

KEEP LINCOLN "DRY" AND DECENT

What reasons are there to offer for bringing the saloons back to Lincoln? What will be the benefits of changing the policy Lincoln has been following for the two years past? Who will be the beneficiaries of a change in this policy? Will there be any suffer by reason of changing back to the discarded system of licensed saloons?

These are a few of the many and pertinent questions that press for answer during the present campaign. The man who seeks the best for himself, his family, his community and his country, will strive to find intelligent answers to these questions.

"License and regulation will increase business!" That is the first declaration of the man who argues in favor of licensing saloons. Will that answer stand the test?

Undoubtedly the abolition of the saloon from Lincoln injured some classes of business—the business depending in whole or in part upon the manufacture and sale of intoxicants. But the cold statistics, easily available, point to the undisputed fact that during the year 1910 Lincoln, without a licensed saloon within her corporate limits, enjoyed the greatest period of prosperity in her history. The bank clearings were larger, the building record was far above the average, the postoffice receipts were larger, every retail merchant practically without exception reported larger sales and better collections. Compared with other cities of the same class licensing saloons, Lincoln had fewer unemployed men, fewer calls for charity, fewer arrests for crimes and misdemeanors, cleaner streets, more public work completed and more public improvements initiated.

Opponents of the "dry" policy have made much of the number of empty houses in Lincoln. That there are many empty houses in Lincoln no one will attempt to deny. But on the other hand there are more occupied houses in Lincoln today than ever before in her history. There are fewer empty houses in proportion to the population than in wide open Denver, wide open Omaha, wide open South Omaha and wide open Kansas City. The average home in Lincoln today is larger, better, cleaner and more sanitary than the average home in any license city of the same size in America. Lincoln today presents the splendid spectacle of a city without saloons, slums, red light districts, wine rooms or sweat shops.

There is not today a single, solitary argument in favor of the licensed saloon—not even the arguments of revenue, regulation or business. Twenty-five saloons at \$1,500 a year each would mean a revenue of \$37,500. To meet the results would require a doubled police force, more money to maintain the jails, more costs to the taxpayers for criminal prosecutions, more misery, more woe and more heartaches. It would mean withdrawing \$1,000,000 a year from the legitimate channels of trade and diverting it into channels that run red with the blood and tears of men, women and children.

For the mere purpose of a few paltry dollars of gain there are men who would scorn to engage in the liquor business themselves but who will seek to fasten upon a community a system that reaps rich profit from the wrecking of men, the wrecking of homes and the wrecking of society.

The argument of license and regulation is without foundation in fact. Carried to its logical conclusion it would render nugatory every law for the protection of life and property, and grant indulgences to every foe of society. The fact that whisky is clandestinely sold in Lincoln today is no argument in favor of a return to license. Men will commit crimes of every character, no matter how many nor how strict the laws. What man will dare stand forth and favor license and regulation of crime because laws are unable to wholly stop them?

Lincoln today, without a saloon, is the cleanest city of its size in America. It has fewer unemployed in proportion to population, fewer hovels, fewer hopeless men and women, fewer child workers, better school facilities and a healthier moral atmosphere. It is the largest city in America abolishing saloons on its own motion, and the resultant advertising has attracted to Lincoln the attention of the best men and women in America.

Its business today is built upon a sure foundation, not upon a foundation of dead men's bones. It is appealing to the best there is in men, not to the worst.

Shall Lincoln return to the old conditions? Shall it be said of her, this city of homes and schools and churches and universities and clubs, that for a paltry \$37,500 a year it will open up twenty-five saloons to pour into the social system the veriest dregs? Shall it be said of such a city that after two prosperous years under a system that makes for character building and business progress, it will trade off the results for a mess of pottage—sell for a pitiful \$37,500 a year the privilege of opening up twenty-five places to lure men to destruction, to cater to their baser appetites, to build up a political system that has always traded of the welfare of society for gold!

Ever hear of a rotten, corrupt political deal being cooked up in the rear of a department store or a grocery? Ever hear of schemes to loot the public being hatched up by a coterie of crooks in the rear room of a church or a schoolhouse? Where is the natural habitat of the porchclimber, the strong-arm man, the political crook and the grafter on the public? Lincoln is well rid of them now; shall she permit the return of them in order to put \$37,500 a year into her school fund and force all the evils that will follow upon the public in order that a few men may make paltry dollars and others given unbounded opportunity to exercise the "personal liberty" that simply means unbridled license.

Every man who votes for license votes to make himself a partner in and beneficiary of the saloon business. He is a party to all the evil results that flow from the licensed liquor traffic. There is no difference, morally, between the man who sells liquor over the bar and the man who makes it possible for liquor to be thus sold.

The argument that it is better to have it sold openly and under rigid regulation than to have it sold clandestinely, is the sheerest rot. It is an argument just as available for the men who want to run lotteries, steal horses, burglarize banks or break down the social system by unbridled indulgence of the baser passions.

The argument that there is more whisky "bootlegged" in Lincoln today than was sold over the bars of the city when we had saloons is too silly to give consideration. And even if it were true it would be no argument in favor of licensed drinking places, with their wide open doors, their conviviality, their appeal to the social instinct and their readiness to take the last dollar.

The license system is an economic wrong. Utterly aside from the question of morals, every dollar spent for intoxicating beverages is an economic waste. Every hour spent in front of a saloon bar is an economic waste. Every drink taken for "good-fellowship" means an economic waste of human energy and vitality. One hundred dollars' worth of beer represents \$4 paid for labor. One hundred dollars' worth of shoes represents \$32 paid for labor. Which are you for—shoes or booze? Of all articles sold on the market, whisky and beer represent the lowest labor cost, and for every dollar paid to labor by manufacturers of intoxicants, \$900 is exacted in tribute from the workingmen of America.

Let us keep this evil out of Lincoln—the evil of the open saloon. The "bootlegger" skulking through the back alley is not keeping open house and luring the young men to destruction.

Dirty dollars vs. Men and Women!

Revenue vs. Righteousness!

Mammon vs. Morality!

On which side will you take your stand?

The editor of Will Maupin's Weekly has never yet cast his vote for the open saloon, and he is too old to begin now. He never thought enough of a dollar to trade a conviction for it, and he is too old to begin now. He denies to no man the right to drink if he so desires, and reserves to himself the right to take a drink if he so pleases. But he denies the right of any man