

After advocating the so-called *use* of wine and spirits Dr. Bayard proceeds to define the conditions under which liquor should be sold. I quite agree with him that no amount of prohibition will prevent *in toto* the sale of liquor; that we are certain to have drunkards in spite of all coercive measures, and that, when prohibitionists declare that if prohibitory laws prevailed all over the globe the millenium would arrive, they are subjects of a fond delusion—all this I hold to be quite true, and yet *agitation for prohibitory liquor laws* is the necessary and logical outcome of the truth that alcohol drinking is an injurious nuisance.

Thirty years ago absolute and unconditional human slavery was largely believed in the United States to be a worthy, God-permitted institution, and suited to the temperament and mental condition of the poor African. Gradually, however, the idea gained ground that only he who treated his slaves in a proper manner had any *ordained* right to them; that the Almighty, though permitting slavery, intended the slave owner to be a sort of divine trustee, and believers in this idea inculcated kindness and humanity towards his trust. Holders of the latter opinion were among the most determined opponents of abolition the North had to deal with, and they constituted the great majority of Northern "copperheads," as they were called. Now the fact is, that slavery was wrong all along, and that it was wrong under the "trustee" notion and it was wrong under the absolute ownership notion, and only when the principles of equality and freedom were preached was any progress made towards abolition.

And so with alcohol drinking: continued progress beyond a certain point is only possible when the whole truth about it is proclaimed. I do not deny the utility of teaching moderation in drinking to the people, but why teach a half truth when the whole truth will better answer the purpose? Why preach moderate drinking when the inculcation of total abstinence as the true *principle* will not only do as much as the former, but will still leave the way open for progress towards the hoped-for time when man shall break his bonds of passion and stimulation, and rise superior to the need of checks of any sort.

The evident desire of advocates of moderate drinking is to prevent the evil effects that come from alcohol; teetotalers have the same end in view, but total abstinence, while condemning bestial drunkenness endeavors to do something

more; it would remove the *temptation* to excess.

I have no hope that even our children's children will see drinking habits done away with, though all moderate drinkers were to join the ranks of teetotalism—not even if the education and general amelioration of the condition of the masses (the real effective combatants of vice) were to be brought about; but drunkenness will always reign while the way to it is paved by the "good intentions" of the so-called *use* of alcohol as a drink.

As in the case of all other half-truths and artificial barriers to vicious indulgence, much uncertainty and complexity surround the question of alcoholic excess when viewed from the standpoint of the moderate drinker. Hence the trouble about "voluntary" and "involuntary" drunkards, the difficulty of determining when a man has reached the hypothetical limit of alcoholism, and so on. The latter portion of Dr. Bayard's address shows this so plainly and is so instructive that I give it entire:

"Medical treatment has little effect upon the drunkard while he has the ability to indulge his appetite. But how the law should deal with him is a question of great difficulty. The liberty of the subject must be guarded, and the community justly claim protection from the violence of his acts. There are two classes of 'inebriates'—those who voluntarily get drunk, possessing the power to resist, and those who are so far lost that their voluntary power is destroyed. The first should be treated as misdemeanants, the last as maniacs. The voluntary drunkard should be severely punished, not by fine, which too often deprives his unfortunate family of food, but by imprisonment with hard labor. The involuntary drunkard, if I may so term him, should be *kept in restraint for a period sufficiently long to cure his malady*; how long that should be must depend upon the judgment of those in charge of him. While he may be classed as a lunatic, he is not, strictly speaking, insane. The man who drinks gets sober when the drink is eliminated. The insane man does not recover by such a process. But by continued abstinence the drunkard very often regains the power of self-control, which he cannot accomplish if left without restraint. Hence the imperative necessity for legislative action giving power to confine such persons. Did such power exist it would have a restraining influence, and give the unfortunate victim a chance of permanent reformation. Voluntary drunkenness is