

Temperance - Addresses

The Attitude of the Socialist Party Toward the Alcohol Question



By
EMILE VANDERVELDE
Prime Minister of Belgium

A Paper Read at the
Tenth International Congress Against Alcoholism

International Series No. 4



WESTERVILLE, OHIO
American Issue Publishing Company



EDITOR'S NOTE

The leader of the Belgian Socialists, Prof. Emile Vandervelde, now (1915) Premier of Belgium, has also been one of the small group of outspoken anti-alcohol Socialist leaders of Europe. Since this address was given, the anti-alcohol movement has made considerable progress in Europe, but has by no means as yet reached the power which it is capable of exerting. A good summary of the general Socialist movement against alcohol in Europe will be found in *The Anti-Alcohol Movement in Europe* by Ernest Gordon.

It is not to be expected that every reader will agree with the general Socialist principles which Prof. Vandervelde holds and expresses, but it is believed that both Socialists and non-Socialists in the United States may find valuable suggestions in his practical presentation of the interrelation of the temperance and Socialist movements.

Omissions have been made of paragraphs referring to matters now out of date or chiefly applicable only to European conditions.

The Attitude of the Socialist Party Toward the Alcohol Question

CAN SOCIALISTS be uninterested in the direct fight against alcoholism? Ought they to leave to the Good Templars, Blue Cross Societies, popular temperance or abstinence societies the burden of combating an evil whose ravages no one dreams of denying? Ought they to go so far even as to condemn as chimerical or harmful the efforts of those who lead the campaign against alcohol and who refuse to wait for the solution of the alcohol problem by the mere amelioration of popular conditions of existence?

Such are questions which in recent years have given rise to lively controversies and upon which, up to now, Socialist circles are far from being in accord.

(After reviewing discussions upon this subject at various Socialist Congresses, M. Vandervelde thus summarizes the general Socialistic attitude, excepting, of course, the groups of abstaining Socialists in the various countries:)

From the physiological point of view they believe that the moderate use of beer or wine, so far from being harmful, is, on the contrary, beneficial, or at least, harmless and agreeable; hence they condemn abstinence as representing a spirit of asceticism.

From the social point of view, they consider the immoderate use of alcohol the inevitable consequence of existing social conditions. Certainly, there have always been drunkards; but widespread alcoholism is a product of the capitalistic regime, and will only disappear with it.

From the political point of view, they believe the Social-Democratic party has better work to do than to directly lead the struggle against alcoholism. Before anything else, it must attack those causes whose extermination alone will put an end to the disastrous results which they produce. Evidently that does not exclude certain propaganda or legislative measures designed to restrain now the ravages of alcohol, but such measures are only of secondary importance; they must not turn aside the popular decisive struggle against capitalistic exploitation.

It is to a criticism of these propositions that I wish to devote this study. It is impossible for us to agree with them as such, while recognizing that they contain a large element of truth.

Assuredly the argument is conclusive in regard to those who ignore the economic factors of the problem and consider alcoholism a sufficient explanation of popular misery. But, granting that misery may have many other causes, that the economic factors in alcoholism have a considerable or even preponderating importance, this is not a reason for concluding that, within the limits of society as at present constituted, direct efforts against the use or the immoderate use of strong drinks can give only insignificant results. Such a belief could only be maintained if alcohol met a true need in workingmen, if, at least, it were a

necessary evil, dangerous but indispensable, in the deprivations of overwork and underfeeding.

But here is where I definitely disagree with our friends. I believe, on the contrary, that alcohol, even in small amounts, even diluted as in wine or beer, even for workers who are not in normal condition, is always useless to the body, and as a rule harmful.

I. THE PHYSIOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

To explain the resistance which one meets when anticipating bringing the Socialists into line against alcohol, one must take account not only of the arguments of those who talk in their conventions, but of the prejudices of those who vote.

The majority of Socialists have long been uninterested in the problem of alcoholism, regarding it as absolutely secondary; they are hardly acquainted with the most recent works on the subject; one frequently hears them belatedly attacking arguments which have had their day and which everyone has now abandoned.

Out-of-Date Theories

For example, how many times have we not heard some one or other of our friends say that it is the impurities in alcohol which make it dangerous, and that if we were to give the state the monopoly of rectification as in Switzerland, the question of alcoholism would be in a large measure solved.

Again, how many Socialists, especially in France, who represent vine-growing constituencies and wish to conciliate their electors, fancy that, if the industrial alcohols, the alcohols from molasses or potatoes, are a detestable drug, the fruit alcohols, the natural alcohols, distilled by the growers, have never done anyone harm.

Finally, we hear in all parliamentary assemblies, even in those which energetically demand restrictive or prohibitive measures against alcohol, that by this is meant only the distilled drinks, while the so-called hygienic fermented liquors are praised.

Now these are points of view diametrically opposite to those which prevail today among physiologists.

The Question of Impurities

It appears to be established that furfurol and other impurities which can be found in the alcohols used for consumption contribute only in a slight degree to their toxicity; that these impurities are proportionately greater in fine champagne than in the common *trois six*.

A full biographical study on this point will be found in Helenius: *Die Alkohfrage*, Jena. Fischer, 1913. See especially Bruylant: *The Influence of the Composition of Spirits and of Alcohols upon Alcoholism*. A Report to the Commission for the Study of Alcoholism, May, 1903. "Let us assume," says this report, "that the impurities found have a toxicity five times that of ethyl-alcohol, and let us apply this figure to one of the most impure alcoholic drinks, cognac of good quality, which contains in a litre [about one quart] 600 CCM. [20 oz.] of ethyl-alcohol and 2.5 CCM. [about 1/8 oz.] of impurities. Taking 1 as the toxicity for ethyl-alcohol and 5 for the impurities, one finds for a litre of cognac of toxicity of 600 for the ethyl-alcohol and of 12.5 for the impurities, or in percentages: 97.92 toxicity of ethyl-alcohol 2.08 toxicity of impurities.

A person who would be alcoholized by consuming a given quantity of the alcohol of cognac, if we take 100 litres for definiteness, would owe 98 per cent of his physical and moral deterioration to the alcohol and 2 per cent to the impurities. In other words, before becoming alcoholized, he would have to drink 170 litres of cognac containing alcohol only; he has had to stop at 167 litres of fine cognac.

Alcohol Is Alcohol

In the second place, it is generally agreed that the **natural** spirits are at least as harmful as the **industrial** spirits, and that one becomes alcoholized by the alcohol from the juice of the grape as well as by that extracted from potatoes and artichokes.

Finally, many physiologists admit, though this is still a mooted question, that, if one consumes the same quantity of alcohol, it matters little whether it is in the form of wine, of beer or of spirits.

This is the opinion of Forel, expressed in these terms at the Eighth International Congress of Hygiene and Demography: "The poisonous agent, the murderer of body and soul, is and remains ethyl-alcohol, pure or impure, refined or raw, concentrated in spirits or relatively diluted as in beer, wine and cider."

Hence, to judge of the degree of harmfulness of the different alcoholic drinks, it is certainly necessary to take account of accessory substances which make them particularly dangerous—this is the case, for example, with absinthe and other essence liqueurs; but the alcohol they contain always remains the essential element.

How Much Alcohol Liquors Contain

Now, we know that the distilled drinks contain on an average from 30 to 60 per cent of alcohol. The dry and frothy wines vary from 5 to 15 per cent. The alcoholic content of fortified wines may run as high as 25 per cent. Ordinary cider contains from 2 to 6 per cent, but certain very sweet apple ciders and perry (cider from pears) contain nearly 10 per cent.

As for beers, their alcoholic content is very variable according to the kinds and the countries. Here are some figures among those furnished by Triboulet and Mathieu:

	Percentage of alcohol
Beers on sale	
Bavarian	1.1 per cent
Bohemian	2.4 per cent
Vienna	2.7 per cent
Export and Stored Beers:	
Pilsen	3.7 per cent
Munich	4.3 per cent
Faro	4.9 per cent
Lambick	6.2 per cent
Pale Ale	6.5 per cent
Extra Stout	9.0 per cent

Thus the Lambick or the English beers contain as much alcohol as certain wines. On the other hand, given ordinary spirits containing from 40 to 50 per cent of alcohol, it is easy to estimate the quantity of wine or of beer which one must drink to imbibe the amount of alcohol contained in a dram (of spirits).

Liquor dealers generally draw 20 large drinks (of spirits) from a quart. Consequently, a litre of wine with ten per cent of alcohol contains as much alcohol as 5 drinks of whisky at 40 per cent, and a litre of beer at 5 per cent contains as much as two drinks of whisky at 50 per cent.

From which it appears that the militant Socialist of Brussels who takes a pint of Faro at the "People's House," where the sale of liqueurs is forbidden,

imbibes as much alcohol as the less exclusive workman who takes a drink of whisky at the "Workmen's House," where the sale of spirits is permitted.

There is always this essential difference between them, the spirits drinker will more easily go on and call for a half-dozen drinks, than the beer drinker will swallow down a half-dozen pints—which not all stomachs can bear.

Suppose, then, as Forel asserts, that, for the same quantity of alcohol, and in spite of the difference in dilution, the poisonousness of the two liquids may be equal, it seems that the dangers of alcoholization by beer ought to be less than those of wine, and especially than those of whisky.

Nevertheless, it is a fact proven by experience that in many countries, and notably in Germany, the beer question is to the front, as much as or more so than the question of wine or of spirits. The leaders of the movement against alcoholism, whether Socialist or not, show an increasingly marked tendency to campaign simultaneously against both the distilled and the fermented drinks.

But it is here that they meet the sharpest resistance, the most numerous objections.

Use Versus Abuse

What good is it—say those opposed to total abstinence—to want to prohibit the use because one condemns the abuse? It is such exaggerations as these which endanger better causes. We understand perfectly that workmen should be warned of the dangers in alcohol. We will even go so far as to admit that they should be urged to adopt complete abstinence from distilled liquors; but that it is absurd to want to suppress the moderate use of wine or beer, to deprive us of agreeable, harmless and even beneficial drinks.

These arguments would be decisive if it were true that the fermented drinks are harmless and beneficial.

But is this so? First, are they harmless?

According to many physicians, the moderate use of alcohol in the form of wine and beer has no harmful influence on the health.* From the point of view of the **individual**, there would be no serious reasons for proscribing them as long as the alcoholic content of the liquids drunk did not exceed the "physiological dose"—that is, the "quantity of alcohol that a healthy man can consume without eliminating alcohol as such and without passing it in the urine."

But everybody knows that this "physiological dose" is always extremely small; some fix it at 15 grammes ($\frac{1}{2}$ oz.) at the most, others go as high as 30 to 40 grammes; in an address at Paris, May 4, 1905, under the auspices of the *Revue Scientifique*, Prof. Gauthier went as high as 60 to 80 grammes daily, equivalent to a bottle of wine; but, he added, "this is the extreme dose, and it ought absolutely not to be exceeded, nor should it be thought that these 80 grammes of alcohol can, on the average, be taken in the form, for example, of liqueur, rum or cognac; one would only get intoxicated."

Whatever the figure at which one stops, whatever the dose, probably too strong, of Prof. Gauthier, it is certain that there are many people who exceed it sincerely believing that they are moderate drinkers, and who would not deny that the use of alcoholic drinks is a considerable danger to many because, owing to one circumstance or another, it easily degenerates into the immoderate use.

*This sentence of M. Vandervelde, it will be evident as one follows his argument, is not to be taken literally, since he shows farther on that experiment has demonstrated the harmful effects upon working ability of even smaller amounts than the "physiological dose" referred to here.

So, if one takes the **social** point of view, if he considers the evils of all kinds that are engendered by alcohol, if he believes, as I do believe, in the sovereign power of example, total abstinence, absolutely no compromising with alcohol, appears the most efficacious means to bring others either to abstinence or to moderation.

Moreover, experience of temperance and of abstinence societies shows in all countries that, to make an impression upon minds, it does not amount to much to drink little wine, little spirits; what is necessary is not to drink at all.

But possibly someone will say, and this brings us to the second part of the fundamental objection that they make to abstainers, Is not your uncompromising attitude contrary to the results of scientific experiments? Are there not illustrious scientific men who affirm that alcohol is a food, that alcoholic drinks in moderate amounts—a half-pint of wine, a quart of beer, for example—are not only harmless, but useful, especially for manual laborers?

The Question of Alcohol as Food

There again we have to recognize that accord is far from unanimous and complete among physiologists.

There are those like Forel, Bunge, Kraepelin, Smith, who, themselves abstainers, deny to alcohol all food value, or at least consider that alcohol is a toxic substance, that its burning in the human body does more harm to the organism than it aids nutrition.*

Others, like Gley, believe, on the contrary, that the question of the food value of alcohol is a bad field of attack against alcohol. It seems to him difficult, at least in view of the facts actually known, to contest that this substance has qualities of a food: "It would be better to transfer the question to the economic field, and to call attention to the fact, for example, that the food value of alcohol is out of proportion with its price. From the heat point of view, it is about three times as costly as milk, and eight times dearer than bread (Jacquet). On the other hand, no one should forget that the quantities of alcohol necessary for it to have nutritive value, in the meaning just indicated, quickly reach the body's limits of tolerance of alcohol, and even surpass that limit in many persons who are very susceptible to alcohol."

One observes that this opinion amounts to practical conclusions differing little from those of Forel and Smith. From the point of view of the anti-alcohol movement, it is of small consequence whether alcohol has no food value, or whether it is a mediocre, dangerous food, much more costly than other foods having the same advantages but not having the same disadvantages. In either case, every reasonable man ought to conclude that poor people, especially, have an interest in not devoting a considerable part of their expenses to alcoholic liquors.

Yet everyone does not agree with this. Everyone will remember the famous article that Duclaux, an illustrious microbiologist, but less recognized as a physiologist, published in the *Annals de L'Institute Pasteur* under this title: Is Alcohol a Food?

"Twenty to thirty ccm. of pure alcohol (that is 2 to 4 decilitres [1.5 to 2.5 of a quart] of wine," says Forel, is enough to disorder and slow immediately and for some time all mental work (memorizing, associations, etc.) increasing the number of errors. Furer even showed a slowing after 7.5 ccm.

Duclaux's Argument for Alcohol as Food

Basing his conclusions upon the experiments made by Atwater and Benedict in the United States, Duclaux declared in the affirmative. If we were to believe him, alcohol possesses considerable food value; it should be placed beside sugar and starch; it surpasses them in one respect, viz., that, weight for weight, it contains more energy. From now on (he argued) there will be a complete change in the point of view in everything which concerns man and animals; the time is coming when alcohol will enter into all tables of food rations. "We ought, then, to apologize for the way in which we have hitherto treated it. What of the drunkenness which it causes? I know well that is the sad side. A food which ranks so well and which is easily absorbed by the tissues has both its disadvantages and its advantages. Use it; do not abuse it."

We know the scandalously exaggerated conclusions which people who were interested in increasing the consumption of alcohol, or those who sought only an excuse for their intemperance, drew from these words. While Duclaux was trying to rehabilitate only the simple mug of beer or the one glass of wine, they pretended to see in that article, which gave joy to dealers and distillers, an attempt at scientific justification of the *trois six* or even of absinthe. So it is not surprising that, aside from some timid supporters, the director of the Pasteur Institute drew upon himself replies as numerous as vehement.

The Argument Against Considering Alcohol Food

Among these none seems to us clearer, more conclusive, better adapted to the comprehension of the layman, than that of Dr. Louis Papicque in the *Petite Republique*, January 7, 1903.

Lapicque does not dispute the fact that alcohol in a weak dose can replace a certain quantity of our usual foods. The heat released by alcohol, burning in our bodies, is used like the heat released by other foods. So also, we could heat a steam engine with wood, oil, gasoline, alcohol—all these substances being combustible. In the human machine, the combustible is called food; alcohol, then, is a food since it can replace true foods. But is it necessary to admit, for all that, that alcohol is a good food, that it is not a poison? Not at all. There is no contradiction between the two ideas, taking each in the largest sense. In the sense in which we take the word food here and in which Duclaux took it in his article, it means everything that can furnish heat to the body. A poison means all that does harm. Very well! Come back to our comparison of the steam engine. While one can heat his machine with wood, coal, gasoline, does it follow that it is a matter of indifference which fuel we use? No. Kerosene oil will put the machine out of use in a very short time. Similarly, alcohol burns in the organism and consequently is a physiological fuel; but it acts at the same time as a poison, and a poison dangerous in proportion to the sense of well-being which it temporarily brings to its victims.*

The Misleading Sense of Well-Being Given by Alcohol

Indeed one of the difficulties of the movement against alcoholism or rather, more exactly, against the so-called moderate use of strong drink, is that the person who imbibes alcohol experiences at first an impression of being warmed

if he is cold, of restoration if he is tired, of intellectual stimulation if his mind is sluggish.

But—many experiments have proved it—these sensations are pure illusions, or rather passing states, presently followed by a more or less profound depression.

As we are speaking of the physiological action of alcohol only to the extent strictly necessary to justify our conclusions from the social point of view, I do not propose to summarize here the works of Schmiedeberg and all those who after him have shown that alcohol is not a stimulant, but, on the contrary, a paralyzer, a narcotic, an anesthetic.†

The Paralyzing Effects of Alcohol

Physically it is by paralysis of the brain centers, by an anesthetic action comparable to that of opium, that alcohol benumbs or suppresses painful sensations such as sensations of cold, hunger, thirst, sadness or weariness.

For example, one often hears it said that when one is cold, alcohol warms him. But the feeling of warmth is illusory. Bunge shows clearly that it is due in part to the abolition of the sensation of cold, in part to the paralysis of the nerve centers controlling dilation of the blood vessels, and consequently a greater quantity of blood rushes toward the skin; as a result one has the illusion of being warmer, because the blood grows cool in contact with the air.

So, also, the benumbing of the feeling of weariness is one of the symptoms of paralysis which is ordinarily considered excitation. People firmly believe of paralysis which is ordinarily considered excitation. People firmly believe of paralysis which is ordinarily considered excitation. People firmly believe that alcohol strengthens one when tired and enables him to resume work. But the sensation of fatigue is the safety valve of the human machine. To destroy that sensation so as to continue to work, is like the engineer who would overheat his boiler without watching the steam gauge. (Bunge.)

And what is true physically is not less true intellectually and morally. Here, again, alcohol plays the role of a narcotic and anesthetic: it depresses, benumbs, puts to sleep moral pain as it puts to sleep the sensations of cold and fatigue.

Hence, it is not surprising that people who have worries, cares, anxieties, are tempted to drink alcohol to forget, if only for a moment, these anxieties, cares and worries.

It is the great resort of those who are discouraged, who give up bringing things to a head, who, despairing of a better future, of not being able or willing to make life happy, seek in intoxicating drinks an "artificial paradise."

A Paralyzer of Social Striving and Activity

But do you not see that, precisely for this reason, those who think that struggle alone will liberate the industrial classes and that whoever gives up this struggle not only wrongs himself, but his companions in misery, ought above all others to be enemies of alcohol?

Even supposing that alcoholism were not a disastrous thing from the point of view of the individual, of the family, of the future of the race, Socialists ought to combat it because of the depressing action which it exerts upon the combative energy of the proletariat.

†Schmiedeberg: *Grundriss Arzneimittellehre*, 2nd edition, 1888, pp. 35-48. A resume and very complete bibliography of the later works of Kraepelin, Smith, Bunge, etc., will be found in the work of Helenius already referred to: *Die Alkoholfrage*.

*Compare Dr. Max Kassowitz, professor at the University of Vienna in "Is Alcohol a Food or a Poison?" published in *Die Zeit*, April 7, 1900.

Let it be well understood, in writing these lines I am not only thinking of the confirmed drunkards who completely brutalize themselves, who spend in the saloon expenses the larger part of their wages, and who are purely and simply of no value, or rather who are social nuisances. These, on the whole, are numerically negligible.

The Loss of Social Energy Through Regular Moderate Drinking

What is infinitely more serious, from our point of view, is the waste of energy which results, taking the working class as a whole, from the so-called moderate use of alcoholic drinks.

Every time that, under the paralyzing influence of alcohol which slows the perceptions, makes the association of ideas more difficult, the will more vacillating, the workman sees less clearly, thinks less directly, wills less firmly, feels less sharply the prick of legitimate discontent, he diminishes by so much the capital of energies at the disposal of his class to struggle against the evils from which it suffers, against the exploitation of which he is the victim.

It will be objected, possibly, that sometimes alcohol gives momentarily courage to cowards, bravery to the timid; here a workman who must appear before his patron, his director, his railroad superintendent, will drink two or three drams to give him heart; there, another during disturbances of a strike will manage to visit the saloon before having a struggle with the police.

But Socialism bears poor witness to itself if it claims to have to resort to such methods in its struggle against capitalism.

What is needed, on the contrary, in this struggle, where the fists are very often ineffective, is not impulsive or over-excited men, but those who have a cool head, steady nerves, a clear vision of the difficulties to be conquered and of the obstacles to be overcome.

This is why the struggle against alcoholism—if only for the physiological reasons which have just been described—appears to us one of the necessary features of the social struggle.

If the people wish to triumph, they must, to conquer their adversaries, learn also to conquer themselves; they must not only endeavor to develop their political and economic organization, but to make that organization possible and powerful by combating with all their strength the enervating, depressing, paralyzing action of alcohol.

II. THE SOCIAL POINT OF VIEW

To obtain effective results in the movement against alcohol, the first thing to do is to break squarely with two propositions, or rather with two dogmas, equally indefensible, that have often been set up against each other—viz., that alcoholism is the cause of misery and, vice versa, that misery is the cause of alcoholism.

On the one hand, it is absurd to pretend that alcoholism is the only or the principal cause of misery, and that, consequently, the social question would be solved the day the industrial class is converted to abstinence.

Alcoholism Not the Sole Cause of Misery

Suppose, indeed, that, by achieving the impossible, all the workers of a country or of an industry should give up alcohol the day after tomorrow, they would dispose, without doubt, of a surplus of considerable resources. Rowntree and

Sherwell estimate that not less than 2,700,000,000 francs (\$520,000,000), more than \$80 per family, is the annual expense of the English workingmen for their alcoholic liquors (beer, wine, or spirits). But, supposing that all begin to drink water, the machinery of capitalistic exploitation would not be modified: as long as the property regime was not radically changed—which their conversion to abstinence would make easier—they would none the less continue to be despoiled of the larger part of the value which they produce by those who hold the means of labor.

Misery Not the Chief Cause of Alcoholism

On the other hand, it is also absurd to pretend that misery is the sole or the principal cause of alcoholism; and that, consequently, the alcohol question would be solved by abolishing the capitalistic regime, and only by this means.

This theory is, of course, attractive to those who like to veil their regard for the interests, the prejudices or the vices of their electors, under the appearance of inflexible adherence to Socialist theory—but, unfortunately, it does not stand examination.

How can one maintain that misery, misery alone, engenders alcoholism when one sees how seriously alcoholism attacks* the upper as well as the lower classes, under different forms, but often with equal intensity, sometimes even with more intensity. And if alcoholism has other causes than misery, if people drink equally because they like it, because of imitation, prejudice, unemployment, custom, how can one hope that without direct efforts against it, alcoholism will disappear of itself, spontaneously, automatically, the day that the workers are freed from capitalistic domination?

However, let no one be surprised at the drift of these observations. I do not dream of denying the close connection which exists between alcoholism and working and living conditions. But still it is not at all necessary to exaggerate the closeness of these relations.

Alcohol Not a Present Physiological Necessity

For alcoholism to be absolutely dependent on economic conditions it would be necessary that, in the present state of affairs, the use of strong drink should meet, for manual laborers at least, a physiological necessity.

Now we know that is not so.

However poor a workman may be, however deplorable his working or living conditions, he is making an undeniably bad speculation when he takes alcohol in the hope of giving himself strength, of making up for insufficient nutrition, of defending himself against cold or other extremes.

Suppose even that alcohol were a food, capable of replacing to a certain degree other foods, still this workman would evidently be better off from the expense point of view if he took an egg, or ate a bit of sugar, instead of taking beer, "that liquid bread," whose nutritive virtues so many people are accustomed to extol, it has been estimated that five litres of Faro or of Bavarian beer costing

*Cf Hoppe: Die Tatsachen über den Alkohol, 1904. According to statistics of Swiss cities from 1892 to 1898, persons belonging to the higher classes furnished 40 per cent of the deaths caused by alcoholism, the industrial classes, with their 60 per cent, formed four-fifths of the urban population. If one include the gardeners, shop-keepers, postal and railway employees in the working class, so-called, one finds, on the average for the same period, 348 deaths among the working men and 98 in the other professions, a figure which expresses a little more nearly the numerical relation between the two groups; from which it appears that the professional classes are not less affected by alcoholism than the other classes.

from one to three francs (\$.20 to \$.60) contain no more nourishment than a small loaf of bread costing ten centimes (\$.02).

It is, then, ridiculous to praise the use of alcohol even in the form of wine or beer, from the nutritive point of view.

The smaller the wages of the workman, the more he needs substantial nourishment to protect him against the bad consequences of too hard or too prolonged labor, the less interest he has in trying to restore his strength by a substance of such doubtful value and so costly as alcohol, no matter in what form.

Abstinence Especially Advantageous to the Workman

So far from alcohol being indispensable to workers who are in abnormal conditions, it is for them especially that abstinence presents the greatest advantages as much from the hygienic as from the economic point of view. And for this total abstinence to be successfully advocated, it is not necessary to wait for the fall of the capitalistic regime to obtain appreciable results in the movement against alcohol, as is signally illustrated by the example of millions of abstainers among the working classes throughout the world, and especially in England, the United States and Canada.

A direct propaganda against alcoholism, then, can have real efficacy, quite apart from all change in the material conditions of existence. But, let me hasten to add, I do not share the illusions of those who rest their hope, or their principal hope, upon the mere virtue of this propaganda. Because, if the use of strong drinks does not meet in any case a **physiological** necessity, it is unfortunately certain that for the downtrodden it constitutes almost a **psychological** necessity.

The Psychological Factor in Alcoholism as Related to Economic Conditions

What leads men to consume alcoholic drinks? Certainly habit counts for much, as does also the contagion of example, the obligation to do as others do, the difficulty frequently experienced in public places in securing other drinks, maybe because the water is bad, maybe because one does not dare ask for something which costs nothing.

Further, it is necessary to take into account the prejudices in favor of alcohol, the belief, so widespread and so carefully entertained by certain physicians, that alcohol is useful, or even necessary, especially for those who are engaged in fatiguing and prolonged work.

But the initial motive, the prime mover in alcoholism, the only reason general enough and powerful enough to explain both its diffusion and its lightning-like progress among savages who become acquainted with it, and its tenacious resistance to the most active movements against it, is unquestionably the need of distraction, of enlivenment, of escaping for the moment from the painful realities of life; it is, in other words, the need of **euphoria**, the desire to get slightly or profoundly intoxicated, the stifling of the feelings of discomfort or of fatigue, the fleeting sensation of well-being which immediately follows the taking of alcohol, or other substances which take its place among other peoples, such as the betel-nut, hashish, or opium.

"The narcotic substances," says Grotjahn, "do not act primarily through the satisfaction of taste; they act directly upon the brain surface and waken feelings of pleasure wholly independent of the sense organs and of perceptions of the external world. This is why the enjoyment that results from taking these sub-

stances holds a place quite by itself among the pleasures of life. In fact, there is no other method, independent of external perceptions and the organs of sense, of thus procuring for oneself agreeable impressions of which we can prescribe the duration and intensity."*

Thus it is natural that, other conditions being equal, the psychological need of substances like alcohol or its substitutes should be the stronger the more narrowly the field of enjoyments of a higher order is limited by the monotony of existence, by defects in working conditions, by increased anxieties, by poverty of intellectual and moral life.

The pensioner, the provincial officer, the commander of the "small garrison," drink because they are bored, because their existence is desperately empty.

The man who has troubles and annoyances, and who lacks moral force, becomes alcoholic because alcohol quiets and puts to sleep his disquiet or his suffering. The workman when he is overworked, under-fed, haunted by the fear of non-employment, deprived of intellectual enjoyments, devoid of ideals, gives himself up to drink, because he has no other pleasures—other pleasures, at least, which are not associated with the saloon—or because alcohol offers him the means of distraction for some minutes or some hours, according to the amount, from the disagreeable sensations which he experiences from his bad condition of wages, of work, of dwelling or of nutrition.

And it is here that there appear the economic factors of alcoholism, the connection between the need for the feeling of well-being, inherent in human nature, and the situation in which the worker is placed in society.

Certainly, all that I have said so far shows clearly that I do not pretend to limit a problem as complex as alcoholism to this single cause. But, even when we have taken account of the factors of climate, of heredity, of custom, it remains none the less true that economic conditions exert a considerable influence—we are even inclined to say a preponderating influence—upon the development of alcoholism.

How Present Economic Conditions Favor Alcoholism

Domela Nieuwenhuys clearly exposed himself to easy refutation when he wrote recently that, "Intemperance is a consequence of the capitalistic system, and will only disappear with the system itself."

There were drunkards, and noteworthy drunkards, before the capitalistic period. There will still be some of them, according to all appearances, if the capitalistic system finally disappears. But that does not stand in the way of the fact that widespread popular alcoholism may be a phenomenon correlated with capitalism, and that the development of the capitalistic regime acts upon the production, the sale and the consumption of alcohol.

Until recent times, spirits, produced by distillation from wine, were sold only by apothecaries, and alcoholism produced by the consumption of wine or of beer remained the privilege of the rich. The peasants, who formed the immense majority of the population, were too poor to use strong drink regularly. On certain feast days they got drunk without stint, but in the intervals they were temperate of necessity.

It is capitalism that has made alcohol accessible to everybody, by revolutionizing the industries of the brewery, of wine-making, of distilling, turning out at a low price in the markets of the world ever-increasing quantities of alcoholic

*Dr. Alfred Grotjahn: *Der Alkoholismus*, 1898.

drinks from the beers made stronger in alcohol for the export trade, and wines often adulterated, to spirits made from molasses, potatoes and artichokes.

It is capitalism also that, to provide an outlet for this over-production, seeks to multiply the sales of drink, either by establishing "Alcohol Palaces," whose false luxury is the people's only parlor, or by inducing numerous citizens, workmen or from the middle classes, to open a saloon to get a living or to supplement their resources. . . .

It is capitalism which tends to increase the consumption of alcohol by the prolongation of excessive hours of labor, the crowding of workmen's families into the poor quarters of the cities, the subjection of the proletariat, or at least the larger part of it, to living conditions which are both dangerous and abnormal.

We know very well that, in having recourse to alcohol in the hope of alleviating evils from which they suffer, laborers are simply aggravating their condition. But we also know that most of them persist in believing the contrary. We know that the use of alcohol, by the momentary sense of relief that it brings, contributes to perpetuating the error; moreover, while admitting that an intensive campaign might disabuse them of the idea, it would not overcome the attraction of narcotization by alcohol, the temptation so natural to those in discomfort and misery to procure by an artifice the moments of happiness that their normal life refuses them.

The efficiency, then, of the propaganda against alcohol depends, to a large degree, upon the people's attaining a happier life.

Certainly the alcohol question is not, or rather not merely, a question of housing and of wages, but better houses, higher wages, are essential elements in solving the alcohol problem.

Consequently, in the matter of opposing alcoholism, direct and indirect efforts, so far from excluding each other, ought to be mutually helpful.

In fighting alcoholism, one is working for increased wages because one increases in this way the resources and energies of labor; in striving to increase wages, we are working to diminish alcoholism because it tends to suppress, at least in part, the motives which push the lower classes to self-alcoholization.

Alcoholism and a Higher Wage Scale

The middle class man, employer or philanthropist, willingly agrees with the first of these propositions, but gives it a very different significance from what I have given it; but he vigorously rejects the second, and goes so far as to pretend that the increase of wages would have the effect of increasing rather than of diminishing alcoholism.

How often have we heard it said that if wages were increased, whether directly or indirectly, by the reduction of hours of labor, workmen, not knowing what to do with their money and their time, would eagerly increase their consumption of alcohol. Moreover, in support of this opinion, certain facts are cited which at first sight seem to confirm this view in part. What proves that an increase in wages would not diminish alcoholism, we are told, is the fact that workmen who are relatively sober in times of stringency, drink much more in times of prosperity. When wages rise, the consumption of alcohol increases; when they fall, it declines in proportion.

On the other hand, it is not, or not always, the worst paid workmen, the most badly nourished, worst treated, who really consume the most alcohol; for example, agricultural laborers in general earn less and drink less than city

laborers; mill girls, whose working conditions are almost always miserable, drink less than their better paid companions. The Japanese and the Chinese, with their starvation wages, are more sober than Europeans. The starving peasants of Russia, the factory workers who, lodged in frightful holes, work fourteen or fifteen hours a day, get intoxicated possibly more on certain days, but become alcoholized on the average much less than the peasants of Normandy and the workmen having good wages on the wharves of Calais.

Likewise in Belgium, the Flemish provinces which, to quote Bertillon, present a collection of sociological dregs, have an alcohol consumption, and especially a consumption of spirits, smaller than the rich industrial Walloon provinces. How can one pretend, therefore, that insufficiency of wages, with all the evils that result from it, constitutes one of the principal causes of alcoholism, and that the increase of wages would bring about a diminution of this evil?

To answer these objections, without denying the element of truth which they may contain, let us first examine whether it is true to say that the consumption of alcohol always increases or diminishes with the rate of wages.

It is a fact that, in all industrial countries, crisis years, 1848 and 1886, for example, were marked by a fall, the years of prosperity, like those following the Franco-Prussian war, or, more recently, the years 1899 and 1900, by an increase more or less marked in alcoholic consumption.

In his address on Labor and Alcohol which John Burns delivered at Free Trade Hall, Manchester, October 31, 1904, he produced a chart upon the variations in the conditions of the people from 1888 to 1903, showing a parallelism more or less clear between the fluctuations of wages and the consumption of beer and spirits.

Commenting upon his figures, Burns draws these conclusions:

"The theory which would affirm dogmatically that poverty is the cause of alcoholism is badly damaged by the fact that the expenditures for strong drinks in the families of the middle or higher classes are two and one-half times larger than in the families of the industrial classes, although by reason of other causes the effects of this expenditure is less apparent.

"But the strongest reply that one can make to this theory is the fact established by statistics that, if wages rise, convictions for drunkenness increase, cases of insanity increase, and infractions of the law due to heavy drinking follow the same course. On the other hand, it is to be observed that, in the rural districts, where wages are low, public drunkenness is more rare, and the cases of insanity due to drink more infrequent. In support of these views and of the statistics, the Prison Commissioner's Report (P. 16 Judicial Statistics, 1899) says: 'A year of great prosperity, 1899, was also a year of great intemperance.'

"However, the cases of drunkenness per 100,000 population for 1899 were, I am pleased to say, much fewer than in the preceding periods of prosperity like 1890 and 1884; our most prosperous year was also the one marked by the heaviest drinking."

I have emphasized these last words because they will help us understand the error in the theory which Burns seems to accept almost without reservation.

In reality, if laborers have a very natural tendency to increase their expenditure for alcohol when they have more money in their pockets, it has ceased to be true, and is more and more ceasing to be true, that the consumption of alcohol always rises or falls with the rise or fall in wages.

This is clearly shown in the case of Belgium.

From 1893 to 1903, Belgian industry passed through a time of exceptional prosperity. Wages, especially in 1899 and 1900, rose considerably. Nevertheless, the consumption of alcohol remained nearly stationary. It tended rather to decline, as appears from a table in which I have placed the wages received by coal miners and the government figures as to the consumption of spirits.

It is proper to note, however, three facts which diminish to a certain extent the value of these figures:

1. The illegal production of alcohol appears to have increased after the taxes were raised in 1896, and especially after the tax was fixed, February 18, 1903, at 150 francs per hectoliter.

2. The rise in the price of alcohol may have counterbalanced somewhat the rise in wages.

3. The consumption of beer increased, while the consumption of spirits tended to diminish, from 182 litres annually per capita ($4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent alcohol), it rose in 1900 to 219 litres.

Nevertheless, if one can support the contention that, in spite of statistical appearances, the consumption of absolute alcohol has not declined, it remains no less certain that it has not at all, or scarcely, increased during the exceptionally prosperous years, 1890-1900; from which one concludes that rising wages do not always lead to a corresponding increase in alcoholic consumption.

In reality, if it is true that workmen, little developed, profiting by a **short and temporary** increase in wages, too often increase also their alcoholic excesses, it appears, on the contrary, that all permanent and normal rise in the scale of living tends—other conditions being equal—to a decline in alcoholism.

But then, it will be said, how shall we explain the incontestable fact that in Flanders and generally in agricultural sections the consumption of spirits is less, on the average, than in an industrial section like Wallony.

First, because the beer in Flanders, ordinarily, is more strongly alcoholic than that in the Walloon districts. Then, and especially, because in Flanders the need of spirits, however intense it may be, is not so readily satisfied as in the cities or industrial sections because drinking places are fewer; wages are lower.

No money, no alcohol!

Just as it is not the hungriest people who are the best customers of the butcher and the baker, it is not necessarily those most thirsting for spirits who are necessarily the best customers of the liquor seller.

Where Industrial Alcoholism Is Low

That is why one finds two low degrees of alcoholism among laborers: On the one hand, in the poorest countries, in the most miserable lodgings of the lower classes, because of the lack of money, the lowest wages act as a sort of automatic check; on the other hand, in the most prosperous countries, in the better lodgings of the people, because of other checks of a moral and intellectual order, together with better living conditions, conditions tend to reduce the need, or rather the desire, for alcohol, and consequently the consumption of strong drink. Only, between the upper and the lower minimum, there is this fundamental difference, that the laborers having better dwellings drink less as their situation improves, while the laborers of the lower rank drink more as their opportunities for securing alcohol increase.

This was signally proved by the Governor of Eastern Flanders in his very careful and well-authenticated statement in the agricultural inquiry in Belgium in 1886:

"The rural working population is less given to intemperance than that of the cities, but there are certain localities, notably in the sea-coast region, where the farmers abandon themselves to intemperance and thus neglect their farms. Let us note again that it is rare to find in the country women who become addicted to drink, and that, in general, drunkenness there is confined to Sundays and holidays.

"Only," added the Governor, replying to a question whether the rate of wages had an influence upon intemperate habits, "inversely to what occurs in the cities, almost always, with an increase in rural wages, there is a corresponding increase in consumption of liquors."

It is perfectly true, for example, that agricultural laborers (Belgium), relatively sober during the rest of the year, except on Sundays and holidays, give themselves up to frightful alcoholic bouts at harvest-time, when they receive the highest wages.

Some years ago, in a village of Condroz (southeast of the Meuse in the provinces of Liege and Namur) I asked a day-laborer how many drinks he was in the habit of taking daily. And he answered, not without pride: "Last summer during harvest I took sixty drinks one day,"

"What happened to you?"

"I was so well that the next forenoon before dinner I had already taken thirty drinks more. But, to drink like that, I tell you, one can't have a paper stomach!"

Observe that this workman, according to the people of the village, was not what one would call a drunkard; he remained perfectly sober for a fortnight at a time without a single glass of gin, simply for lack of money to buy it.

But suppose now that the same man, imitating many like him, moving into the city, goes to work in some industrial center, becomes a brickmaker, coal miner, quarryman, rolling mill worker—in short, receives higher wages for harder, more unhealthful work. You will see his consumption of alcohol increase; and it is thus that the maximum of alcoholism is found rather in connection with the middle than with the lowest incomes.

The Effect of a Permanently Higher Standard of Living

In England, and especially in the United States, the relative weakness of the strong drinks, the undeniable success of the anti-alcohol work, is principally explained by the higher standard living of the working class, and the possibility of laborers securing for themselves higher and more healthful pleasures.

Thus, one may say, parodying a well-known phrase, a little prosperity pushes one to alcoholism, more of it drives one away from it.

Increase wages, shorten the hours of labor of untrained, ignorant workmen demoralized by their slavery, and perhaps they will take advantage of it, or at least some of them will take advantage of it, to become more alcoholic.

But let these increases of wages, shortening of hours of labor, be achieved by a purposeful people, organized, aspiring to other pleasures than the lower pleasures that drink can give them, and there is no doubt that these conquests, so far from increasing alcoholism, will deal it decisive blows.

This was recognized, for example, by the Swiss industrialist, Mr. Blocher, in an address at Basel ten years after the federal law regulating adult labor was put into effect:

"There were those who feared that we should see the workmen using the leisure that the limiting of the working hours gave them for greater frequenting

of the saloons and for giving themselves up to debauchery. I have seen nothing like this. It is when they have been working night and day that I have found the greatest debauchery. It is at such times the most serious offenses are committed, not only on Sunday and in the evenings, but even in the workshop during the hours of labor. Without doubt, this is not wholly due to prolonged and too fatiguing labor; but the requirement of a shorter day resulted in the introduction of stricter discipline, and then drunkenness was reduced to a minimum."

In conclusion, it is not possible to say that necessarily all material improvement of the conditions of the workingman shows itself in a diminution of alcoholism, but it would be much more false to pretend that alcoholism does not decrease when the standard of living rises in a normal and permanent manner.

Consequently all who sincerely wish to combat alcoholism ought, at the same time, to aid the proletariat in its effort toward social liberation; but, on the other hand, all those who are seeking to free the people ought, from the point of view of success against capitalism, to carry on the struggle against alcohol, that internal foe which constitutes one of the most formidable obstacles to the organization of labor, to the emancipation of labor.

III. THE POLITICAL POINT OF VIEW

Some of our friends, without denying that the alcohol question is very important, consider that it is an independent question, which does not interest the Socialists as such, and consequently that it ought to remain outside their sphere of action.

This attitude—which undoubtedly the liquor sellers who are affiliated with Socialists regard favorably—could be understood if the movement against alcoholism were not, in the last analysis, one of the aspects of the movement which the common people are conducting for their liberation; or again, if it were true that in the present state of affairs this struggle is to be totally ineffective; or if, on the other hand, in a social order that would provide for the well-being of all, alcohol would disappear of itself without the necessity of any other effort in the way of agitation or coercion to make it disappear.

But, if one agrees with us in the social and economic point of view, it becomes impossible to maintain any one of these three suppositions.

Even under a communistic or collectivist regime, the workers would continue to alcoholize themselves—as many people in comfortable circumstances do today—if they persist in believing that alcohol is necessary to overcome the fatigue of hours of labor, or to while away the hours of tedium.

On the contrary, we have shown that, even under the capitalistic regime, workers could let alcohol alone, and that they do so effectively when they join to the knowledge of its uselessness or harmfulness courage to resist the seductions of alcoholic narcosis.

Finally, it is undeniable that the struggle against alcoholism—such, be it understood as Socialists ought to conduct—is directly connected with the popular struggle for emancipation as a whole.

The Financial Gain in Abolishing Alcohol

I am not thinking merely of the resources that the working class could find for its work of education and organization if it should divert to the latter a part

of the millions which today are sustaining the alcohol budget, and in consequence the treasury of the state.*

A Belgian publicist, Louis Bertrand, lately estimated that of ten centimes spent for a glass of gin, one centime alone represented the value of the drink, three centimes the profit of the seller, and six centimes the tax paid to the state. Now, as one considers the more than hundred millions of the amount which the Belgian workers spend annually, this percentage represents ten millions for alcohol, thirty millions for the saloonkeepers, and sixty millions for the government.

Drink Dulls Ambition to Change Conditions

But, important as is this financial question, it is nothing compared to the increase of energy which the workers would be even able to prove if they got out from under the depressing influence of alcoholic drinks.

All who have to do with labor organizations know that a manager or a secretary who begins to drink is a man lost for the cause; it is one of the sources of strength of English trades-unionism that most of its leaders are abstainers. But, what is less well understood, less often seen, is the evil done to the people as a whole, not by drunkenness, which is the exception, but by the so-called moderate use of strong drink, which is almost the general rule.

In taking alcohol to escape the cares, restlessness, uncertainties of their condition, the excessive fatigue resulting from labor, to dull consciousness of their misery, the laboring classes resign themselves to that misery and settle down to making no effort to deliver themselves.

"One cannot deny," said Professor Gruber, "that alcohol is one of the foundations of the present social order. Without it, this present regime would long ago have become intolerable for the unfavored classes."

What the Socialists Can Do Against Drink

From their point of view, then, those who would preserve the present order have not been wrong in being indulgent to those who sell or use strong drink. Only, it is a further reason why Socialists, abandoning the indifference which many of them have shown hitherto, should enter upon the struggle against alcoholism with all the energy which they well know how to put at the service of causes which they have at heart.

Does this mean that, ignoring what separates us, we ought to unite with the Good Templars or the popular Anti-Alcohol Leagues? This is not my thought.

Assuredly, justice must be done to everybody, and no one more than I would acknowledge the devotion, the energy, the services rendered by the men who have freely given themselves to combating alcohol in other places or by other means.

Nevertheless, though our end in this respect is the same, though our efforts can be and ought to be mutually helpful, though it is desirable that our contact with one another should be frequent and our relations cordial, we have not, we can not have, the same language, the same methods. They are anti-alcoholists, but they are not Socialists.

*In 1892 a special commission of the British Association, which included among its members statisticians like Jevons and Leon Levi, came to the conclusion that in the round sum spent for strong drinks the working class, which constituted three-quarters of the population, came in for approximately two-thirds. In this alcoholic expenditure of workers, beer accounted for about two-thirds, spirits for about one-third.

We are anti-alcoholists, but we are, before everything else, Socialists, and for this reason we have, we ought to have, a prejudice in favor of closely uniting our own propaganda against alcohol with our general propaganda.

Further, as the alcohol question is, in our eyes, inseparable from the social question as a whole, the struggle against alcohol ought to be looked upon as one of the methods for the liberation of the working class. And that alone is enough to necessarily differentiate our action from that of the other anti-alcohol groups.

It is in making an appeal to the conscience of the common people, showing them that they are dissipating their resources and strength in drinking, showing them all that they would gain by not drinking, that we would push the war against alcoholism, and that in the very midst of the working groups and organizations themselves.

So far the results are not to be ignored. There is not yet a large number of abstainers among the Socialists, but their influence exceeds their numerical importance; even those who have not the courage or who do not believe it necessary to abstain completely from wine and beer at least understand that it is absolutely necessary to fight by every possible means what is rightly called the **pest of spirits**. . . .

[M. Vandervelde reviews here at some length the efforts, for the most part unsuccessful up to the time this paper was prepared, to abolish the sale of spirits from the Co-operative Houses managed by the labor party, the lack of suitable places where palatable and tempting non-alcoholic drinks can be obtained, the tenacity with which the Belgian workman held to his prejudices in favor of beer and wine, and the attempts in some sections where the beer was poor and the workmen disposed for this reason to use spirits, to establish co-operative breweries in the hope of preventing the consumption of spirits.]

Entire Abstinence as an Advantage to Social Progress.

But, to avoid having the beer question come up to trouble us some day, I believe that the leaders of the Labor party, or of labor organizations, ought to show by their example that it is possible, that it is an advantage, to let alcohol alone, even in the form of fermented drinks. . . .

If I advise abstinence, it is less in the interest of those who abstain than of those who use alcohol immoderately; less in the interest of personal hygiene than of social welfare.

It should not be possible for workers, when advised not to drink alcohol in the form of spirits, to be able to say that it is altogether too easy to give such advice when one does not himself abstain from beer, burgundy or champagne.

We know very well—the editor of **Vorwaerts** [the German Socialist organ] has lately called attention to the fact—that for many of our comrades it may be a sacrifice, after a long day's work, to restrict oneself to drinking nothing but seltzer water or lemonade. But what is this slight sacrifice beside the unexceptionable advantages of the influence of example?

Moreover, a few months, a few weeks even, of abstinence are enough for the "moderate drinker" who completely gives up alcohol to find in such abstinence a personal advantage; one cannot deny that alcohol, in however small doses it may be taken, even if not harmful in manual work, exercises a depressing influence, a paralyzing action, upon the brain centers and upon mental work.

Let us, then, be tolerant for others, but rigorous with ourselves. Let us endeavor to create among the people as a whole and especially in the rising generation groups of abstaining Socialists, who may be for their companions living examples and who will show by the increase in their power to labor, their organizing activity, or their revolutionary energy, all that the working class, taken as a whole, would gain in dignity and in force if it were to **free itself** from the tyranny of alcohol.

The Alcohol Question a Vital Factor in the Social Problem

In summarizing the whole matter, I think that the Social Democrat can not be either disinterested in the alcohol question or confine himself to a more or less benevolent neutrality toward those who are working for temperance or abstinence in the labor organizations.

So far from this question being considered subordinate to other matters more urgent or more essential, alcoholism itself is, on the contrary, a powerful, formidable factor in the revolutionary concerns of today.

Alcoholized laborers, in a moment of passing excitement, are good for riots, but they absolutely cannot be counted upon to lead well the painful and difficult work of freeing their class.

It is not at all a matter of ignorant asceticism—as some seem to believe—that leads the abstinence Socialists to warn their comrades against the immoderate use of strong drink, and advise them to even renounce it altogether. It is not a matter of depriving them of enjoyment, but of substituting for a dangerous and artificial enjoyment greater and nobler pleasures.

Under the influence of alcohol one sees the world as it is not. On the contrary, we want the world to show itself as it is, because the clear vision, the conscience responsive to wrongs, injustices, abuses which people suffer, are the preliminary conditions necessary to their suppression.

If we want the people, instead of trying to forget their misery in alcohol, to abolish that misery, we must combat alcoholism; if we want to see at the head of our organization cool-headed men, men of firm will, we must combat alcoholism; if we want coming generations to be stronger and healthier than the generation of today, we must combat alcoholism.

But for this struggle to be really effective, we must never lose sight of the fact that superficial measures can only give superficial results: the alcohol question is attached to the social question as a whole by ties too close and too numerous for one to hope to solve it without concerning himself at the same time with the fundamental causes of moral and material pauperism.

Hence, let us establish abstinence leagues. Let us endeavor, as Wurm proposed at the Congress of Mayence, to establish locals where one will not be obliged to drink in order to meet his friends or to be present at meetings. Let us give our support to legislative measures against alcohol, although they may be only a fiscal pretext to levy upon the laborer. Above all, let us multiply our efforts to destroy the prejudices in favor of alcohol which still exist among labor.

May these efforts be accomplished, not on the fringes of the Socialist movement, but as an integral part of it. It is from the common people before all from whom must come indispensable moral reform to assure its victory over all the power of domination and demoralization which enslaves them. In this matter, as in all others, the freedom of labor will be the work of the laborers themselves.

THE INTERNATIONAL SERIES

EDITED BY

CORA FRANCES STODDARD *and* EMMA L. TRANSEAU

OF

THE SCIENTIFIC TEMPERANCE FEDERATION

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

1. The Alcohol Question. By Dr. G. von Bunge, Professor of Physiological Chemistry, University of Basel.
2. The University Student and the Alcohol Question. By Dr. Emil Kraepelin, Director of the Clinic for Psychiatry, University of Munich.
3. Alcohol and Mental Work. By Dr. A. Smith, Hospital Medical Director, Marbach on Lake Constance.
4. The Attitude of the Socialist Party Toward the Alcohol Question. By Dr. Emile Vandervelde, Professor of Law in the New University, Brussels; Premier of Belgium.
5. The Influence of Alcohol Upon the Functions of the Brain. By Dr. Rudolf Wlassak, Vienna.
6. The Influence of Alcohol Upon the Race. By Dr. Alfred Ploetz, Editor of *Archiv. fur Rassen-und-Gesellschafts Biologie*, Berlin.
7. Race Welfare. By Dr. Max Gruber, President of the Royal Hygienic Institute, Munich.
8. Experimental Tests of the Influence of Alcohol on Offspring. By Dr. Taav. Laitinen, Director of the Medical Department, University of Helsingfors.
9. The Alcohol Question in the Light of Social Ethics. By Dr. B. Strehler, Neisse, Germany.
10. Industrial Phases of the Alcohol Question. By Alfred H. Stehr, M. D., Doctor of Political Economy, Magdeburg.
11. The Causes of Alcoholism. By Dr. A. Cramer, Gottingen, and Prof. H. Vogt, Frankfort.
12. Alcohol and Crime. By Dr. J. Gonser, Secretary of the German Union Against the Misuse of Alcoholic Drinks, Berlin.