

which allows alcoholism to weigh them down with criminals and "poverty-struck victims," is in no condition to call itself a civilized nation.

The Declaration of Independence.

It remains to be shown that the doctrine of individual liberty and the licensing of the liquor business on the basis of that doctrine is contrary to the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. That it is against the natural law of self-protection for everyone but the liquor dealer who does not drink, and even for him as a part of the community, has been sufficiently demonstrated. The Declaration of Independence says that "the creator has endowed all men with certain inalienable rights, among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." It requires no argument to show that the over-consumption of liquor is not consistent with the life of the consumer his personal liberty, or happiness, or the best life, liberty, and happiness of the community.

Man civil is a part of the community. In primitive days he made himself so. In these days he is born into communal institutions made such by his fathers. A queer, mad, unethical idea possesses the community. It is that because we happen to be born into these institutions that we owe them something more than the mere obligations of a self-constituted co-partnership. The apotheosis of the state, nation, humanity, is on a par with the new gods so often raised by the ancient Athenians. The enacting clause of the constitution may be fitly compared to the articles of agreement of any business co-partnership. The union was formed by each member to the compact to give him a still better opportunity than had before existed to use his abilities for himself. It was not formed that each member should live for the benefit of any other member. On the contrary each member to the union agreed with every other member to uphold certain general conditions the maintenance of which were and are vitally essential to the well-being of each individual and to his using faculties to his best ability for himself. The enacting clause of the constitution is really the tie that binds, and while the articles provide for the government, its machinery and regulation, the enacting clause states what the government is to do and the compass by which the government and citizens must steer. While everyone should know how it reads, the majority do not. Still fewer realize its nature and import. It is well to consider that.

The Constitution.

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and

our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America."

The wonderful thing in the constitution is that it is such an exact statement of the individual law of self-preservation under social conditions. Read as it is writ, there is not one word which can be construed into "living for the general good" save as one's individual good is dependent on the stability of the conditions detailed in the constitution. The framers of the constitution were wiser than their posterity appears to be. They made no apotheosis of "general good". They knew better than to fall down and worship themselves. They knew that "general good" consisted only of the prosperity of themselves individually. They knew that "general good" was at its best, when every man in the union was strong enough, intelligent enough, and "good enough" to be self-supportingly useful to some one else and not interfere with any one else being self-supporting. Another thing the posterity seem not to know is, that no person in the United States has any rights under the constitution, that means to citizenship, who is not able to and does not contribute to the maintenance of all its conditions. "Women, imbeciles and paupers" are barred. Even that is not carried out. Paupers, in the poor houses, can and do vote in many states. There seems to be no provision for loss of citizenship on a person becoming unfit to fulfill the conditions of citizenship. An amendment in this direction is much needed. Criminals do not lose their citizenship by being such. They simply lose the privilege of voting while imprisoned. There can be no question that according to the broad and yet strict reading of the constitution the liquor business and the licensing the same, under the idea of a public necessity, is unconstitutional. The statistics have been published that no one can doubt that the recognition of this "public necessity" is the cause of more crime, more poverty, more misery than any other civilized (?) institution. The weakness of men for liquor rendering them unfit to form sound judgments or to maintain themselves, renders such unfit to fulfill the duties of citizenship according to the constitution. The man who cannot support himself, cannot pay taxes. The man who cannot support himself from his weakness for liquor cannot support his family. Who does then? Those who support themselves and pay taxes for the maintenance of the government and upholding the Union. Again, the liquor dealer supports himself and his family, and does his part as a citizen. Where then is he so immoral as to be held up to derision?

If the liquor business is constitutional then it must be shown that it is "establishing justice" to license a business

whereby hundreds make of themselves paupers and fail to maintain their families, both becoming a burden to the public. True it is but just that those who license the business should pay the bills. Still it is not very high justice that permits a man's bad habits to make paupers of devoted wife and innocent babes. Does the liquor business "insure the domestic tranquillity?" The records of the police court, the disturbances of our streets, the robberies and murders that find their origin in the liquor habit show how opposed the whole business is to the constitution. Does the liquor business help "provide for the common defense"? Yes, in so far and no farther as that very moral gentleman, the liquor dealer, who pays his taxes and does not drink, contributes to the general fund and no farther. As a given civilization is to be judged by the proportion of self-supporting citizens it has in comparison with the number of criminals, paupers and imbeciles, in and out of public institutions, so no state is defensively stronger than its percentage of able-bodied, intelligently strong men, in comparison to another state. As liquor does more to make criminals, paupers and imbeciles, than any other factor it certainly is a menace to the common defense and the business cannot be constitutional. The same can be said as to its promoting the general welfare. As every man who becomes a victim of the liquor habit is self-evidently a slave to his own weakness, it is evident that he is not securing the "blessing of liberty" to himself nor to the family which he makes the slave of poverty, nor to the public that pays to maintain both him and his family. Is it not evident that the liquor business is unconstitutional? There is nothing either in natural law, the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution, which justifies the "individual right" of a citizen to weaken his self-maintaining power through liquor; or that he shall impoverish others, or make himself and those legally dependent on him by his own act a burden on others. The ethical law of self-preservation should force every intelligent, self-maintaining citizen to look on the liquor business as a personal enemy, therefore a common enemy, against which he and all who maintain the government should unite in "common defense."

The License Question.

Certainly, no further proof is necessary. One point alone remains to be discussed. Why license the saloon? Why penalize the saloon keeper by such extraordinary license fees? It has been shown that when he drinks not of his poison that he is an ethical and moral man in so far as his business is concerned, when it supports him. If licensing the saloon finds its only justification in the individual right of a man to weaken his powers of self-maintenance, then no