



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HV  
5089  
P18

UNIV. OF MICH.

# The Psychology of Prohibition.



STORAGE  
P187

An Answer to an Article by Hugo Munsterberg Appearing in the McClure Magazine for August, 1908, by Charles O. Boring.

The learned professor of psychology of the Harvard University has given us a full and frank expression of his views relative to prohibition in the McClure Magazine. It would appear from reading this article that Prof. Munsterberg is comparatively free from ordinary prejudices. Although a German by birth, he admits that he has never used alcohol or even tobacco, and this is certainly an unusual illustration of personal freedom. He does not claim to be a total abstainer, but gives us to understand that his use of the "Opaque Mug" in his college fraternity meetings was to conceal the fact that his own drinking receptacle was not quite empty, that he might thus escape martyrdom from his college mates because of this departure from custom. He also makes it clear that he has never even fallen a victim to the "cocktail habit" of America. It would seem therefore that it was worth while to endeavor to reach such an one who is so "near the kingdom" as Munsterberg appears to be, for if all he states is true, he is not yet beyond the reach of conviction.

Here is a sample of his views regarding the saloon: "Whoever simply takes side with a saloonkeeper and his clientele--yes, whoever is blinded by the colossal harm which alcohol has brought and is now bringing to this country, is unfit to be heard by those who have the healthy and sound development of the nation at heart. The evils which are connected with the drinking habit are gigantic; thousands of lives and many thousands of households are victims every year; disease and poverty and crime grow up where alcohol drenches the soil. Today it means to ignore the teachings of medicine and economics and criminology."

One who speaks thus eloquently and powerfully upon this subject must be credited with unusual power of observation and great study of the subject. We would appear, therefore, to be dealing with one whose sentiments and sympathies are not on the side of the saloon, either as a social or economic necessity, and yet the strange contradictions which follow in this article make it appear that this view is the result of one marvelously warped in his mentality when he puts himself, as he finally fairly does, on the side of the saloon.

Let us glance at a few of the terrible forecasts of prohibition which Munsterberg fears, should it become widespread. We are not long in

6-19-10  
HV  
5089  
.B62  
1908  
BLMK

discovering that it is his "social conscience" that is offended. It is our province, therefore, to convince this learned professor that he need not fear such awful results of prohibition as he imagines possible. However, when he quotes such a phrase as this, "Better England free than England sober," and practically uses this quotation as the text of his discourse, he would appear to be powerfully moved in the cause of "personal liberty," or he would not even seem to dare to justify so monstrous a conclusion as this thought would be.

We must agree with Prof. Munsterberg that liberty is the greatest boon that any nation can secure. That which deprives us of liberty of the real kind is to be detested, hated and fought; but, dear sir, do not fear that in the end our American institutions will lead to thralldom. That love of liberty which made your ancestors fight Caesar has in late years brought your countrymen to our shores in vast numbers in search of it. The same force drove the Puritans to us in the beginning of our history and enabled them to establish a new form of civilization. In the "mingling of waters" which these two diverse immigrations typify we have illustrated the thought that here are gathered the liberty lovers of earth, and it would be strange indeed if a race of heroes begotten from such origin should now forfeit their liberty.

One of the most terrible ghosts which frightens Munsterberg is the possibility of the "tyranny of public opinion." Can any one imagine a land where more diverse public opinions are expressed, publicly or privately, than in America, or a country where fewer persons are put into prison and forced to sacrifice their convictions? Can you show one single illustration where the tyranny of public opinion has forced any human being in America to abandon America, or give up his convictions from any cause short of immoral conduct? But it is safe to presume that by this term you mean to imply that there is a psychological energy in public opinion, which is in fact a most compelling force. Certainly this is true, and weak and comparatively incompetent persons who get their opinions at second hand are often brought under this spell. Here is the one and only cause of the failure to perfectly prove by a great example that complete prohibition is possible. There are more than enough converts to this principle to bring a complete reform at once upon this question, but fear of their fellows keeps many from voting their real convictions, and this delays the great reform which in the end must come.

But let us make a study of the method by which such public opinion is formed, and as an illustration take that with which Prof. Munsterberg is perhaps not as familiar as the writer, who witnessed the reversal of public opinion here referred to.

At the close of the civil war for many reasons we began to be a nation of drinking men. The soldiers returned from camp life with new habits there acquired, and as those who know the facts must lament, many had developed an appetite for drink. Also at this period emigrants from Italy, Germany, Hungary, Russia and other countries where drinking alcoholic beverages is common began to flock to us in great numbers. A wave of vast enthusiasm for "personal liberty" was aroused. The

writer of this article has seen processions, composed largely of children marching through the streets of Chicago, carrying banners emphasizing the idea that the cause of "personal liberty" was the dearest to them in all the world. As we learned from other mottoes carried in the same processions we discovered that the demand for "personal liberty" meant only the personal right to drink alcoholic beverages. The origin of this wave of vast enthusiasm was the saloon. The demand for personal liberty was created in the saloon and by the saloon, and only meant to inform us that, as an institution, the saloon was here to stay.

We would wish Prof. Munsterberg to give us some other definition of "personal liberty" than that relating to the use of alcohol if he possibly can, for it is certainly true that no restraint is put upon the individual in this country worth considering other than that relating to the use of alcohol and dangerous drugs and to immoral or unlawful acts. In America we propose that those who insist upon the right to degrade their fellows shall either move on, or if they remain with us, shall be restrained.

As a matter of fact, at the time mentioned total abstainers were greatly in the minority, and the reversal of public opinion has been of very slow, but constant growth. When we began to understand the influence of alcohol upon our population and saw the results from the use of it which our statistics clearly revealed, we became convinced that as an institution the saloon was the greatest enemy of society. In the South the negro, who had been so recently set free from slavery, was a child, and the liquor vendor found him a ready victim. The intoxicated negro is in fact a monster, a terrible menace to society, because of his lack of discipline. Both North and South, therefore, began to study the liquor problem. Studying this problem, the students soon discovered that one of the greatest causes for this sudden development in the use of alcoholic beverages resulted from a portentous act of legislation passed in 1863. This was a new excise law designed as a war measure for the purpose of providing funds with which to carry on the civil war. When the question was being discussed in Congress Senator Wilson from Massachusetts moved to strike out the clause, "Licensing the retailing of liquors by individuals." Senator Fessenden asked, "Why?" Wilson in answer made a statement that proved a prophecy of the result of such act of government. He declared that by such an act the United States government would give immense power and strength to those selling liquor and would enable every grog shop and rum hole to parade their respectability. Wilson said, "I would as soon give my sanction to the slave trade as to the sale of liquor." Abraham Lincoln would certainly have vetoed the whole enactment, necessary as it seemed to be, but for the assurance that this provision was only temporary. However, in actual practice it remains to this day, and the Speaker of the House of Congress is only recently responsible for refusing to do the will of the majority and allow this subject to come up for discussion. But a psychologist like Prof. Munsterberg can surely understand the enormous potency of suggestions connecting this partnership of interests of the rum power and the United States government. Every liquor peddler could plead respectability, and in

fact does so, because of this relationship, and every liquor drinker could plead patriotism.

There was one other phase of this legislation more important possibly than that mentioned, enormously successful as this was, in recommending the use of intoxicants. The old provision that liquor could not be sold by national sanction in a state that prohibited it was removed. From that day to this the United States government, with its excise provisions, has been the greatest lawbreaker of state enactments and has remained as the agency of liquor sellers. Maine has nearly 1,000 of these lawbreakers who use the power of the federal government to prevent the state from enforcing its enactments. Texas, Alabama, Georgia, Oklahoma and Kentucky and other Southern states are almost in a condition of rebellion from the fact that they cannot enforce state prohibition. In Chicago alone we have 2,500 vendors of this liquor who do not pay the city or state license. These persons are furnishing intoxicating liquor in brothels and in dens of vice where the lowest practices common to mankind are indulged. These dens are fought by the police authorities of the city, the Law and Order League and other institutions that work for the welfare of the city; but for the federal co-operation these infesting and polluting dens of infamy would be impossible. And we have yet not found a means of exterminating them, as Chicago certainly wishes to do.

Does this not prove to you, Prof. Munsterberg, that "personal liberty" on the part of such persons is a monstrous abuse? Why should your friends be pleading for greater personal liberty than they now have as the result of this strange conflict of public opinion?

Munsterberg's article dwells largely on the idea that this present movement for prohibition is an "emotional craze." For a few moments let us study the meaning and purpose of an "emotional craze." If Munsterberg had been in America when the South rebelled against the United States government he would have noted a similar "emotional craze" at that period. The singing of such hymns as "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," "John Brown's Body Lies Mouldering in the Grave," "Old Shady" and other songs of kindred character and sentiment aroused audiences to a pitch of emotional excitement far surpassing in psychological power this present wave of excitement of which he now complains, but which has in fact just begun. As a student of psychology, Munsterberg must be well aware of the fact that **moral conviction always precedes action.** The sympathies outrun the intellect and in fact prophesy the great social reforms. Without this burst of song and flood of tears there would have been no possibility of abolishing human slavery. It was from the furnace heat of passion that America emerged a free nation and now dares to face the world an exponent of human liberty that practices, in this regard, what it preaches. Out of this present period of excitement, which we believe has in fact just begun, will also arise real, tangible and abiding results which must in the end compare with the triumphs of that other reform. The great Abraham Lincoln clearly saw that the two giant evils of human slavery and liquor slavery were linked together. The abolishment of human slavery is a

prophecy that the other reform is also near at hand, and this will also be brought to pass because of the development of intense emotional excitement. If Munsterberg would study this problem at first hands, let him visit the West and the South, where he will discover a pitch of "emotional craze" such as he never witnessed.

But Munsterberg is in terrible fear of the growing disregard of law. Here is his expression: "And can there be any doubt that disregard of law is the most dangerous psychological factor in our present day American civilization?" Let us stop to ask him the question, Who are the lawbreakers most to be feared? In Chicago we have more than 7,000 men, most of them citizens of the United States, who refuse to obey the law of the State of Illinois. These dangerous offenders are in one line of business and are banded together in a common cause. These are saloonkeepers who at this time force the State of Illinois to submit to their contention that they have a right to keep their saloons open on Sunday in violation of a statute which has been upon the books for many years, and is highly approved elsewhere in the state. A majority of these saloonkeepers are naturalized citizens who have taken the oath of allegiance to the United States and have sworn to keep its laws, including the state laws. These men add to their other crimes that of perjury, and at present go unnoticed and unmolested by the authorities. One of our federal judges recently made a decision relating to enforcement of this law. A German saloonkeeper appeared before Judge Ball, applying to become a citizen of the United States. The district attorney then brought out the fact that as this man was a saloonkeeper he probably kept his place of business open on Sunday in violation of the statute. When asked if he did so, he promptly answered, "I do, and so does every one else." Judge Ball promptly decided that this man was not moral, and hence not entitled to become a naturalized citizen. Let us ask the question, What motive guides these men in violating the statute? If it is because they defend some sacred cause of liberty, they are heroes and must in the end win their case; but the facts prove them to be far from being heroic. They are lawbreakers simply because they can make more money by breaking the law than by keeping it. Their only excuse for violation of this law is that Sunday is their best day for business. Yes, and the fact that they keep open on Sunday makes it possible for them to sell more intoxicating liquors on this day than any other of the week, and in consequence Monday following this is the greatest for municipal and police records. Our "worthy" mayor insists that it would hurt business to close the saloons on Sunday; that is, it would hurt the saloon business, but it would help every other business if they were closed, and Chicago would certainly be a safer place in which to live if this was done. Munsterberg has affirmed his conviction against the saloonkeeper. Why not, then, join with the prohibitionists in hurting a business the sole purpose of which is to degrade men?

"Don't you know you're hurtin' bizness,"  
Said the red fox to the hound.

"When instead of sleepin' peaceful,  
You come snoopin', sniffin' round?  
What's the good of all your barkin'?  
What's the use of all this fuss?  
What were chickens ever made for  
If they weren't made for us?"

"Can't you see you're hurtin' bizness?"  
Said the South Sea savage chief  
To the fearless missionary  
Who was sitting on the reef.  
"I have seven white men captured  
That I want to sell as' meat;  
What were white folks ever made for  
If they weren't made to eat?"

"Don't you know you're hurtin' bizness?"  
Said the robber in the jail,  
While the stubborn sheriff listened  
To his almost tearful tale.  
"Those who make and sell the jimmys,  
Don't you see, are losin' trade  
While you foolishly confine me  
Where no getaways are made."

"Can't you see you're hurtin' bizness?"  
Said the devil to the man  
Who was steadily progressing  
On the live-and-let-live plan.  
"You are keepin' men from fallin'  
Who, if sorely pressed, might fall.  
Why, if all men done as you do,  
I would have no job at all."

—From Chicago Record-Herald.

Munsterberg also fears that this present era of compulsory legislation is not sound for the reason "that it aims to foster this immoral negligence of law by fabricating hasty, ill-considered laws in a hysterical mood; laws which almost tempt towards a training in violation of them are surely a dangerous experiment in social psychology." Munsterberg must surely not refer to laws against the use of cocaine, opium and other dangerous drugs, for at the outset of his article he puts himself plainly upon the side of enforcement of law prohibiting the common use of these dangerous drugs; and yet is it not true that these laws are more commonly disregarded than even those against the liquor traffic? One reason why we do not know more about the violations of such laws than we now do is the fact that these drugs occupy much smaller bulk than liquor and may be better concealed, so that offenders are not so likely to be discovered. We will admit that the laws providing pun-

ishment for these offenses are not commonly observed, and that there is in fact very dangerous laxity on the part of our public officials upon this subject. And yet, with all of these shortcomings, any one who is honest must admit that the very partial enforcement of such enactments is a great public good. Therefore it is evident that Munsterberg does in fact believe in prohibition, and he gives further evidence of this fact when he states his great comfort in living in a town where liquor is not licensed, and consequently where students are not enticed into drinking habits. The writer of this article also lives in a college town where all of our citizens glory in the fact that we keep liquor from our borders. One of our great brewers moved into our neighborhood for the very reason that this was a prohibition town, and that his children would not be so influenced to become liquor drinkers as elsewhere. In fact, Munsterberg must know that very many of the most influential people in Cambridge, as also in Evanston, are moved to live in these places because the public sentiment for prohibition is there so strong, but with all of this powerful sentiment, he must admit, as we do, that we are not able to obtain complete prohibition. Why? Simply for the reason that we have at hand great, alluring cities, calling and inviting the young people away from the habits encouraged in these college towns—cities where liquor is licensed and sold.

As a scientist, Munsterberg must favor prohibition in many other lines than these before mentioned. He would favor separation of those with communicable diseases from others, even by forcible means if necessary. He would favor destruction of horses with glanders, of hogs and chickens with cholera; he would favor prohibition of mosquitoes that bring yellow fever and malaria, and would unquestionably do what other wise scientists recommend—namely, exterminate them. A few weeks ago while visiting in Colorado I learned of a man who was discovered on a ranch deliberately infecting horses with glanders that he might secure the state reward for destroying them. This man certainly was not "moral," but, after all, was he a more unnatural or dangerous citizen than the lawbreakers of the city of Chicago? This man in Colorado was only killing horses and robbing men. The others are destroying men as well as robbing them. Would you license this man to encourage glanders? Would you license the continuance of the other diseases mentioned above or the other pests, and yet this would not be nearly so dangerous a practice as the licensing of men to sell liquor which creates a moral contagion of the most terrible order.

Any candid, serious student will surely be much disturbed in reading this article of Munsterberg's from its apparent contradictions. For instance, Munsterberg gives us clearly to understand that he is not in favor of the use of alcohol for himself, and yet he seems to recommend it for all others. Here is his language: "Psychologically the case stands thus: Alcohol has indeed an inhibitory influence on mind and body. The feeling of excitement, the greater ease of motor impulse, the feeling of strength and joy, the forgetting of sorrow and pain—all are at bottom the result of inhibiting impulses that are let free because the checking centers are inhibited; but it is absurd to claim from the start that



all this is bad and harmful, as if the word 'inhibition' means destruction and lasting danger." He distinctly affirms, then, that in the inhibition itself lies no danger, and to strengthen his position, makes the following statement: "There is not the slightest act of attention which does not involve such inhibition." But will Prof. Munsterberg give us the scientific pertinency of the word "inhibition" when used in relation to the effect of alcohol upon the human system? Any student of psychology knows that a psychological action has taken place, not at all to be compared with that when giving attention to some subject. Physiologically the act of attention creates a distinct effect upon that part of the brain which records it. The fine protoplasmic cells of the brain are directly acted upon by the blood current, stimulating that part and producing a lasting effect upon it, such as is exhibited by the use of memory. As Ribot suggests in his work on the "Psychology of Attention," every blood corpuscle surges through the body under this impulse as if charged with an electric force. The inhibition of the organs of vision or of hearing comes from the fact that the blood stream is not going directly to this part of the brain unless attention is there focused. Because of this act of attention the person is shut out, for the time being, from ordinary emotions, which are thereby inhibited. If the attention is intensely focused and upon some subject of importance, the human being so affected is greater for all of the life following for even a small effort, and because of such repeated acts all human power is developed. Prof. Munsterberg does not dwell much upon the inhibition of attention, which seems to me so important, but he dwells very largely upon the rare and higher result of the inhibition of alcohol, as it appears to him. When we study the effects of alcohol we at once discover what inhibition there means. When the blood is charged with alcohol, every red blood corpuscle is shrunken and diminished. The blood stream is thereby greatly reduced in ability to nourish the system. Not only are all of these blood corpuscles thus hurt for the time being, but they leave a record in the body of their diminished forces. Physiologically, therefore, the action of alcohol is to reduce the nourishment of the entire system, as has been repeatedly proven. Every school book of physiology contains information upon this point, and of course Munsterberg is not ignorant of the facts.

Another effect is that alcohol inhibits, for the time being, the finer tissues of the cerebrum, and the blood stream, which is deflected from it, now goes to surcharge the lower lobes of the brain, which are not under the direct control of the will, but are the field where animal impulses are engendered. This accounts for the brutality manifested by any person who comes under the complete influence of alcohol, and it is a common observation that a drunken man is a brute. If the action is sufficient to produce complete inhibition, he becomes paralyzed, and before he again becomes normal and able to use his upper brain or cerebrum, the alcohol must be excreted from the system in some way. We will admit that for the time being one may forget sorrow and pain and weariness, but they also forget propriety of conduct, personal relationship to fellows, and their own ability to distinguish between right

and wrong. Munsterberg admits that this final result is a monstrous curse, and he does not recommend this extreme. He shows us how to avoid going to this extreme by the use of milder liquors, such as beer, ale, wine, etc. He is so concerned about our people that he makes the following statement:

"The inhibition of alcohol to man has in the right place its very desirable purpose, and no one ought to be terrified by such psychological statements, even if inhibition is called partial paralysis." Also he states: "The American masses work hard throughout the day, but the constant, sharp and mental labor, the constant hurry and drudgery, produce a state of tension and irritation which demands before the night's sleep some dulling inhibition, or a dangerous result is set in. Alcohol relieves that tension." Yes, and so do cocaine, opium and absinthe, and even to a greater degree than alcohol; but even Munsterberg objects to the common use of these dangerous drugs. Why are they thus dangerous? Simply because they set up a demand for the renewal of the inhibition, which demand must continue until the victim is finally a maniac or is dead, unless saved by some heroic treatment. Alcohol is slower in its results, but is not less certain. Our insane asylums and penitentiaries are filled with its victims. Recently visiting the Chicago jail, I questioned numbers of the inmates there, and did not find among the several hundred interviewed three persons who would even claim to have been total abstainers during the years previous to their incarceration. There is surely great significance in the fact that so large a percentage of criminals are users of intoxicants; in fact, the majority of men confined in jails or penitentiaries admit they are, and the honest ones will admit that drink has been the prime cause to bring them there.

But Munsterberg seems to think that if genius is to be encouraged and developed this must be the result of the mild use of alcohol. Let us select the lives of two persons well known, and who were injured and almost wrecked by the comparatively slight use of it. Would Munsterberg suggest that Robert Burns and Edgar A. Poe were richer, better, stronger in their lives and more beneficial to humanity because of the inhibition from alcohol? The facts are that these men, and all such as they, are infinitely more susceptible to alcohol than ordinary human beings because they are finer in their emotional nature, and the product of their genius is of a higher order than that of ordinary men. But we challenge any human being to show one place in their lives where they were benefited from using intoxicants.

Is it not true, on the contrary, that because of the physiological construction of such brains, which are capable of being more completely flushed by the blood stream, and because the nerve system of such super-fine human specimens is more perfect, yes, and more directly under the control of impulse and volition, these persons are not only capable of greater and more supreme effort than ordinary beings, but are especially capable of being inhibited by a small quantity of alcohol, which would be excreted from the system of an ordinary person without any effect whatever? The late General Ulysses S. Grant once stated in my own presence that he was utterly incapable of taking any but the smallest

quantities of alcohol. When he came to know that fact, he became a total abstainer, as he acknowledged himself to have been during his entire later years. Every leader, in all departments of life, is thus unusually organized, and because of this rare and fine constitution is infinitely more easily affected by alcohol than the plodder. We see these victims in every community, and it is a common observation that our men best qualified to become powerful and great in public esteem are reduced to a low level because of indulgence, especially of alcohol; but, of course, it is a well-known fact that indulgence of alcohol leads to all other indulgences. We cannot even surmise what genius may really mean until we have become a nation of total abstainers.

Munsterberg makes one statement in his article which either needs to be reinforced by the facts, or to be publicly withdrawn as a monstrous misstatement of truth. This statement is that "the periods of greatest effort in the world's history have been preceded by periods of the greatest indulgence in the use of alcohol." We challenge this statement. However, if there is even the slightest connection and relation between such periods of inebriety and those of national unfoldment, it is certainly true that this great development did not come from personalities influenced by alcohol. This observation does not accord with reason or with history. It is certainly true that alcoholic inhibition, if continued in practice, not only reduces the vital power of succeeding generations, but also greatly interferes with reproduction, so that quantity and quality are alike interfered with.

But when we come to the heart of his recital, we find his remedy, which he suggests is not only a panacea, but a most benevolent agent. Ah, he would cure the abuse of alcohol by its greater use! The stream should not be so deep, but would be vastly wider. In fact, he recommends that we all use alcohol, but greatly reduced in potency, and such as is to be found in light wines, beers, ales and other brewed beverages. Yes, Prof. Munsterberg, this is the best argument that liquor dealers have to offer for their business, and we do not wonder that you project it. It is a most subtle and captivating argument for those who do not think for themselves, but take opinions from others. It is not remarkable, therefore, that the brewers are making great use of Munsterberg's article, and we certainly expect in a very short time to find lithographs of his visage hung in beer halls, where he will be promoted to the office of patron saint to those in the profession of liquor selling.

A saloonkeeper knows his business. He is, in fact, a fine student of psychology and is a profound success when it comes to applying principles that will help his business. He knows that if he can get the custom of an individual to any extent, he is finally sure of the man as a constant customer until he becomes a victim. Of course, saloonkeepers don't wish "victims," and when any person has reached this stage, the saloonkeeper has no more use for him than has Munsterberg or the police authorities. But the missionary efforts of the saloonkeeper are unsurpassed in proselyting for those who will buy his light wines and beer. He knows very well that the use of these beverages will soon require those of greater potency. This is the "kindergarten" work of

the Liquor Dealers' Association, and they begin very early in the lives of men to attract them to their places to drink beer. The Law and Order League of Chicago is constantly prosecuting liquor dealers who sell to minors. This fact is known by the Brewers' Association, who are urging their agents to great caution in this regard, and to be "very good"; but how can a liquor dealer "be good" when everything he has to offer is bad? No, Munsterberg, we thank you very much for your recommendation, but we do not propose that our boys shall become addicted to the use of alcohol and so become victims of the saloon through any missionary effort of yours or of your friends.

You insist that in your country—namely, Germany—the effects of alcohol are not so great as in this country, because of the general use of these mild liquors. But the facts are that we are another race from the Germans, and our psychology is entirely different. We are high strung, nervous, and go to excess in almost everything we undertake. Here is the cause of our strength, but also of our weakness. The great employers of men, such as the railroad companies, life insurance companies and great manufacturing institutions, are now becoming so well acquainted with these facts that they refuse to employ boys who use any kind of liquor, or even tobacco. These men want those who will be developed in their institutions to become useful and powerful, and thus become an advantage to them. They know that even a very slight use of the mildest liquor leads to indulgence, and so unfits these boys to become masters of their work.

Again, where are we to find light wines and beers in this country? Certainly not upon the shelves of the liquor dealers. The percentage of alcohol even in brewed beverages has steadily advanced, and the power to intoxicate thereby increased. These mild beverages, such as are spoken of, do not exist in this country, but even if they did, we all know that even small percentages when used in large quantities produce the same effect as if used in the more intense form.

We are very much interested to know why Munsterberg is so ardent in his recommendation for the use of these beverages, and we can discover but one plausible reason for it. That reason would be that he is of Teutonic origin, and has a "race appetite" for alcohol. It was an old statement of the prophet that "the fathers ate sour grapes and the children's teeth were set on edge." It is unquestionably true that it will take many generations of total abstainers to set a progeny free from this race thought, and it is evident that Munsterberg has not come from a long line of total abstainers, or he would never use the argument he does.

We note a very unfortunate reference in this paper to the effect of prohibition upon those of the Mohammedan faith. Of course, we all agree that generally the Mohammedan races are ignorant, bigoted and even fanatical. Their treatment of women marks them as far below other enlightened nations. Their whole past history is that of an unusually stubborn and narrow-minded people. But has it ever occurred to you, Prof. Munsterberg, what a power these races would be if as enlightened as other people? They suffer not for lack of alcohol, but for

lack of knowledge. Physically, these men are unconquered and unconquerable. Their bodies are as strong and sturdy as were ever given to men. The American and English surgeons who attended the wounded upon battlefields of the Turks and Greeks reported that the wounds of Turks healed marvelously well, illustrating the fact that their bodies had not been destroyed by the use of liquor. Unquestionably an army composed of such abstainers would rank far above those of any Christian nation where liquor is commonly used. Take, for instance, the records of the physical condition of the English army. Here is constant decrease in height, weight and physical capacity for endurance. The prime factor which makes the English soldier inferior is unquestionably the drinking habits of the men. But we have also to take into consideration the fact that so many of the mothers of these men commonly indulge in liquor. And here is even a greater cause for diminished physical power than any other.

If these Mohammedan nations with their inferior mental and moral development were to become a race of drunkards, what monsters would they be! How marvelously more capable of wrongdoing than now, until in the course of time their bodies would be reduced, as in the case of other drinking nations. There is now, however, a marvelous arousement of these people. The younger men are beginning to take hold of a new civilization. If now they dare to remain free from the drinking habit, they will certainly be a most invincible race and will be masters among men, even as the Japanese have proved themselves to be, and because of total abstinence from the use of liquor among them.

There is now in the United States a great band of men and women united harmoniously and determined to destroy the liquor traffic. These persons are not idiots nor fanatics, but are the free and moral persons of any community. They are not asking for the abolition of the drink traffic in order to secure personal advantage to themselves. They are in dead earnest as advocates of human rights. They demand that the children of coming generations shall be given complete liberty and shall be delivered from the evils which hurt and in so many cases destroy those of this generation. So long as there is an institution whose business it is to entice and deprave the youth of this land with beer and rum, we are not free. The Prohibitionists are determined that our youth shall not be so depraved, and they put this question foremost as the greatest before the American public. In order to mock this class a little, you put a question which reads, "Are we about to prohibit meat and tea?" This would not be worthy of an answer from serious-minded people, but for an inuendo carefully concealed in it, which is to the effect that the prevailing tendency of the American people is to go to such extremes in their views that they might almost be accused of insanity. This is not a new charge, and Munsterberg's article reads as if inspired by the literature of the Liquor Dealers' Association and that of the Brewers and the Distillers, for these dwell upon this theme constantly. The question lacks novelty, therefore, but as it emanates from a scientific source, we will challenge him to prove his statement in any way. Has Munsterberg read the platform of the Prohibition party recently

adopted at Columbus? It is evident that he has not done so or he would not accuse the party of either insincerity or absurdity of action. Here is certainly the most statesmanlike paper presented to the American public this year. It is completely free from absurdities, platitudes and fanaticism. If Prof. Munsterberg or any one else can prove this charge, let him arise to do so.

Again, Munsterberg makes a very strange statement when he says: "Psychologists are not interested in politics." Surely, if a psychologist is an American, he must be interested in politics, if he has at heart any effort to help this country. Munsterberg may not be to blame for not understanding American institutions, as he apparently does not, but will he understand that one fundamental condition with the American people is that they are self-ruled? That which they believe in their hearts they express by ballot. When a matter becomes a deep conviction it is decided by the power of the majority, and it is to the credit of the American people to state that no great question has been otherwise decided than on moral grounds. We so decided the question of human slavery, that of public gambling by lottery, the question of regulation of railroads discriminating in favor of the few, etc. We are about to decide this great question also, and when settled it will finally be settled through no other agency than that of politics. We precede action by psychological processes, which students ought to understand and should be interested in. We are about entering upon such an era of psychological excitement as Munsterberg complains of, which he speaks of as an "emotional insanity."

But for a few moments let us see what disposition might be made of this question other than by prohibition.

We might proceed on the "let alone" policy, originally used by all barbaric races. This policy is at present destroying the native races of the earth where it is observed. It is completely successful in obliterating those untutored and undeveloped peoples who are practicing it.

The second plan, and that commonly adopted at this time where prohibition is not effective, is that of licensing and so attempting to "regulate" the liquor traffic. Munsterberg regards this as a great improvement over either the "let alone" or the Prohibition policy.

We challenge the world to produce one single illustration of success on a large scale with such regulation. In the end these institutions "regulate" American politics, and the great struggle in America at this time is the control of the centers where such regulation is attempted.

The gigantic commercial interests behind the liquor traffic employ bribery, corruption of officials, misrepresentation of truth and every scheme which diabolism can invent to pervert the will of the people and retain power. A common fallacy is that the money obtained by license reduces the cost of government and so the saloon power is using this thought throughout the land and is especially endeavoring to link the public school system with liquor selling. The great distillers and brewers confess to each other in their various papers and magazines that their only hope lies in license, and they constantly urge high license. They employ every means possible to convince the public that license

money is a necessity. Perhaps Prof. Munsterberg is not free from this suggestion in some way, for he is led by some influence to believe that our nation is more or less dependent for its prosperity on the success of the liquor business.

The third plan, and one which we deem the only successful one, is to cut off the head of the "mother serpent," which lays the eggs from which the foul brood hatches—prohibit the sale, manufacture, importation, exportation and transportation of intoxicating beverages. The "mother serpent" is license. Destroy the possibility of licensing this evil as the United States destroyed the sale of lottery tickets, and there will be complete mastery. Compromise by licensing is not mastery, it is only delay. Compromise with evil is a moral impossibility, as Abraham Lincoln declared. It cost hundreds of millions of dollars to destroy human slavery in America, and yet the price, great as it was, would have been small if only one human being was rescued, for while the negro himself suffered from the crime, upon the whole nation was placed the great penalty for our own wrongdoing.

What will it cost to complete the destruction of liquor slavery? Who knows? But it does not matter if millions or billions of money are sacrificed, the price will be cheap if we accomplish the result.

But in destroying this traffic we shall undoubtedly find that, far from incurring a loss, measured by such millions of dollars, in fact we shall have vastly gained in money power as the result of such righteous action. We shall have taken from this vile and really dangerous employment less than 250,000 persons, whom we shall put to work in other fields of usefulness, where they can accomplish infinitely more both for themselves and humanity than they now do. We shall also have put them in a more healthful employment, for it is true, as those students know who have investigated the subject, that the insurance companies put a great premium on the insurance of people in this department of labor above those in other employments.

The distillers and brewers are now using every psychological thought to assist them and are discovering that some of our greatest and most earnest people are in some way advocates of the use of liquor. As an illustration, they have discovered that John Wesley, the great apostle of Methodism, was also an apostle of "small beer." To be sure, Wesley at one time wrote a letter to a friend recommending the use of small beer. This is a home-made and utterly harmless concoction, which would be so mild that it would be spat out by any beer drinker of this day as completely lacking all necessary qualifications. So, too, they are holding Lincoln up as one who recommended their vile stuff. From the beginning of his career to the end, Abraham Lincoln steadfastly fought liquor drinking and liquor selling. Abraham Lincoln recognized the fact that liquor slavery was a twin evil with human slavery and devoted his energies to the destruction of both. In the meantime, however, our friends, the distillers and brewers, are discovering that Lincoln was only an advocate of temperance, and they are praising him in unlimited terms as a "temperance" advocate. Indeed, every psychological force is being used by these interested classes to "suggest" to the American people that manu-



facturing liquor and liquor selling are honorable, and that the business is a vast economic advantage.

The very opposite of this thought is true, and if Munsterberg knew as much as he might know, with a very little reading, he would not hold up the economic argument as he does as of any importance. However, the discussion of this phase of the subject is a problem by itself, and we cannot give it space in discussing psychology.

Opposed to this band of brewers, distillers and their hired agents behind the bar, in the Congress and Senate of the United States and elsewhere are the heart and brain of the American people. Not all are as yet fully enlisted on the political side of the question, for not all have yet discovered that in fact this is the foremost question before the American public. When our American people really discover the truth that there is a liquor conspiracy, they will certainly be arrayed on the other side. The moral consciousness of the people must discover that in the end only political action can solve the problem. We may be certain that hearts and brains educated as leaders of this movement are will do nothing "hysterical" and will be sane and sensible in providing legislation. Munsterberg's inuendo against the American people is not only groundless and lacks information as to facts, but is indeed an insult to our American people, whom his article condemns as being practically irrational. Of course, we will admit there are times when even great communities become morally and mentally unsound. So the State of Louisiana was at one time upon the question of lotteries, and so the entire South was upon the question of human slavery, but Louisiana is now thankful for deliverance from lottery gambling; Utah is happy that she was forcibly compelled to abandon polygamy; the entire South is supremely happy in deliverance from her perverted thought, and so, too, the entire country will rejoice when we have achieved national Prohibition.

As an illustration of his condemnation of the American people he says: "The American nation as a whole is evidently strong for temperance, but a hysterical minority has at present succeeded in transforming it into its caricature Prohibition." The repeated use of this word "hysterical" evidences the source of inspiration of Munsterberg's article, for this is the common attack of the periodicals and papers furnished by the brewers and distillers. In fact, it would seem desirable on their part to keep this word in permanent form for continued use, judging from the great number of times they employ it. But if Prof. Munsterberg had spent years in some rum-soaked city, whose policy was necessarily shaped by its rum sellers, as it always is where they prevail, and had then witnessed the transformation following Prohibition, he would never have dreamed of calling this change a "caricature of temperance." Intemperance is developed only by liquor drinking. Liquor drinking results from no other cause than liquor selling. Eliminate the possibility of publicly securing liquor and the evils connected with it are vastly reduced. Gradually but surely the other ills connected with it are also lessened, so that a community thus set free begins to develop its aesthetic side, its literary side, its social side, and is soon



on the way to a higher and greater civilization.

As we think of Munsterberg's picture we recall to mind a famous story of Edgar A. Poe. Owing to astigmatism of vision, the hero of this story had fallen violently in love with a most ill-fetaured and ill-favored woman, but when he secured means of a better vision and put on the eye glasses, we are told that his love was changed to horror. We do not commend this story in its finale, for the reverse of it will be true, if Prof. Munsterberg will correct his own violent astigmatism. This terrible caricature, as he now sees it, will be a marvelous form of beauty, and will enrapture his vision. Will not Prof. Munsterberg apply to some good mental or moral optician for such a remedy?

When this "hysterical" minority becomes a majority, as it certainly will in this country, and when it then destroys this great reptile which now stretches about our land, when we have freed ourselves from the rule of the Dragon and have then become a free people—free not only in name, but in deed and in fact—then, and not till then, will that great statue standing at the entrance of New York harbor symbolize the truth. Not until that time will America be "LIBERTY ENLIGHTENING THE WORLD." In great humiliation we bear in mind the petition from Liberia and other African countries to the United States, which country was changing their paradise into a Sahara, when, the solitary exception among all civilized nations, we refused to prohibit the exportation of rum to these peoples which the rulers of the countries assured us was destroying them. The present Speaker of Congress is using his enormous energies to prevent the American people from expressing themselves upon this question, but even he may not continue to accomplish that result.

The future glows with light, which is breaking in upon every hand, North, South, East and West communities are freeing themselves from the power and dominion of the rum devil. When all of these communities see, as they must finally discover, that only National Prohibition can accomplish for them what they desire, they will then join forces with all true, patriotic Americans to make a national movement which shall finally dethrone the rum power from America.

Prof. Munsterberg, will you not join with us and with all good men in hastening this day?

CHARLES O. BORING.

Evanston, Ill.