

THE PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY
FOR
DISCOURAGING THE USE OF ARDENT SPIRITS,
TO
INNKEEPERS, AND THE FRIENDS OF ORDER AND ECONOMY,
IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

FELLOW CITIZENS.

In addressing you on a deeply interesting subject, we disclaim all intention of depriving any man of his legal means of support, without offering him an adequate substitute. Many well intentioned persons keep hotels, taverns, or houses of entertainment, who are themselves sober, and who dislike the scenes of drunkenness to which they are often witnesses. You would, we know, rather issue other drinks than ardent spirits from your bar, and would prefer travellers who are temperate, to those of a different description, if in so doing you could keep up your establishments, and maintain yourselves and families. The peculiar circumstances in which you are placed, are known to travellers and others, who stop at your houses for rest, or to meet a friend on business. They, in order as it were to pay for their footing, consider themselves obliged, although often at the sacrifice of their tastes and health, to purchase liquor at your bar.

The time has now arrived when both parties should understand each other, and act in a proper spirit of reciprocity. On the generally pernicious effects from drinking ardent spirits, especially when once degenerated into a habit, it is unnecessary for us to enlarge at this time, the evil is admitted by all reflecting and patriotic citizens. Our object in addressing you, is to enable you to cease any longer to be agents for the sale and distribution of this baneful drink. The means are simple these. Let the traveller who has enjoyed the opportunity of rest on a journey, and protection from inclement weather in your house, be allowed to make a pecuniary return, equal to what he would otherwise think it necessary to pay at your bar for liquor. In receiving this money, you, as inn-keepers, will be more profited, and rightfully profited, than if you had sold liquor to that amount, while the traveller will feel grateful for the comfort which he enjoys in your house, without his being obliged to take a drink which he either dislikes, or believes to be eminently unfavourable to his health and prosperity.

But it has been, and not improperly urged, that the thirsty traveller on some occasions requires, and would be willing to pay for other drink than water, which, though the safest and most salutary of all drinks, may sometimes disagree with him on account of certain mineral impregnations. We would, therefore, recommend you to keep a variety of pleasant vegetable syrups, and fruits, such as lemons, to make lemonade, and dried fruits of our own country, the infusions of which make agreeable drinks. The sale of these at your bar, would prove a source of handsome profit, without exposing you to the odium of making drunkards, or being yourselves annoyed and disgusted by scenes of riot and turmoil. A soda water fountain might be readily kept in your bar, so as to furnish a pleasant beverage, either of the water alone, or of it mixed with a vegetable syrup. If a more stimulating liquid be thought necessary after great fatigue, and when sleep, the true restorative, cannot be indulged in, coffee could be very easily kept in readiness, for the supply of any applicant at all hours of the day. In some other parts of the world, a weak infusion of the lower priced teas is occasionally used, cold, as a refreshing beverage.

Your houses no longer giving out the fumes of distilled liquors, nor resounding with the language of vulgarity, and too often of blasphemy, would under the improved system here recommended, be resorted to when needful, by all classes in your neighbourhood. The sober discreet citizen, the young, and the old, might then meet in your bar room to enjoy friendly conversation, and learn the profitable news of the day, the rates of the market, &c. All will willingly obtain the right of a seat by the purchase of some of the simple, yet profitable and refreshing drinks which we have recommended.

Give the plan a trial, we treat you, fellow citizens, and you will find, whether you be innkeepers, travellers, or occasional resorters to taverns for news, or recreation, that it is the best for your pecuniary interests, personal comfort, and respectability in society.

Signed on behalf of the Society, at Philadelphia, April 24th, 1832,

ROBERTS VAUX, President

ISAAC S. LOYD, Corresponding Secretary.

DAVID McCLELLAN, Recording Secretary.

THE
PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE
OF
HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

VOL. XLIX.

1925.

No. 3.

**THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA
PRIOR TO THE CIVIL WAR.**

BY ASA EARL MARTIN, the Pennsylvania State College.

Few political, economic, and social problems have been more persistent and significant in our entire history than the temperance movement, now more than a century old, which brought about, during the World War, the adoption of the 18th Amendment to the Federal Constitution. While much has been written concerning the development of this movement during the past fifty years, little attention has been paid by the historian to its origin and growth before the Civil War. As a matter of fact, the temperance advocates of pre-Civil War days were numerous, influential, and active. During the fifties, when their strength was greatest and their organization was most highly developed, prohibition in one form or another was adopted by several states; and the movement was going forward with such momentum that it bade fair to engulf the entire nation, until its progress was checked by the War and the consequent reconstruction problems. Because public sentiment was thus diverted to other channels, this cause soon lost nearly everything that it had gained in years of organized effort. The result was that more than half a century elapsed before it commanded the re-

spect, the attention, and the influence that it had exerted during the late forties and fifties.

It is with the temperance movement in Pennsylvania during that period prior to the Civil War that this study will deal, emphasizing especially the events leading up to the prohibition plebiscite of 1854.

During the colonial and the early national periods, there was little or no sentiment against the customary free use of liquor by all classes of people throughout this country. While the great majority used it with moderation, the per capita consumption was very large, reaching in 1771 something between five and six gallons. Social engagements of every sort, funerals, weddings, public sales, and even ministerial ordinations where liquor of various kinds was not served were indeed unusual occurrences. To the soldiers in the Revolutionary and the other early wars it was an important, in fact an almost indispensable, part of the daily rations. In many industries wages were paid wholly or partly in liquor. And until well into the twentieth century, no farmer would dare attempt to raise a barn or harvest his crops without having on hand a generous supply of alcoholic beverages.

The founders and the early inhabitants of Pennsylvania were not different in their attitude toward liquor from their neighbors in the other colonies. In 1681, the year before his first visit to Pennsylvania, William Penn wrote to James Harrison that he was sending over "some wine and strong beer. Let the beer be sold; of the wine some may be kept for me, especially sack, or such like, which will be better by age . . ."¹ Two years later, he established at his home at Pennsbury the first brewery in the province.² Since he thought he saw on the banks of the Delaware River a land that could in the course of time be made to rival

¹ W. H. Davis, *History of Bucks County, Pennsylvania*, p. 180.

² H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, p. 17.

France and Italy in the production of wines, he zealously urged the importation and the cultivation of grape vines.³

In Pennsylvania, as in the other colonies, distilleries and breweries were established in great numbers and immense quantities of rum and other liquors were imported. With the settlement of the western part of the state, the failure to obtain the cheap and satisfactory transportation essential to the prosperity of the country led to the discovery that the hitherto unmarketable grain could be converted into liquor, which could be carried to the East with ease and a fair degree of profit. The consequent importance of this industry, which represented the only possible profit on the yearly crops, explains why the levying, during Washington's first administration, of a federal tax of about seven cents a gallon on distilled liquor resulted in the now famous Whiskey Rebellion. Only in the face of a large federal army did the people submit to this tax, which they regarded as arbitrary and discriminatory. While many distillers were thus forced out of business, it is said that one farmer in five operated a still. The Monongahela Valley, however, remained until the passage of the 18th Amendment one of the country's centers of the distilling business.

While the use of liquor was general throughout the province and while as little opposition to its manufacture and its sale existed in Pennsylvania as elsewhere until well into the twentieth century, there is evidence that a feeling was early developing in the minds of many that sooner or later drastic prohibition legislation would be necessary. At first this sentiment found expression in isolated attacks upon the liquor business where the evils were most evident and where the effect on public welfare and morals was generally

³ H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, p. 15.

recognized. Very early, as a result of the debasing influence of liquor upon the Indians, many protests came before the Provincial Assembly both from the red men themselves and from their white friends against the sale of liquor to the Indians. The resulting legislation on this matter, however, can scarcely be used as an indication of the development of prohibition sentiment since it dealt with the Indian alone. Among the pertinent laws is an interesting measure passed in 1752 to prevent the use of liquor by candidates to win elections. Its need is indicated in the following quotation from the preamble: "Whereas such persons as stand candidates for being elected and returned for the office of sheriff and coroner within this province make it too frequently their practice to engage persons to vote for them by giving them strong drink, and use other means inconsistent with the design of voting freely at elections."⁴

Furthermore, the evident danger of the use of liquor by laborers in certain industries was recognized by the Assembly as early as 1726, when it prefaced an enactment forbidding the sale of liquor within two miles of iron furnaces by the statement, "Whereas the selling of rum and other strong liquors near the furnaces lately erected to running and melting iron ore have already proved very prejudicial and injurious to the undertakers."⁵ While the wording of the law indicates that the consideration prompting the passage of the law was economic, the welfare of the laborers themselves must have been a factor.

Besides these, many other laws might be cited showing a desire to protect important interests or to remove certain of the most pronounced evil effects upon society or individuals rather than a feeling that the use of

⁴H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, pp. 38-39.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 39.

liquor was morally wrong and for that reason should be discontinued.

In advocating temperance, the Society of Friends appears to have been more active than the other religious groups in the province. The Quakers consistently opposed the sale of liquor to the Indians and urged its use in moderation by everyone.⁶

The other religious denominations of the state, however, evidenced little or no interest in the liquor question until well into the nineteenth century. Even instances of isolated individuals attempting to secure from their respective denominations official condemnation of intemperance were not numerous and almost universally met with failure. The prevailing attitude toward the liquor question is well illustrated by the experience of the Rev. John Black of Upper Marsh Creek (Gettysburg) Presbyterian Congregation who, in 1791, proposed to his congregation for their signatures the following temperance resolutions:

“We resolve that we will not make a frequent, much less a common use of spirituous or intoxicating liquors, and will guard at all times against drinking, so as in the least to disturb our frame or in anywise injure us in rational and religious exercises.

“We resolve, secondly, to avoid temptation to the vice of drunkenness, to shun the company of drunkards, to abstain from places where liquor is sold, except when the pursuit of our lawful business, or the duties of good neighborhood, oblige us to visit them.

“Moreover, we resolve that we will not give such liquor to persons whom we may employ in harvest, at house-raising, or any other gathering for labor, to such a degree as to injure them; and that at vendues, which any of us may make, we will not afford any of

⁶ H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, pp. 18-21. See also George Smith, *History of Delaware County, Pennsylvania*, pp. 166-171.

it at all.”⁷ In spite of the mildness of these resolutions, only three members of this congregation would sign the document. The great popularity that Mr. Black had enjoyed for years was soon lost and he was forced to resign for lack of support.

The indifference of the churches to the moral issues involved in the temperance question is further illustrated by the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1812 in refusing to pass a resolution to the effect “that no stationed or local preacher shall retail spirituous or malt liquors without forfeiting his ministerial character among us.” The same question was brought before the General Conference in 1816 and passed only after the reference to malt liquors had been stricken out.⁸

Among the early temperance workers and writers was Anthony Benezet, a native of Picardy, France, who emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1732. Probably his most valuable contribution on the liquor problem was an essay entitled “The Mighty Destroyer Displayed” published in 1774. In this, as in other publications, he called to the attention of the people in a forceful and convincing way the more pronounced of the evils of intemperance.

Of greater influence in creating a sentiment against the use of liquor were the life and the writings of Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia. Benjamin Rush was one of America’s pioneer physicians, a statesman, and a member of the Provincial Assembly. As a member also of the Continental Congress, he served as Chairman of the Committee on Independence. As early as 1776, he published a book of three “Sermons to Gentlemen upon Temperance and Exercise;” and nine years later he put out in pamphlet form his well known essay entitled

⁷ George Norcross, *The Centennial Memorial of the Presbytery of Carlisle*, pp. 175-178.

⁸ H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, p. 60.

"An Inquiry into the Effects of Spirituous Liquors on the Human Body," which went through many editions and had great influence. In his early writings he opposed the use of distilled liquors but did not advocate total abstinence from intoxicants. In fact, he suggested that cider, beer, and wine be used as substitutes for distilled drinks. During the latter part of his life, he spoke and wrote continuously on the subject and was a powerful voice crying in the wilderness. He exerted wide influence although with few if any direct results in the form of legislation. His mission was that of pioneer.

During the first three decades of the twentieth century, temperance workers gradually increased in numbers and activity. While little organized effort is to be found, leaders were being developed and a common program formulated. The first temperance society in Pennsylvania of which a record has been found was that of the "Darby Association for Discouraging the Unnecessary Use of Spirituous Liquors," organized in Delaware County in 1819.⁹ In its first address to the public it issued a protest against the "fashionable custom" of treating and the general use of liquor in the harvest fields.¹⁰ Two years later, a similar society was formed at Lewisburg.¹¹ Although other societies with conservative temperance programs came into existence in other sections of the state, most of them survived only a few years. Not long after this, however, following the publication in 1826 of Lyman Beecher's famous "Six Sermons on Temperance," thousands of copies

⁹ The first temperance society in the United States was established at Moreau, New York, in 1808. Each member pledged himself not to drink "rum, gin, whiskey, or any distilled spirits" except on advice of a physician or at public dinners under a penalty of twenty-five cents. For the offense of offering drinks to other people, a like fine was imposed and for drunkenness a fine of fifty cents.

¹⁰ H. G. Ashmead, *History of Delaware County, Pennsylvania*, pp. 190-191.

¹¹ H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, p. 64.

202 *Temperance Movement Prior to Civil War.*

of which were sold in Pennsylvania, permanent temperance organizations sprang into existence in all parts of the state.¹²

One of the most active of these early societies was the Susquehanna Temperance Society, established at Montrose in 1828. Through its efforts, societies were organized throughout the county, which in turn were federated with the parent society. Each member pledged himself not to allow the use of distilled spirits in his family and not to provide them for persons in his employment and in all suitable ways to "discourage the use of them in the community." In 1828 the Grand Jury resolved "to abolish the custom heretofore practiced, of using ardent spirits while in session;" and many farmers began the experiment of raising barns and harvesting their crops without the "use of liquor." In 1832, a Temperance Hotel was established in Montrose, whose advertisement stated that "A variety of wholesome and refreshing drinks will be kept as a substitute for ardent spirits."¹³

A similar development of the temperance movement was taking place in nearly every county in the state during the same period. In 1827, "The Pennsylvania Society for Discouraging the Use of Ardent Spirits" was organized in Philadelphia. Among its many activities may be mentioned the formation of a "Young Men's Temperance Society," the appointment of an organizer, the making of a study of the taverns and their conditions, the employment of a committee of the Philadelphia Medical Society to study the temperance situation and report to the public, and the establishment of a temperance paper.¹⁴ In 1834, due to the federation

¹² H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, pp. 62-75.

¹³ Emily C. Blackman, *History of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania*, pp. 557-70.

¹⁴ "The Annual Report of the Managers of the Pennsylvania Society for Discouraging the Use of Ardent Spirits" (pamphlet) gave the number of societies in the entire state as 124. This report in reviewing the

of nearly one hundred and fifty local temperance societies of the state, the name of the society was changed to the "Pennsylvania Temperance Society" and total abstinence was approved as an important feature of their platform. Upon the resignation of Roberts Vaux Dr. Philip Syng Physic, one of the most eminent surgeons of the day, became president. The report of the society for that year stated that there were thirty local branches in Philadelphia in spite of the existence of 1500 saloons in that city. Chester reported forty temperance stores and eight temperance hotels. In Bucks County, twenty-two physicians declared publicly against liquor and seventeen societies existed. Lewistown reported that fourteen of its fifteen merchants had stopped selling liquor.¹⁵

The first temperance society in Pittsburg was organized in 1830. One interesting feature of its program was the establishment of a savings fund society to take care of the savings of those who had given up drink. Two years later this became the "Pittsburg Temperance Society," which affiliated with the "Pennsylvania Temperance Society."¹⁶

In 1834, thirty-six societies in Washington County claimed a membership of 4813, or one in every nine out of the whole population. Through the efforts of these societies, sixty-five of the 174 venders of ardent

work of these societies stated: "The diminished consumption and distribution of domestic ardent spirits in the state of Pennsylvania during the last two years had been, on an average, upwards of 50,000 gallons per annum. . . . Many of our tavern keepers have banished spirits from their bars, and some of them have adopted the substitute of coffee. . . . One-half to two-thirds of the distilleries in this state are no longer in operation. . . . Since January 1st. 1830, more than one hundred and fifty vessels have sailed from the port of Boston, which do not carry ardent spirits. . . . Within the last four months, there have been built and launched at Kensington (the upper suburb of Philadelphia), 5345 tons of shipping, besides hauling up and launching three of the largest steamboats, without the use ardent spirits. . . ."

¹⁵ H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, pp. 67-71.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

spirits had abandoned the traffic and forty of the 113 distilleries of the county had discontinued business.¹⁷

The local papers throughout the state contain announcements of temperance meetings with full accounts of the activities of each. The progress of the movement in the state as a whole as measured by the increase in the number of societies, by the establishment of temperance hotels, by the disbanding of breweries and distilleries, and by the signing of individual total abstinence pledges was phenomenal. Daniel Bowen in his "History of Philadelphia," published in 1839, in speaking of the "Grand Reformation, connected with TEMPERANCE, which has spread over our shores, even to Europe" stated that "Vessels are now fitted out, for voyages to India, the North-west Coast of America, and other near and distant parts of the world, entirely on temperance principles:—More activity, and greater success attends their enterprising and praiseworthy Officers and crews; and their families on their return, have the enjoyment of the reward of industry and temperance, instead of the unpleasant task of nursing the broken-down inebrities, whose wages have been exhausted, by a GROG BILL, and whose constitutions, are no longer able to resist the effects of unnatural and inordinate STIMULATION."¹⁸

With this growth of the temperance movement in the state, the pledge administered to the members of the societies gradually changed from one designed to discourage the use of liquor under a penalty of a small fine to total abstinence. While total abstinence so-

¹⁷ H. M. Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, p. 72. Daniels, *The Temperance Reform and Its Great Reformers*, p. 59. In 1833, it was estimated that more than 5000 temperance societies existed in the United States with a total membership of 1,225,000, of whom 10,000 had been drunkards. "Four thousand distilleries had been stopped, six thousand merchants had given up the sale of ardent spirits, and their use had been abandoned on over four thousand vessels."

¹⁸ Daniel Bowen, *A History of Philadelphia*, pp. 117-118.

cieties existed in the early thirties, they were not numerous until about 1837, after which they became general throughout the state. Article 8 of the constitution of the "Centre County Society for the Suppression of Intemperance" of 1832 reads: "We whose names are hereunto annexed, believe that ardent spirits or wine, is not only unnecessary but hurtful to the social, civil, and religious interest of men, do hereby agree and promise that we will not use them or traffic in them except as they may be necessary as medicine or in the performance of religious rites; nor will we provide them for the entertainment of friends, or for persons in our employment; and in all suitable ways we will discountenance the use of them throughout the community."¹⁹ Though the total abstinence pledges differed somewhat, they were essentially the same in content. The following pledge of the "Lock Haven Temperance Society" (1841) is typical of hundreds of others: "We whose names are hereunto annexed, do PLEDGE OURSELVES not to make, sell, use, or traffic in any kind of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. We give this pledge because we believe that the use of intoxicating liquors as a drink is wholly unnecessary, and very injurious to the welfare of our country and mankind."²⁰

¹⁹ *The Centre County Democrat* (Bellefonte, Pa.), Dec. 29, 1832.

²⁰ *Clinton County Democrat* (Lock Haven, Pa.), Jan. 4, 1842. April 16, 1845, the General Assembly of Pennsylvania incorporated the "Temperance Beneficial Association of Germantown, Philadelphia County." Two sections of the act of incorporation follow: "Section 1. Be it enacted . . . That George Hergesheimer, John H. Bringham, Rees Taylor, Rittenhouse Farley, John Shaffer, Eli Morgan, and their successors . . . are hereby incorporated and made a body politic. . . .

"Section 7. Any member who shall be known to make, purchase, sell or drink any vinous or intoxicating liquors as a beverage or be guilty of gambling, or any other immoral conduct whereby this association shall be injured, or impose upon the association he shall be cited to appear before the association, and if found guilty, or if any shall refuse to appear, he shall be expelled, and forfeit all claims upon and to the association." *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1845, pp. 479-480.

206 *Temperance Movement Prior to Civil War.*

At the annual meeting of the "Pennsylvania State Temperance Society" at Harrisburg in 1843, fifty-one different societies, several of which were federated county organizations, with a total membership of nearly 35,000 were represented.²¹ Among the larger societies were:

	Members
Mauch Chunk Total Abstinence Society	400
Newville Washington Temperance Society	457
Philadelphia Jefferson Temperance Society	5364
Uniontown Washington Temperance Society	1582
Washington (Pa.) Temperance Society	613
York Washington Temperance Society	490
Allentown Jefferson Temperance Society	1578
Centre County and Auxiliaries	4196
Cumberland County Society	765
Columbia Union Temperance Society	900
Delaware County Temperance Society	4263
Harrisburg Washington Temperance Society	1100
Harrisburg Total Abstinence Beneficial Society	159
Harrisburg Martha Washington Temperance Society	500
Lewistown Washington Temperance Society	807
Mifflintown Washington Temperance Society and Auxiliary..	1500

In attendance at this convention were several members of the Legislature and many influential business and professional men of the state. Upon the invitation of the convention, the Governor and other state officials addressed the meetings. In the statement to the public, the society reviewed the development of the temperance movement in the state and set forth a series of resolutions from which the following are taken:

"... Resolved, That the efficiency of the total abstinence pledge in raising the slave of intemperance to self government and confirmed sobriety, calls for special action, and imposes upon every individual a powerful motive to give it his signature, that all of this wretched class may be induced to come under its salutary influence.

"Resolved, That in the judgment of this Convention,

²¹ *Proceedings of the Pennsylvania State Temperance Convention, Harrisburg, Pa. (Pamphlet), 1843, p. 2.*

every Temperance man is in principle bound to encourage Temperance houses; and that in his journeyings through the country, he should be particular in his inquiries after them, and act accordingly.

“Resolved, That we view with pleasure the increasing interest in this great moral reform manifested by the young men of our State; and that we deem it a harbinger of its ultimate and glorious success. . . .

“Resolved, That this Convention reiterate the sentiment so clearly settled by the action of previous Conventions, in relation to the immorality of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and would urge upon the friends of Temperance, the necessity of acting out those principles, in refusing to sign any and every application for the vending of the poison.

“Resolved, That we recognize no neutrals in the cause of Temperance; ‘They that are not for us, are against us; and they that gather not with us, scatter abroad.’ . . .”²²

The temperance cause was greatly furthered during this period by the coming in 1844 of Father Theobald Mathews, an Irish priest, who had been induced to join the temperance workers by a Quaker. It is said that in the United States and Ireland alone 5,000,000 people put their names to the temperance pledge under his magnetic exhortations. In Pennsylvania, as in other sections of the country, he exerted a tremendous influence. In the newspapers and public addresses of the period, he is quoted frequently. His terse, unique, and eloquent way of expressing his arguments carried conviction and a desire to join in the movement.

Another influence of first importance in the rapid growth of the temperance movement during the forties and fifties was the consolidation of all temperance or-

²² *Proceedings of the Pennsylvania State Temperance Convention, Harrisburg, Pa.* (pamphlet), 1843, p. 10.

ganizations and the adoption of a common program. Of great significance was the appearance of several new types of societies, the most important of which were the "Washingtonians," "The Sons of Temperance," and the "Independent Order of Good Templars."

The "Washington Society of Reformed Drunkards," commonly known as the "Washingtonians," was organized in the city of Baltimore in 1840. It was composed of a small group of drunken laborers who had wandered into a meeting, where a temperance lecturer had converted them to his cause and had proceeded at once to form a society, the main purpose of which was to preach temperance to drunkards. Several members of the organization proved to be good speakers and organizers, with the result that the movement spread to all parts of the country. Societies were formed throughout Pennsylvania and thousands of drunkards signed the total abstinence pledge and joined the great missionary movement of the order.²³

Another organization of a different type, which was introduced into Pennsylvania during the early forties and which spread rapidly throughout the state, was the "Sons of Temperance," by far the most efficient and highly organized of all the numerous temperance groups. By 1849, "The National Division of North America," embracing thirty-five "Grand Divisions" and more than four hundred subordinate divisions, claimed a membership of 220,000. In Pennsylvania, the three hundred and eighty-five local divisions had a membership of 27,241. "The Cadets of Temperance," a juvenile adjunct of the society, had 125 chartered

²³ *Proceedings of the Congressional Total Abstinence Society* (Washington, D. C.), (pamphlet), 1842, p. 6. County newspapers throughout Pennsylvania beginning in the fall and winter of 1840 contain frequent references to the organization and work of these societies.

locals in Pennsylvania with thousands of members.²⁴ In addition to supporting the regular temperance crusade, the society performed most of the functions of the fraternal or benevolent organization of today. This phase of the work of the society is indicated in the various legislative acts incorporating local divisions. Section 2 of the act incorporating the "Canton Division, No. 404, Sons of Temperance, Bradford County, of the State of Pennsylvania," under date of 1852, follows: "That the object of the said corporation shall be to provide, erect and furnish a hall or suitable building, in the said town of Canton, for the accommodation of said Canton Division, number four hundred and four, Sons of Temperance, established there, and also, to promote the interest, elevate the character and secure the happiness of its members, and provide for their families in case of sickness, disability or death, in such manner as shall be ordered or agreed upon by the by-laws of the Society."²⁵

Membership in the society was limited to persons eighteen years of age or over of good moral character. Candidates for membership were proposed in writing and voted into the society by secret ballot. Five negative votes debarred from membership. An initiation fee of two dollars was charged and a sick benefit of three dollars per week was paid. Thirty dollars was allowed for the funeral expenses of a member and fifteen for those of a wife or a brother. For violation of the pledge not to "make, buy, sell or use, as a beverage, any Spirituous or Malt Liquors, Wine or Cider," membership was forfeited. A two-thirds vote of the members might re-instate an offender after the payment of a fine of one dollar for the first offense and two dollars for the second. Upon additional violation of

²⁴ *The Democratic Whig* (Bellefonte, Pa.), Oct. 27, 1849.

²⁵ *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1854. p. 857.

the pledge, he could regain membership only by being proposed and voted in as a new member.²⁶

By providing a substitute for the saloon in the way of temperance inns²⁷ and recreation halls and by caring for its sick and unfortunate members, the society became a power in winning converts to the temperance cause. Another group of tremendous influence in the movement at a later date was the "Independent Order of Good Templars," formed in Utica, New York, in 1851. This order, which later embraced a membership of 7,000,000 adults and more than 700,000 juveniles, was one of the first organizations of any kind to admit women on the same basis as men and to make them equally eligible to any office within the gift of the order. The principles were far in advance of those of other similar organizations of that early date. Among other things they advocated: total abstinence by perpetual obligation, no license in any form or under any circumstances, absolute prohibition in due form of law for both state and nation, and a persistent effort to save individuals and communities from "the direful scourge" until success was complete and universal. Under able leadership and with the zeal of crusaders, the organization spread throughout the country so rapidly that by 1860 locals were to be found through-

²⁶ The entire constitution of this society is printed in *The Democratic Whig* (Bellefonte, Pa.), March 25, 1846.

²⁷ The local newspapers contain many advertisements of Temperance Hotels after 1840. In the *Democratic Whig* (Bellefonte, Pa.), for Sept. 2, 1846, is an advertisement of "UNCLE SAM'S INN, The Subscriber informs the Public that he continues to keep a TEMPERANCE HOUSE of Entertainment. . . ."

In many sections of the state, Fourth of July temperance celebrations were held. Usually a box luncheon or a barbacue was prepared in some grove near the town. Lemonade and other soft drinks were served as a substitute for liquor. *Now and Then: A Bi-Monthly Magazine devoted to History, Amusement, Instruction, Advancement* for Jan. and Feb. 1892, pp. 22-30, gives an interesting account of two rival Fourth of July celebrations in Muncy in 1842, one a dry and the other a wet celebration.

out Pennsylvania as well as in other states of the Union.²⁸

Thus by the middle of the century, temperance societies with thousands of members were active in all sections of the state. In addition, the leading denominations had gradually added their strength to the cause of removing the curse of drink. All of these workers, whether they had as their object the regulation of the liquor traffic or its complete abolition, decried the evils of intemperance, such as crime, poverty, pauperism, domestic discord, untimely deaths, insanity, the economic loss to the community, and the increased cost of government, and quoted statistics in great numbers to prove their statements.²⁹

So far, they had sought such legislation as they could gain to lessen intemperance and to pave the way for its complete suppression.

With these great accomplishments in the way of vast organization and of aroused public sentiment to support them, the temperance leaders were now in a position to enter upon the second and last stage of their work, the complete prohibition of the manufacture and the sale of intoxicating liquors by either legislative or constitutional measures.

An examination of the laws of Pennsylvania from

²⁸ Hammell, *The Passing of the Saloon*, p. 140.

²⁹ The general interest in temperance may be judged by the extent of temperance literature sold or distributed in the state. In the small town of Bellefonte, J. Livingston placed the following advertisement in *The Democratic Whig*, Jan. 21, 1846:

“TEMPERANCE BOOKS

JUST RECEIVED, AND FOR SALE,

War of 4000 years,
Drunkards Doom,
Autobiography of a Drunkard,
Wedding Days of Former Times,
Jessie Johnson and His Times.”

The Bellefonte Book Store, on Feb. 18, 1846, advertised four new temperance books.

212 *Temperance Movement Prior to Civil War.*

the founding of the Province in 1682 until the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution in 1918 reveals a large amount of legislation dealing with one phase or another of the liquor industry. For the most part these laws are concerned with such questions as the granting of licenses to handle liquor, the protection of the industry in regard to the quality of the product, and the removing of some of the most pronounced evils associated with the traffic by prohibiting the sale of intoxicants to minors, women, Indians, etc. Until well into the twentieth century, no considerable pressure appears to have been brought to bear on the Legislature to establish prohibition either by legislative or constitutional measures. While it is true that in a few instances laws had been passed prohibiting or limiting the sale of liquor in certain places, the motive in all these cases was largely economic and was not connected with any effort to bring about state-wide or even local prohibition.

There developed, however, with the organization of temperance societies and the unification of temperance sentiment in all parts of the state in the late twenties and the years following, an ever increasing hostility to the liquor interests and a growing determination to destroy them. At first, effort was directed toward obtaining rigid license laws designed to reduce materially the amount of liquor consumed and to protect certain groups or classes of individuals from its influence. Thus, in 1834, the temperance forces united in an attempt to amend the liquor law passed in 1830 by raising the minimum amount of liquor that could be sold to any individual without a dealer's license from one quart to five gallons.³⁰ While this and other temperance measures failed of passage in that session of the

³⁰ Manuscript petitions in Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg, Pa.

Legislature, they were reintroduced for years in each succeeding session. Gradually the growing strength of the temperance movement in both numbers and influence resulted in many alterations of existing laws and in the passage of new measures regarding the liquor traffic. Furthermore, the attendant state-wide discussion of the evils of intemperance strengthened the cause.⁸¹

One exceedingly important development during this period was the growing conviction of many large concerns that their business interests as well as those of their employees were identified with the temperance cause. Many of the firms had formerly or even up to that time actually paid wages in part in daily or weekly allowances of liquor. They were observing, however, that its excessive use by the average laborer weakened his body, lessened his efficiency and tended toward general demoralization. During the forties, many employers engaged in industries where the element of danger was great and where large numbers of men were employed presented petitions to the Legislature asking enactments creating partial or total temperance zones around certain business establishments. In these petitions, the moral, the economic, and the social evils of the liquor traffic were described in detail as they were related to the particular industry in question. In answer to these petitions, the Legislature passed a series of laws between 1846 and 1860 forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquor in quantities of less than thirty gallons to any individual within three miles of certain iron

⁸¹ Among the bills for the better regulation of the liquor traffic before the Legislature in 1834 was one to prohibit the sale of liquor in theatres. Petitions both for and against this bill were presented in great numbers. Those opposed to the proposed law maintained that it was unconstitutional and furthermore that it would result in the great inconvenience of the patrons of the theatre and a great economic loss to the owners and operators. The sponsors of the bill emphasized the moral issues involved.

214 *Temperance Movement Prior to Civil War.*

and coal mines in Armstrong, Clarion, Luzerne, and Carbon Counties.³² In 1854, the provisions of the act were extended to the "Sand Patch Tunnel" in the county of Somerset "during the time of making and completing said tunnel."³³ Requests for legislation of this character were denied to other industries.

During the early forties, the temperance workers united in an attempt to secure among other things the enactment of a general local option law, by which each election district would be privileged to decide at the polls whether or not licenses should be granted for the sale of liquor in that district. In all sections of the state, temperance meetings were held, at which men of prominence in and out of the Legislature espoused the cause. Local organizations as well as the federated State Temperance Society issued addresses to the public and to the Legislature urging local option measures.³⁴ The following extract from a series of resolutions adopted by a large temperance meeting held at Bellefonte, January 26, 1846, is typical of hundreds of similar documents:

"... And, whereas the direct cost of intoxicating drinks, in Pennsylvania, is estimated to be \$4,490,000

³² The act of 1846 applied to Brady's Bend Iron Company, Cochecho Furnace, Helen Furnace, Clinton Furnace, Hemlock Furnace in Armstrong and Clarion Counties and the coal mines of the Lehigh Navigation Company in Carbon County. The following year, the act was extended to the coal mines of the Buck Mountain Coal Company in Luzerne and Carbon Counties. In 1851, the law was extended to the coal mines in the township of Banks in Carbon County, and the township of Hazle in Luzerne County, and to those belonging to the Beaver Meadow Railroad and Coal Company. By a separate enactment, the sale of liquors was forbidden within one mile of the borough of Elizabeth in Allegheny County. In 1852, the three mile prohibitive zone was extended to Mauch Chunk. *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1846, pp. 431; 1847, pp. 430-431; 1851, pp. 447, 82-83; 1852, p. 587.

³³ *Ibid.*, 1854, p. 449.

³⁴ The Archives of the State Library at Harrisburg contain hundreds of these petitions. The state newspapers also report the proceedings of local temperance meetings.

annually—a sum more than the entire expenditure of the State Treasury—a sum more than double the interest on our grievous State debt—and a sum sufficient to extinguish that debt in ten years. Add to this, the indirect expenses of the same evil, which is estimated to be \$5,400,000 annually—the greater portion of which, comes off the temperance community, in supporting in our jails and penitentiaries 8000 criminals, four-fifths of which are drunkards; in trying twelve drunken murderers annually; in maintaining 8100 persons that are annually made paupers; 9000 children that are annually sent to the almshouse; and the thousands that are supported by public charity; and the millions of dollars of property that are destroyed by the recklessness caused by intemperance.

“While we are ever willing to pay all necessary taxes, either direct or indirect, this item of more than \$5,000,000 annually, we wish to repudiate. It is unnecessary and avoidable, and our Legislature can do much to remove it. But while we represent the item of dollars and cents, we do not want to lose sight of the murdered souls of the 2500 drunkards that fall into eternity—the glaring stare of 2300 idiots and insane in Pennsylvania, a large portion of which owe their situation to intemperance—of the eighteen that committed suicide during the last year, and the 1500 women that are annually made widows by this accursed poison, and their 9000 orphan children. Here is a picture of horror and destitution, we wish our Legislators and Judges could behold. . . .

“Resolved, That as long as the voice of twelve men will obtain license in defiance of the remonstrance of any greater number of the citizens equally respectable, the power is not democratic, and the law is not equal and impartial to all. . . .”

Then follows a strong plea for the enactment of the local option law. While absolute prohibition was not

asked, it was asserted "That if it is wrong to sell liquor on the Sabbath, it is wrong on every other day in the week; and if it is necessary on a week day, it is on the Sabbath; the effect on society is the same. And, if our Legislators can constitutionally prohibit its sale on one day in the week, they can, on the same ground, prohibit it on every day in the week. . . ." ³⁵

After years of agitation for a local option law, the Legislature passed an act in 1846 under the title, "An Act authorizing certain counties to decide by ballot whether the sale of vinous and spirituous liquors shall be continued . . ." in said counties in which it was stated "That from and after the first day of January (1847) it shall be lawful for citizens of the several boroughs and townships of the counties of Chester, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Butler, Erie, Delaware, Tioga, Mifflin, Bradford, Crawford, McKean, Elk, Warren, Fayette, Allegheny, Mercer, Clearfield, Washington, Beaver, and the township and borough of Mount Pleasant, in the County of Wayne, and the borough of Lewisburg, in Union County, at the annual election for constables . . . to decide by their votes, whether or not the sale of vinous and spirituous liquors shall be permitted among them for the then ensuing year; . . ." The law provided that tickets should be labelled on the outside "sale of liquor" and on the inside "for the sale of liquor," or "against the sale of liquor." ³⁶ An effort had been made to have Philadelphia County included in the list of counties but without success. The rejection of their numerous petitions occasioned so strong a feeling among the friends of temperance in Philadelphia that at a public meeting a series of resolutions was adopted condemning the action of the Legislature. ³⁷

³⁵ *The Democratic Whig* (Bellefonte, Pa.), Feb. 4, 1846.

³⁶ *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1846, pp. 248, 431.

³⁷ *The Democratic Whig* (Bellefonte, Pa.), Apr. 22, 1846. See also Jan. 27, 1847.

The following year, the Legislature granted the borough of Erie in Erie County the right to determine whether "the borough shall be dry or not according to the borough majority."³⁸ It extended also the local option right to Venango County except that "granting of licenses shall be regulated by the majority of voters of the whole county, except the borough of Franklin, which shall be regulated by a majority of the voters in said borough."³⁹

In answer to a well organized demand, the Legislature enacted in 1850 ". . . That from and after the first day of June next, it shall be not lawful for any person or persons, except inn-keepers who have obtained licenses from the court as the law directs, and manufacturers of the article, to sell any vinous or spirituous liquors within the county of Washington, unless for mechanical, medicinal or sacramental purposes, in a less quantity than one barrel."⁴⁰ During the same year, the privilege was granted to hold prohibition elections in McKeesport and Elizabeth in Allegheny County.⁴¹

Acting upon a large petition of inhabitants from Delaware County in 1850, the Legislature passed an act incorporating the borough of Media in that county. In this act a section was inserted stating that "It shall not be lawful for any person or persons to vend or sell vinous, spirituous, or other intoxicating liquor within the limits of the said borough, except for medicinal purposes or for use in the arts; . . ."⁴²

³⁸ *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1847, p. 53.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 314-315.

⁴⁰ *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1850, pp. 634-635; 1851, pp. 82-83.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1851, pp. 82-83. In 1854, these acts relating to Washington County and Elizabeth in Allegheny County were repealed. *Ibid.*, 1854, pp. 88, 548.

⁴² H. G. Ashmead, *History of Delaware County, Pennsylvania*, 1884, pp. 595-596.

Another of the many special laws dealing with some phase of the liquor business was one passed in 1852 prohibiting the sale of liquor on Sundays, in the county and town of Lancaster.⁴³

As early as 1846, in many sections of the state, candidates for the Legislature and other government positions were asked to declare themselves on the temperance question; and by 1854 this custom had become general throughout the state. Since the temperance voters were numerous in all the counties, and in many held the balance of power, few candidates expressed open opposition to them.

Following the passage of the Maine State-wide Prohibition Law in 1851, a movement was started in Pennsylvania, as in other states, for the enactment of a similar measure. While in each of the three following campaigns the Maine Law was discussed everywhere, it was not until 1854 that it became a major issue. In that year, the well organized temperance forces united on a general program to a greater extent than in any previous campaign. The result was the election of a Legislature favorable to temperance reform measures. Soon after the assembling of this Legislature, the temperance workers centered their efforts on an attempt to accomplish complete prohibition by either legislative or constitutional measures. Among the many arguments advanced in support of complete prohibition were these: the government owed protection to the country's industry and was bound to guard the property rights of its citizens; the government was respon-

⁴³ *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1852, p. 513. The Legislature passed also "An Act to Prevent Abuses in the Sale and Use of Intoxicating Drinks," in which the selling or the giving of intoxicating drinks to minors, intemperate persons, and insane persons was made a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of from \$10 to \$60 and imprisonment of from two to sixty days. The performance of marriages when either of the parties was drunk was also made a misdemeanor. *Ibid.*, 1854, pp. 663-664.

sible for the public health and should protect it by all necessary sanitary legislation; the government was responsible for the personal safety of its subjects; the license system during the one hundred and fifty years of its existence had failed; the grog shops were impoverishing and demoralizing; the vast cost of supporting by charity inebriates and their families, for whose condition liquor was largely responsible, fell upon the temperate people of the state; prohibition was earnestly desired by many drinking men of the state; the peace and the happiness of thousands of homes were destroyed by liquor; and the licensed liquor traffic burdened the state with an enormous debt.⁴⁴

No question before the Legislature in 1854 received more attention throughout the state than the temperance bills, several of which were designed to prohibit the manufacture and the sale of all intoxicating liquors. At the capital, as in other sections of the state, it was freely asserted that the prohibition sentiment was in the minority in the state. To forestall the passage of a strong prohibitive measure, which the Legislature appeared to be willing to do, the opponents of temperance started a campaign to submit the question to a plebiscite in a future election. After several weeks of discussion, this group prevailed; and on April 28, 1854, the following law was passed providing for the submission of the question of state-wide prohibition to the people at the time of the general election to be held on the second Tuesday of the following October:

“Whereas, All laws to be efficient should have the approbation and sanction of the people:

“And Whereas, It is represented that a large number, if not a majority of the citizens of this Common-

⁴⁴ *The Greensburg Democrat* (Greensburg, Pa.), April 13, 27, 1854; *The Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Feb. 22, 28, 1854; *The Daily Legislative Union* (Harrisburg, Pa.), 1854, pp. 333, 337, 345.

wealth, are deeply impressed with the necessity of the passage of a prohibitory liquor law:

“And Whereas, It is impossible to obtain a certain indication of popular sentiment relative thereto by means of petitions and remonstrances; therefore,

“Section 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in General Assembly met, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That the qualified voters of this Commonwealth are hereby authorized at the places for holding the general elections in their respective wards, boroughs and townships, on the second Tuesday of October next, to vote for and against a law which shall entirely prohibit by proper and constitutional regulations and penalties the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for medicinal, sacramental, mechanical and artistical purposes.

“Section 2. That the officers authorized by law to hold elections in each ward, borough and township of this Commonwealth, are hereby directed and required at the place fixed by law, in the several districts for the holding of the general elections in said districts, on the second Tuesday of October next, when they shall be organized as an election board, to receive from each voter of their said districts, a ticket written or printed on the outside, ‘Prohibitory Liquor Law,’ and the tickets in favor of the proposed law shall contain in the inside the words, ‘For a Prohibitory Law,’ and those opposed to the proposed law shall contain in the inside the words, ‘Against a Prohibitory Law,’ which votes shall be counted and returned to the court house of the counties or city, in which the said election shall be held, on the following Friday by the return judges, who shall cast up and certify all the votes polled in said county or city, to the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth at Harrisburg, directed and transmitted in the same manner the votes for Governor are required

to be directed and transmitted, and the said secretary shall on the third Friday of January next ensuing, communicate the said returns to the Legislature to be opened and counted in the same manner the votes for Governor are opened and counted, and considered as the prayer of the voters of this Commonwealth relative to a prohibitory liquor law. . . .'⁴⁵

Immediately after the passage of this bill, both the friends and the enemies of the measure organized for one of the most bitterly contested elections in the history of the state. Temperance conventions throughout the state held regularly scheduled meetings, appointed committees to prepare and circulate campaign literature and arrange for temperance addresses. Candidates for elective positions were asked to declare their stand on the liquor question; and in case no suitable candidate was favorable to the cause, a prohibition man was put on the ballot.⁴⁶ The following communication addressed to Lot Bergstresser, Esq., a candidate for the Legislature from Dauphin County, is typical of many: “. . . Dear Sirs:—The undersigned, representing the friends of a ‘Prohibitory Liquor Law’ in Dauphin County, desire your answer to the following interrogatories:

“First.—Should a majority of the votes deposited at the next election, on that subject, be in favor of the Prohibitory Liquor Law, will you, in the event of your election, use your best endeavors to secure the passage of, and vote for, a law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of all intoxicating liquors as a beverage within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?

“Second.—Should a majority of the people decide

⁴⁵ *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1854, pp. 543–544.

⁴⁶ *The Evening Bulletin* (Philadelphia, Pa.), Sept. 4, 16, 1854; *The Westmoreland Intelligencer* (Greensburg, Pa.), July 6, Sept. 21, Oct. 5, 1854; *The Morning Herald* (Harrisburg, Pa.), Sept. 19, 21, 28, Oct. 6, 1854.

against such a law, will you advocate and vote for, a law that will effectually prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage on the Sabbath?

“Third.—Will you, in the event of such decision against a Prohibitory Law, use your best endeavors to secure the passage of, and vote for, a law compelling all retailers of beer and other malt liquors to procure license from the Court of Quarter Sessions of the proper county, and to conduct their business under similar restrictions and penalties as licensed inn-keepers?

“An early reply is respectfully requested. . . .”

Mr. Bergstresser promptly answered all the questions in the affirmative.⁴⁷ Similar interrogatories were sent to candidates throughout the state.⁴⁸ If the answers were in the affirmative, the State Temperance Society gave them its official endorsement. If the opposing candidates answered in the affirmative, as they often did, the society approved both men. Governor Bigler, who was a candidate for re-election, was somewhat non-committal in his replies, whereas his opponent, James Pollock, gave the Prohibitory Liquor Law his approval, stating that he regarded the proposed law as constitutional and pledged himself in case of his election to favor “every measure of moral and political reform, sanctioned by the representatives of the people. . . .” He stated further that “If the people demand, and their Representatives enact such a law, their will should not be resisted by the exercise of the veto power. . . .”⁴⁹ Although the temperance leaders were not agreed as to what action they should take in the case of the two candidates for Governor, the ma-

⁴⁷ *The Morning Herald* (Harrisburg, Pa.), Sept. 23, 1854.

⁴⁸ Replies from a number of candidates are printed in *The Morning Herald*, Sept. 23, 1854. They appear in this and other papers regularly after this date.

⁴⁹ *The Pennsylvania Archives*, Fourth Series, Vol. VII, p. 783.

jority of them urged their supporters to vote for Mr. Pollock.⁵⁰

Hundreds of articles for and against the Maine Law, as the Prohibitory Liquor Law was commonly called, were published in the papers and in pamphlet literature.

Among the many temperance articles which attracted special attention throughout the state was one, first printed in "The Morning Herald" (Harrisburg, Pa.) and later reprinted in many papers, entitled "THE WAR BELT or Twenty-one Reasons Why every PENNSYLVANIAN Should Vote for a Prohibitory Law" and signed by "A PENNSYLVANIAN." The author expressed the utmost confidence in the outcome of the election, believing that "public opinion of the State was fully ripe for it." The 300,000 citizens who had petitioned two years before for such a law as this could be multiplied by five or six in 1854. In the election of 1852, the pure temperance vote was 52,880 and that mixed with the other parties was 52,678 more, giving a grand total of 105,558. The annual cost of intoxicating drinks to the state was placed at "Twenty Millions of Dollars." The author attempted to prove that the number of people actually engaged in the liquor business was relatively small by giving the following figures from the Census of 1850: "... There are (in Pennsylvania) 484 Distillers, 624 Brewers, 244 Wine and Liquor dealers, 5134 Inn Keepers, 878 Bar-keepers, 2995 Grocers, 318 Refectory Keepers, 251 Bottlers, and their dependents. . . . If they were all to leave the state, the remaining 2,300,000 would hardly

⁵⁰ *The Morning Herald* (Harrisburg, Pa.), for Sept. 20, 1854, stated that "The Prohibition Liquor Law Committee of Philadelphia" had adopted a resolution recommending James Pollock as the temperance candidate for Governor. The same paper for Sept. 4 said that Governor Bigler was straddling the issue and that many temperance people were supporting him on the ground that his position on the liquor question was satisfactory.

224 *Temperance Movement Prior to Civil War.*

know that they had gone. . . .” To prove that agriculture would not suffer, as was commonly asserted, as a result of prohibition, he gave these further figures from the same Census :

Amount of Whiskey manufactured in Pennsylvania in 1850	Gallons, 6,584,810
Whole amount of Corn raised	Bushels, 19,707,702
Whole amount distilled	Bushels, 1,483,553
Whole amount of Rye raised	Bushels, 4,805,160
Whole amount of Rye distilled	Bushels, 517,180

He gave further statistics to prove that on the other hand the farmer would benefit materially as a result of prohibition. In discussing the moral issues involved in the election, he credited to intoxicating liquor 30,000 drunkards, 3000 deaths, 2000 widows and 10,000 orphans, whose direct cost to the sober, temperate taxpayers of the state ran into millions of dollars annually.⁵¹

Editorials appeared frequently in the newspapers friendly to the temperance cause urging people to seize the wonderful opportunity offered by the Legislature in submitting the prohibition question to a plebiscite. “The Morning Herald” (Harrisburg) urged the friends of temperance to “Rally in your strength under the banner of ‘Prohibition,’ and strike a vigorous blow for the overthrow of the Rum Power. Victory is within your grasp. One more united and vigorous charge of the Temperance Hosts will drive the cohorts of Rum and Ruin from the field, in confusion and disgrace, and achieve the crowning triumph of Temperance Reform—a popular vote in favor of Prohibition—A Prohibition Governor—a Prohibition Legislature, and the enactment of a stringent Prohibition Law. . . .”⁵²

The enemies of the cause were greatly alarmed and put forth every effort to combat the arguments ad-

⁵¹ *The Morning Herald* (Harrisburg, Pa.), Sept. 30, Oct. 2, 1854.

⁵² *Ibid.*, Aug. 19, 22, 1854.

vanced everywhere by the friends of temperance. An enormous campaign fund was raised and used to employ speakers and to disseminate literature.⁵³ The most common points advanced in opposition to the Prohibitory Liquor Law were:

1. The measure was unconstitutional.
2. It was a violation of "personal liberty." "What right," it was asked, "had any man or any body of men, or even the State, to say what I shall not sell or what I shall not buy?"
3. To deprive a man of his property and to destroy it was, regardless of the constitutional question involved, morally wrong.
4. A prohibitory law would be injurious to the farming interests by diminishing the demand for corn and thereby lowering the prices.
5. A prohibitory law would do great injustice to those who were engaged in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks inasmuch as the capital thus invested could not be withdrawn and reinvested without great economic loss.
6. A prohibitory law could not be enforced and would lead to smuggling and boot-legging on a wholesale scale and to the consumption, in the absence of regulatory legislation, of liquor inferior in quality and dangerous to the users.⁵⁴

With unabated fury the campaign continued from the passage, on April 28, of the law to submit the prohibition question to the people for their approval or

⁵³ *The Morning Herald* (Harrisburg, Pa.), Sept. 23, 1854, stated that "The Liquor dealers in all the large towns are organizing for a determined opposition to the Maine Law. Large sums of money have been contributed. . . ." In the issue for September 28, it asserted that the liquor interests had printed 400,000 ballots for free distribution.

⁵⁴ *The Westmoreland Intelligencer* (Greensburg, Pa.), July 20, 1854.

rejection until the date of the election, October 10. On the eve of the election, both sides appeared to be confident of winning by large majorities. So far as can be ascertained, the election was as peaceful and orderly as could be expected under the conditions.

When the returns were all in, it was found that the temperance forces had secured control of the Legislature and had elected Governor Pollock but had lost in the plebiscite. The results were 158,318 "For a Prohibitory Liquor Law" and 163,457 "Against a Prohibitory Liquor Law." Thus the prohibitionists had lost by the narrow margin of 5,139 in a total vote of 321,875. 51,265 of the men who went to the polls did not vote on this question.⁵⁵ The temperance leaders claimed that the majority of the voters in this list were prohibitionists who for constitutional or other reasons could not support the existing temperance program.

A study of the vote by counties reveals some interesting facts. Thirty-six counties gave majorities for prohibition and twenty-eight against. Two counties did not vote on the question. Allegheny County voted 10,032 for and 4053 against; Chester, 5508 for and 3830 against; Erie, 2767 for and 1501 against; Philadelphia, 25,330 for and 20,570 against; and Luzerne, 4283 for and 3265 against. With the exception of Greene and Cambria Counties, the entire western section of the state voted for prohibition, whereas the eastern and southeastern portions of the state, with the exception of Philadelphia and Delaware Counties, voted against prohibition. Among the counties voting in the negative were: Berks, for 2612, against 10,599; Bucks, for 3778, against 5879; Dauphin, for 2476, against 3448 (Harrisburg was carried for prohibition by 453 votes); Lancaster, for 5536, against 8969; Lehigh, for 776, against 4733; Montgomery, for 3819, against 5789; Northamp-

⁵⁵ *The Legislative Record*, 1855, p. 3.

ton, for 1411, against 5093; and Schuylkill, for 2762, against 5658.⁵⁶

Under the title "The Whiskey Insurrection," the "Westmoreland Intelligencer" on October 26 said: "A comparison of the vote on the Prohibitory Law in the Western Counties of this State with that on the same question in the eastern counties, exhibits a wonderful change since the days of the celebrated Whiskey Insurrection, when the western counties stood in treasonable array against Washington's Administration of the government for cheap whiskey. Now we find Allegheny, the focus of that insurrection, giving 6000 for total prohibition; Washington, near 2000; Fayette, over 2000; Westmoreland, Beaver, Butler, Mercer, Lawrence, Crawford, Armstrong, Indiana, Clarion, Venango, Warren, Jefferson, and Erie, all in favor of that law, while Greene and Cambria alone, of all the western counties, vote for whiskey—the former giving only 700 and latter but 33 majority. Had the eastern counties, which sent out the troops to put down that 'emeute' of the 'Olden Time,' done but half as well, Prohibition would have triumphed gloriously. . . ." "The Philadelphia Public Ledger" attributed the defeat to the agricultural counties in eastern Pennsylvania.⁵⁷

The temperance leaders were by no means discouraged by their defeat in the October election. They felt that a great moral victory had been won. Soon after the election returns had been made known, the Temperance State Committee met to decide upon the character of a prohibitory law to be presented to the Legislature by the friends of temperance.⁵⁸

Governor Bigler in his final Message to the Assembly, January 5, 1855, said: ". . . Although the vote of the

⁵⁶ *The Inland Daily* (Lancaster, Pa.), Oct. 27, 1854, contains the vote by counties. See also *The Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Oct. 20, 1854.

⁵⁷ *The Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Oct. 13, 1854.

⁵⁸ *The Morning Herald* (Harrisburg, Pa.), Nov. 11, 1854.

people would seem to indicate their aversion to the particular measure of the reform proposed, it is not to be inferred, for that reason they are averse to all attempts at reformation. Such an inference, I am confident, would not be a true reflection of their sentiments. So far from this, they acknowledge the existence of the evil and the necessity of proper remedies. Our present license law to this end, might in my opinion be usefully revised—the object of such revision being to lessen the vice of intemperance. That those laws need such revision, is conceded. So far as relates to the city of Philadelphia, they are peculiarly prejudicial to public morals, and seem to have been constructed to promote the convenience of drinking, far more than to restrain its evil consequences. The subject is worthy of your early and deliberate consideration.’⁵⁹

The incoming Governor, James Pollock, in his inaugural address, after discussing the evils of intemperance, recommended a rigid revision of the license laws of the state and the complete prohibition of the sale of liquor on the Sabbath.⁶⁰ Acting on this recommendation, the Legislature passed a law prohibiting the sale of “spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday” under a penalty of fifty dollars, one-half of which was “to be paid to the prosecutor and the other half to the guardians of the poor of the city or county in which the suit was brought.”⁶¹

In the enactment, however, of prohibitory measures, upon which the temperance leaders had confidently counted, the Legislature was disappointing. After many days of debate, it passed an “Act to Restrain the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.” This measure, commonly known as the “Jug Law,” permitted the sale of

⁵⁹ *The Pennsylvania Archives*, Fourth Series, Vol. VII, pp. 743–744.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 792–793.

⁶¹ *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1855, p. 53.

“vinous, spirituous, malt, or brewed liquors, or any admixture thereof” in quantities of a quart or more only and prohibited under a heavy penalty the maintenance or the use of a “bar room or any room where liquor could be purchased and drunk.”⁶² By destroying the social features of the saloon, many believed that the most pronounced evils of intemperance would be removed. This met the approval of many temperance people who, while bitter in their opposition to the liquor traffic, doubted both the advisability and the constitutionality of a measure that would take from the citizen the right to drink in his home if he cared to do so. Much opposition, however, to the “Jug Law” of 1855 came from both the friends and the enemies of liquor. While the latter continued to work for more stringent legislation, the great enthusiasm manifested in all their efforts of the past five years appeared to be on the wane. On the other hand, the liquor interests for their part became more active than ever before. They held great public demonstrations throughout the state and circulated an enormous quantity of literature advocating the repeal of the “infamous Jug Law.” By the spring of 1856, the development of a reaction against the temperance cause everywhere resulted in the repeal of the main prohibitive features of the law of 1855 by the Legislature in its session of 1856.⁶³

During the next decade and more, the centering of public interest upon the great national problems associated with the institution of slavery, secession, the Civil War, and reconstruction was largely responsible for a slump in temperance work. By taking advantage of this condition, the highly organized liquor interests, through a series of laws, gradually secured the annul-

⁶² *Laws of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania*, 1855, pp. 225-228.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 1856, pp. 200-208.

ment of most of the temperance legislation of the forties and fifties. Thus the turn of national events so weakened the campaign against liquor that it was not until the seventies that in Pennsylvania, as well as elsewhere, any serious attempt was made to renew the fight for temperance, while nearly half a century elapsed before the influence and the numerical strength of the temperance workers again equalled those expressed in the election of 1854.