth Amendment in the western state of North Dakota was consistent with their national strategy. They allowed the North Dakota Governor to publically support the bill while the Anti-Saloon League advocated its benefits behind closed doors to state legislatures that would ultimately decide its fate. It was an easy sales-pitch to make in North Dakota. In 1918, the state had a rural population of 513,820 (eighty-nine percent of the state) compared to only 63,236 (eleven percent of the state) living in urban areas.⁴¹⁸ The state had already passed state-wide prohibition by 1915. The combination of being predominately rural and already having state-wide prohibition made it an ideal protagonist for national prohibition. Governor Lynn J. Frazier led the campaign for the Eighteenth Amendment to be ratified in North Dakota, saying in 1918: "Saloons would be the most detrimental institutions, both from a moral and financial standpoint, that could be brought into our midst."⁴¹⁹ Already dry and with a supportive governor, North Dakota became the first western state and the fifth in the nation to ratify the Eighteenth Amendment by an overwhelming 43-2 and 96-10 votes in the state senate and state lower house respectively. Neighboring Montana, another mostly rural state with pre-existing state prohibition laws followed, becoming the second western

⁴¹⁷ Ann-Marie E. Szymanski, *Pathways to Prohibition: Radicals, Moderates, and Social Movement Outcomes* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003)

⁴¹⁸ Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform*. (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America, (1918), 265.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid*, 106

state to ratify federal prohibition.⁴²⁰ States like California, Massachusetts and even Washington were sites of contentious campaigns for prohibition. However in rural states like North Dakota, there was little to no opposition to the 18th Amendment.

The campaign for the 18th Amendment at the state level reveals several central explanations about the Amendment's ratification. States characterized by large rural, Protestant populations were early converts to the cause of prohibition, while larger, more diverse states did not support prohibition until the Anti-Saloon League broadened their message to include concerns about national unity. States such as Kansas and the Dakotas with large rural Protestant populations ratified the Amendment quickly without much controversy. Other states such as Washington relied on a campaign tinged with the viral hatred of nativism. Finally, wartime patriotism dominated the campaign for prohibition in several large and contentious states such as California. No single theme dominated the campaign for prohibition throughout the state level. The states were varied in their demographics and laws, thus the campaign for the 18th Amendment adapted to the conditions in each state. However, the campaign for the 18th Amendment took place during wartime in every state. This made it extremely difficult for brewers to wage a campaign based around individual liberty and distrust of the federal government. The war certainly put opponents of prohibition on the defensive, as shown through the case study of California. Because of this it is fair to say that even when the war was not directly being discussed, it was still framing the debate for prohibition at the state level. The war also helped the Anti-Saloon League break through in states previously believed to be unreceptive to prohibition. States with large populations such as California and

⁴²⁰ Peter H Odegard, *Pressure Politics; the Story of the Anti-Saloon League*(New York: Octagon Books,1966)p.175

Pennsylvania had to contribute to the war effort, thus by connecting prohibition to the war effort, the League was able to finally break through in territory previously believed to be hostile to the cause of prohibition.

The campaign for prohibition on the state level also reveals how successful the Anti Saloon League was at carrying out a state by state campaign for the 18th Amendment. Once the Eighteenth Amendment passed Congress, the League utilized its national network of supporters to influence ratification of the amendment in the statehouses.⁴²¹ This paper has shown how impressive that campaign was. Armed with facts and figures from the Anti-Saloon League, dry supporters converged and fought for ratification on a state-by-state basis. The League and its allies also used high profile supporters such as state governors, church leaders and newspaper editorial boards to champion the Eighteenth Amendment. As effective as this strategy was, the dry forces benefited from fortuitous timing; with the Great War going strong, the prohibition movement was able to tie their efforts to patriotic sentiment so prevalent in the United States at the time. The Anti-Saloon League issued a constant stream of press releases explaining how the alcohol industry had wasted precious resources. In 1918-1919 there was a national will to sacrifice, and this made banning the drink easier to accept. League tactics along with the Great War largely explain the ratification of the 18th Amendment.

⁴²¹ Peter H Odegard, *Pressure Politics; the Story of the Anti-Saloon League*(New York: Octagon Books,1966)

Conclusion

Through a careful examination of League documents, brewers' publications and the nation's newspapers, it is clear that World War One was pivotal in the Anti Saloon League's campaign for Prohibition. It enabled the League to appeal to a cross section of the American public by connecting the cause of prohibition to wartime sacrifice, concern for soldiers in Europe as well as a need to justify the sacrifices of war by creating an improved society following the war. The war allowed the League to use wartime anxieties to promote the urgency and necessity of national prohibition. The war also negated the potency of many dependable wet arguments such as individual liberty. The Great War also made it more difficult for opponents of prohibition such as organized labor to successfully mobilize opposition to the Amendment. This paper has also explained the evolution of the prohibition movement. That paper has argued that the Prohibition movement from 1880-1920 can be defined by two distinct eras. The first era was led by church leaders and focused almost solely on morality and urban decay. The second era focused on a broader message that appealed to Americans from many different walks of life and employed a strong lobbying effort to exploit the American federalist system. The second era benefited from the Great War being fought precisely when national prohibition was being debated. The Anti-Saloon League and their allies were incredibly successful in transforming a movement from one with a strictly rural, Protestant appeal into a movement that managed to pass a national amendment. It is unmistakable that dry activists were incredibly shrewd at attaining national prohibition. However, the tactics of dry activists only explain some of the movements' success; dries still needed the war to create the political conditions necessary to ratify the 18th

Amendment. While many historians have vaguely explored the war's impact on the wartime political campaign of dry advocates, this paper has attempted to focus on the wartime arguments used by elite actors to justify prohibition. This subject is important because it demonstrates how wartime anxieties can be purposefully manipulated to limit personal freedom. Wet activists such as Percy Andrae routinely argued that prohibition would be an impractical and dangerous infringement into the basic freedoms of Americans. Such arguments successfully delayed prohibition for decades. It became incredibly difficult for opponents of prohibition to argue against the amendment throughout 1918 by contending that such an action was an unjust infringement into the personal lives of Americans. During wartime, public officials and many Americans were more than willing to ignore arguments of personal liberty in the name of sacrifice and wartime strength and unity. Further research into this subject should be conducted in order to demonstrate how political opportunists can take advantage of wartime anxieties in order to promote a more intrusive federal government. Central to this paper's focus is the willingness of many Americans to cede civil liberties and freedoms to the government during wartime. While the arguments used by the League were employed early in the Twentieth Century, they are similar to justifications for invasive actions of the government during the Cold War. This connection is also evident as recently as the American war on terrorism. There are many similarities between the wartime arguments used to curtail civil liberties during those conflicts and the ones used by the League during World War One. The campaign for prohibition should entice future historians to attempt the difficult task of approaching this topic from the perspective of working-class Americans. The scarcity of such sources makes this approach difficult but tremendously

rewarding as most histories on the League have been done through the perspective of elite actors.

References

Primary Sources

The American Issue, (Westerville,OH: American Issue Press)

Andreae Percy, *The Prohibition Movement in its Broader Bearings Upon Our Social, Commercial and Religious Liberties :Addresses and Writings of Percy Andreae* (Chicago, ILL: F.Mendelsohn Press, 1915)

Anti-Saloon League of America, *The Saloon Must Go: Proceedings of the Eighteenth National Convention of the Anti-Saloon League of America* (Richmond IN:S.E. Nicholson,1918)

The Atlanta Constitution.

Boston Daily Globe

Carry A Nation, *The Use and Need of the Life of Carry A. Nation*, General Books, originally published in 1905, re-released in 2010.

Cherrington Ernest (ed), *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Congress Against Alcoholism: Held at Washington D.C. September 21-26,1920* (Columbus, OH: Anti Saloon League of America,1908)

Chicago Daily Tribune.

Ernest H. Cherrington (ed). *The Anti-Saloon League Yearbook: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing With the Liquor Traffic and the Temperance Reform.* (Columbus, OH: Anti-Saloon League of America,1918).

Los Angeles Times.

The New York Times.

The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series XII, roll 77.

The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, rolls 1-3.

The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus OH, Microfilm Edition of Temperance and Prohibition Papers, Series X, role1, Ernest H. Cherrington Papers, December 1915.

U.S. Congress House Debate on Proposed Prohibition Amendment, 65th Congress., 2nd Sess., December 17,1917,428-459

The Washington Post.

Secondary Literature

Blum, 'Paul Has Been Forgotten: Women, Gender and Revivalism during the Gilded Age', *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol. 3, no. 3, 2004.

Blocker James S, *Retreat from Reform: The Prohibition Movement in the United States, 1890-1913*. Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1976.

Chambers II John H, *The Tyranny of Change, America in the Progressive era, 1900-1917*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Clark Norman H, *Deliver Us From Evil: An Interpretation of American Prohibition*. New York: NY: Norton Press, 1976.

Davis Polly Ann, *Alben W. Barkley, Senate Majority Leader and Vice President*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, 1979.

Dorn, "In Spiritual Communion: Eugene Debs and the Socialist Christians' *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.2, no.3, 2003.

Capozzola Christopher, *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Enyeart JP, 'Revolution or Evolution: The Socialist Party, Western Workers and the Law in the Progressive Era' *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.2, no.4, 2003

Farwell Byron, *Over There: The United States in the Great War, 1917-1919*. New York, NY: Norton Press, 1999.

Felder Deborah G, *A Century of Women*. Secaucus, NJ: Carol Pub Group, 1999.

Fraham, 'The Hello Girls: Women Telephone Operators with the American Expeditionary Forces during World War I,' *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.3, no.3, 2004.

Gerstle Gary, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century*, Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Gould Lewis L, *Reform and Regulation: American Politics from Roosevelt to Wilson*, New York, NY: Knopf, 1986.

Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*, Urbana Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

Hamm Richard F, *Shaping the 18th Amendment-Temperance Reform, Legal Culture, and the Polity, 1880-1920*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Hawley Ellis W, *The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order*, New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1979.

Heale M.J, *Twentieth-Century America: Politics and Power in the United States, 1900-2000*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Higham John, *Strangers in the Land*. Atheneum Press, 1963.

Hofstadter Richard, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R*, New York, NY: Knopf, 1955.

Johnston, 'Re-Democratizing the Progressive Era: The Politics of the Progressive Era Political Historiography' *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.1, no.1, 2002.

Jeansonne Glen, *A Time of Paradox: America Since 1890*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.

Keene Jennifer D, *The United States and the First World War*. New York NY: Longman, 2000.

Kennedy David M, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*, Oxford University Press, 2004.

Kerr Austin K, *Organized for Prohibition, A New History of the Anti-Saloon League*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1985.

Leinwand Gerald, *William Jennings Bryan: An Uncertain Trumpet*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.

Odegard Peter H, *Pressure Politics; the Story of the Anti-Saloon League*. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.

Okrent Daniel, *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition*, New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2010.

Painter Nell Irvin, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919*. New York, NY: Norton & Company, 1987.

Petit J, 'Breeder, Workers and Mothers: Gender and the Congressional Literacy Test Debate, 1896-1897,' *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* vol.3, no.1, pp. 271-293.

Rumbarger John J, *Profits, Power and Prohibition: Alcohol Reform and the Industrializing of America, 1800-1930*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 1989.

Sinclair Andrew, *Prohibition, the Era of Excess*. Boston Mass: Harper & Row Press, 1964
Bader Robert Smith, *Prohibition in Kansas: A History*. Lawrence Kan: University of Kansas Press, 1986.

Szymanski Ann-Marie E, *Pathways to Prohibition: Radicals, Moderates, and Social Movement Outcomes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.

Timberlake James, *Prohibition and the Progressive Movement, 1900-1920*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Tyler, *Where Prayer and Purpose Meet: The WCTU Story*, Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press, 1949.

Zieger, Robert H, *America's Great War: World War I and the American Experience*, Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000.