

University of Richmond

UR Scholarship Repository

Honors Theses

Student Research

Spring 1966

The moderate period of the Temperance reform, 1776-1833

Edith C. Burrows

University of Richmond

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Social History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Burrows, Edith C., "The moderate period of the Temperance reform, 1776-1833" (1966). *Honors Theses*. 334.

<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/334>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND LIBRARIES



3 3082 01028 5210

The Moderate Period of the Temperance Reform

1776 - 1833

Edith C. Burrows
History 392
May 26, 1966

Preface

Temperance as an organized reform began at the end of the American Revolutionary War, its leaders inspired by the ravages dealt by alcoholism to the soldiers and sailors. At first self-control was desired; later self-denial was its dominant theme. Limited as it was, the temperance crusade, led by the aristocracy and the clergy, was naturally gradual in acquiring acceptance and strength. The course of its development from the 1780's until the mid-1830's was one of moderate demands, as compared with the later extremism, and one led by the fiery clerics and their assemblies, compared to the later common lay leadership. These crusaders saw their land in great need of immediate reform.

... in a country where there is no excuse of want on the one hand, or of habits of conviviality on the other... Certain it is that the vice threatened to poison society. 1

They recognized the possibilities for reform; they were vast and unknown, exciting and exhilarating. The American conditions were a challenge and an opportunity for social reformation which, in the long run, did not go unmet.

Michaud, a Frenchman traveling in America at the turn of the nineteenth century, observed a widespread passion for hard liquors among those he met. This habit, he noticed, often resulted in excessive drinking, particularly since rum, brandy and whisky were readily obtainable.² Many other foreigners, among them John Melish, Harriet Martineau, James Stuart and Charles Janson, had similar thoughts and experiences.³ These men and women traveled through every section of the country and, although they might not have consciously realized it, they saw the reasons for such hearty consumption.

The benevolence and generosity of nature was the cause. The fertile soil, the abundant rainfall and the excellent growing seasons brought rich harvests to many farmers. Vast surpluses of grains and fruits were available for those unable to purchase the imported wines and brandies. Cider was always available. Peaches, grapes, blackberries and cherries were ingredients for delicious cordials and wines. Easily grown grains made excellent malt and brewed beverages.⁴ If there was a lack of any necessary ingredient, the farmer simply made substitutes, creating their own concoctions, some harmful, many distasteful and a few desirable.

If barley be wanting to make into malt,
We must be content and think it no fault,
For we can make liquor to sweeten our lips,
Of pumpkins, and parsnips, and walnut-tree chips. 5

Such new beverages were mead, mulled wine, cherry bounce, sling, perry, toddy and flip, the latter a combination of beer, sugar and rum given its particular flavor by the "insertion of a hot poker." ⁶

Each region, because of its relative proximity to the ocean, its particular economic conditions and its subsequent trade, had its favorite beverages. In the New England area, where the triangular trade was a major source of commerce, rum or "Jamaica spirits," ⁷ a product of distilled West Indian molasses, became very popular. It became so desirable and so generally consumed that verses were composed to perpetuate this dependence on rum.

Their only wish and only prayer
From the present world to the world to come
Was a string of eels and a jug of rum. ⁸

Besides rum, cider was a welcomed refreshment in the Northeast. According to Horace Greeley, a barrel of cider a week was the usual allotment for a Vermont family. ⁹ Since it could be produced quite easily wherever there were apple trees, it was consumed in quite large quantities. In his Recollections, Greeley characterized the predominance of these two drinks in rural Vermont.

In my childhood there was no merry-making, there was no entertainment of relatives or friends, there was scarcely a casual gathering of two or three neighbors for an evening's social chat, without strong drink. Cider always, while it remained drinkable without severe contortion of the visage; rum at seasons and on all occasions were required and provided. No house or barn was raised without a bountiful supply of the

latter and generally of both. A wedding without 'toddy', 'flip', 'sling', or 'nunch' with rum undisguised in abundance would have been deemed a poor, mean affair, even among the penniless.¹⁰

The more wealthy, and often the more thrifty, of the northerners distributed wine, gin and brandy at gatherings. These they had imported from Europe.

The seaboard planters in the South, being the wealthier element of the population, also imported vast quantities of wine and brandy. However the men of the back-country drank corn whisky, a less expensive local brew, or peach brandy, as in Georgia. The author of an old treatise on early citizens of Georgia stated that the production and distribution of brandy were the most profitable of all employments. He told of Micaiah McGehee, the first settler on the Broad River to plant an orchard, the peaches of which annually netted him \$1600, a large income for the period and location.¹¹ Such peaches made a delicious brandy.

On the frontier, home grown products and homemade liquors were universally consumed. Instead of rum or peach brandy, corn whisky was the principal cause of drunkenness. Originally distilled from grains for home consumption, it soon became a commercial favorite. James Finley, the famous Methodist revivalist, noted that it was substituted for currency in some sections of the West.¹² The settlers around Lexington, Kentucky paid

their church dues with whisky. Often in the hill regions whisky was the only product common to everyone, and therefore used as barter.

The popularity of all these beverages, corn whisky, peach brandy and rum, was greatly enhanced by the Revolutionary War period. This was especially true of whisky which was readily available, whereas good rum was very difficult to obtain. When the war broke out, each colony was requested to provide the best liquor attainable for its militia; records show that poor whisky was the chief product furnished. The strenuous efforts made to acquire it indicate the widespread use of whisky.¹⁴

Following the war, the American social conditions and customs were altered. All of the immediate and inevitable results of warfare, laxity in social controls and in the religious restrictions, the example of the immoral life in camp and on battlefield, led to a wide acceptance by farmers, soldiers and merchants of drinking to excess.¹⁵

The first serious, though ineffective, efforts against the use of distilled liquors as beverages began at this time. During the War of Independence the habit was growing in intensity and demanded the attention of public leaders, and their influence toward restriction. The political leaders, those of the aristocracy and of wealth, were the first to recognize and openly move against the evils associated with

drunkenness. The moral leaders of the established churches and of the new sects, and those of the medical profession soon identified the crusade as their own and became avid organizers of the temperance movement.

The major political leaders of the period, George Washington, John Adams and Benjamin Franklin, were resolutely opposed to drunkenness and the evils it produced. John Adams, as early as 1761, reflected openly on the preponderance of drunkenness and the evils of the "tippling taverns." Then only twenty-five years old, he recorded in his "Journal"

(I) discharged my venom to Bill Veasey against the multitude of poverty, ill-government, and ill effects of licensed houses, and the timor-our temper, as well as the criminal design, of the select men who grant them appropriation. 16

With such an influential person presenting strong opposition, ~~it is not surprising that~~ Adam's village of Braintree, Massachusetts voted to allow no person in the town to be licensed to sell spirituous liquors. 17

Benjamin Franklin, a champion of all progressive reforms, was another man desiring more moderation among his Americans. He was a man of more abstemious habits than was Adams. As a journeyman printer in London, Franklin often admonished his fellow workers on their drinking habits. Throughout his later life, "amid the allurements of exalted stations, even at the dissipated court of France,"¹⁸ he remained opposed to all liquors.

These men, along with other political leaders in the 1774 Continental Congress, wrote and adopted a manifesto against the evils inherent in and caused by intoxicants.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the several Legislatures of the United States immediately to pass laws the most effectual for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain, by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived, if not quickly prevented. 19

Little was accomplished by this somewhat weak directive. Only one state, New Hampshire, chose to follow the advice of the Continental Congress. Eighteen months after the manifesto was issued, in August 1775, the New Hampshire legislature passed a preamble and resolution in which it lamented the great prevalence of intemperance, and suggested that the liquor given to soldiers on muster days should be reduced, and that they should be completely eliminated on the days of the officers' elections. This made little impression on the public, it being too superficial and unenforceable to restrain the contemporary social customs. 20

During the war, General George Washington exerted his influence to moderate the soldiers' drinking. On March 25, 1776 he issued orders at Cambridge, Massachusetts recommending that all officers of the Continental Army do their utmost to prevent soldiers from visiting the numerous tipping houses.

Washington's firm example was followed by many leading

military men and legislative bodies during the war. The Pennsylvania Colonial Assembly on April 4, 1776 reduced the daily rations to one quart of small beer per soldier. Maryland set the rations for the Maryland militia and troops in the Continental Army at one-half pint rum daily per man. The other colonies followed these examples, that of Pennsylvania being the more popular, perhaps because of the quantity. The Continental Congress in September 1776 prohibited the sale of all liquors to soldiers, thus recognizing the work of the colonies and attempting greater uniformity.²¹

These political and military attempts to limit and eventually restrict intemperance were followed in the early national period by Congressional action. Interest in temperance, as a result of drinking excesses in the camps and on the battlefields, had increased greatly. This was illustrated clearly by the fact that figures on the importation and production of hard liquors from the early census reports were widely quoted among those well-informed and interested members of society. Alexander Hamilton, the first Treasurer of the United States, was one of the most well-informed. He was quite concerned about procuring revenues through taxes and imposts on distilled liquors. In 1787 he urged Congress to accept such a tax. He published this suggestion in the Federalist two years later.²²

Hamilton was not alone in his efforts, a fact verified by a 1789 Congressional debate on taxing imposts. Honorable

Roger Sherman of Connecticut suggested a tax on West Indian rum of fifteen cents per gallon. A Mr. Lawrence of New York felt that this would probably result in more smuggling. A Pennsylvanian, Mr. Fitzsimmons, replied that there were

No object from which they could collect revenues more to be subjected to a high duty than ardent spirits of every kind, and if they could lay the duty so high as to lessen the consumption any degrees the better, for it is not an article of necessity but of luxury, and a luxury of the most pernicious kind.²³

Madison of Virginia agreed with Fitzsimmons, saying

I would tax this article with as high a duty as can be collected, and I am sure, if we judge from what we have heard and seen in the several parts of the Union, that it is the sense of the people of America that this article should have a duty imposed upon it weighty indeed.²⁴

With such growing unanimity on this question and the subsequent pressure for a law, Congress included in the Revenue Act of 1791 an excise tax to limit liquor selling.²⁵ Hamilton felt that this might bring to the government as much as \$826,000. However before it could be enacted nationally the second Congress in 1792 amended this act by the addition of more restrictions. They included a special tax on foreign liquors, stricter licenses for distilleries, and an increase in the amount of duty on distilled liquors.²⁶

Regretably, the immediate result of this law was the Whisky Rebellion in western Pennsylvania in 1792, opposition which dramatically revealed the local importance and predominance of domestic distilling. The farmers were encour-

aged in their actions by the Pennsylvania state legislature which publicly questioned the right of the Federal government to tax the local production of hard liquors.²⁷ From then on it was evident that the liquor problem could not be solved simply by national action, that personal and local aid was desperately needed for a successful reform.

The most famous of the first individuals who realized this need, who publicly demonstrated and nationally campaigned for temperance was Doctor Benjamin Rush. A reforming physician for over twenty years, Benjamin Rush was nationally known as "the true instaurator" and the "prophet" of the temperance reform.²⁸ From 1766 until 1769 this distinguished Philadelphia practitioner was traveling in England and on the Continent, associating with such influential persons as Mirabeau, Samuel Johnson, Sir Joshua Reynolds and Oliver Goldsmith.²⁹ On his return to America he was elected a member of the Provincial Assembly of Pennsylvania. Politically adept, he rose to the position of chairman of the Committee for Independence in the Second Continental Congress. As such he moved the important resolution for national independence June 23, 1776 and signed the Declaration of Independence.

Rush was influenced to direct temperance reform not only because of his sense of responsibility in a public station but also because of his involvement with the inebriated element of society and his early contacts with anti-intemperance groups. As

a physician he observed frequently and directly the results of excessive drinking. The harsh reality of these scenes struck him more forcefully than did any factual account of the ravages of alcoholism. A Quaker by birth, Rush was influenced by the teachings of his faith, teachings which emphasized the evils of hard liquors. Also as a young man, he frequently associated with the early Methodist leaders, Asbury, Coke, Whatcost and McKendrew, who like the Quakers taught strict temperance to their followers. 30

In 1778 Rush, then the Physican-General of the Middle Department of the Continental Army, began his campaign by publishing a document against intemperance among soldiers. It was immediately adopted by the War Board of the Continental Congress. This appeal, the first recognized officially by the United States government, was circulated throughout the Army camps during the remainder of the war. 31

Directions for Preserving the Health of Soldiers was a refutation of the commonly accepted belief that ardent spirits relieved fatigue and protected against heat and cold. Rush was certain that drinking provoked certain camp diseases such as fever and jaundice. His proposal that beer and ale be substituted for the stronger and more common intoxicants was the basis for later, more scientific writings on this subject. 32

Six years later Rush published another pamphlet which received wide publicity, An Inquiry into the Effects of Ardent Spirits upon the Human Mind and Body. →

Here he presented a lucid explanation of the effects of drinking on the habitual and non-habitual drinker, social, physical, mental and economic. Mental and nervous disorders were caused by excessive drinking, a point emphasized by several graphic case histories. He suggested substitutes such as coffee, tobacco, beer, wines or cider which would have less harmful effects. Rush recommended both that Americans ignore the "brandy doctors"³³ and imitate the Germans who preferred malt over other intoxicants. These were several of the alternatives and remedies that were discussed in this enlightened treatise. He ended this pamphlet with distressing statistics on mortality due to excessive drinking and a heart-rending plea for moderation. ³⁴ Krout colorfully summarizes this essay and Rush's opinion of the drunkard when he states that here "Rush compares the drunkard to the calf in folly, the ass in stupidity, the skunk in feter, the hog in filthiness, and the tiger in cruelty." ³⁵ (see end of work)

Forceful, alarming and dramatic, this essay attracted the attention of many public officials and of many converted inebriates. Owing to such great interest, this great temperance document was republished in the latter part of 1789, again in 1794 and circulated extensively. ³⁶ It gave birth to the first local temperance organizations. Its influence was unmistakable at the celebration of the adoption of the Federal Constitution July 4, 1787 where no

ardent spirits were included in the refreshments; only beer and cider were consumed. The popularity of the pamphlet also led to correspondence between Rush and "the elder Adams" of Massachusetts and Reverend Doctor Belknap of New Hampshire, all avid temperance men concerned with the wide spread of this social reform. ³⁷

Benjamin Rush, also influential as a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Philadelphia, was able to induce its other members to add their names to a message sent to Congress in December 1790. ³⁸ This communique expressed the College's opposition to the use of intoxicating liquors in any form and for any reason.

...the habitual use of distilled spirits, in any case whatever is wholly unnecessary;... they neither fortify the body against the morbid effects of heat or cold, nor render labour more easy or productive; and... there are many articles of diet which are not only safe and perfectly salutary, but preferable to distilled spirits for the above mentioned purposes. ³⁹

The authors of this memorial to Congress continued, noting the obligations of the Federal government in this field of reform.

Your memorialists have beheld with regret the feeble influence of reason and religion in restraining the evils which they have enumerated. They center their hopes, therefore, of an effectual remedy of them in the wisdom and power of the Legislature of the United States; and in behalf of the interests of humanity, to which their profession is closely allied, they thus publicly entreat Congress, by their obligations to protect the lives of their constituents, and by their regard to the character of our nation, and to the rank of our species in

the scale of beings, to impose such heavy duties upon all distilled spirits as shall be effectual to restrain their intemperate use in our country. ⁴⁰

Doctor Benjamin Rush, a strong advocate of temperance for medical reasons, was also one of the first to realize the impact of religion on reform. He saw this reform connected to the spread of revivalism and evangelism, these being practiced primarily through the new religions, the predominant one Methodism. The Great Revival in the early part of the nineteenth century brought evangelism to its height, emphasizing the part played by the common man in saving his own soul and in bringing salvation to his fellow beings. The religious fervor filled many Americans with a crusading zeal, an ardent desire to rid their world of all vice and corruption. The temperance reform was one natural aspect of this crusade. Rush, in a letter to Jeremy Belknap, ⁴¹ disclosed his views on the necessity of such religious aid in temperance reform.

From the influence of the Quakers and Methodists in checking this evil, I am disposed to believe that the business must be effected finally by religion alone. Human reason has been employed in vain...we have nothing to hope from the influence of law in making men wise and sober. Let these considerations lead us to address the heads of the governing bodies of all the Churches in America. ⁴²

The Methodist Episcopal Church was the first to answer the appeal and address itself directly to the temperance

reform. From early in their history the American Methodist societies under Wesley followed what became known as the "original rule of 1753": "all Methodists in good standing were subject to disciplinary measures for 'drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or using them, unless in cases of extreme necessity.'" 43 This proclamation was ill-received by the public until after the Revolutionary War, after the effect of excessive intoxicants became more apparent.

From then on temperance was a central element in sermons and a topic of conference discussion. A sermon preached by Reverend Ebenezer Sparhawk in Templeton, Massachusetts 1776 was typical of those of the period. It was an unscientific but vivid denunciation of the waste of money involved, the misuse of valuable time and the ruinous effect of excessive drinking on the community, both morally and physically. According to Sparhawk spirituous liquors, specifically rum

puts the blood and juices into a most terrible ferment, and disturbs the whole animal economy. It vitiates the humor, relaxes the solids, spoils the constitution, fills the body with diseases, brings on meagre looks, a chastly countenance, and very bad tremblings: yea, when the abuse of it is persisted in, it quite ruins the health, destroys the strength, introduces decay of nature, and hastens death faster than hard labour. 44

Besides physically ruining a man, intemperance leads to equally harmful destruction of his spirit. He is left with no feelings for religious duties; he is pulled away from the Holy Spirit and the Church which strongly bears witness against intemperance. 45

During the 1780's other prominent Methodist speakers preached, admonished, suggested, appealed to their congregations condemning intemperance and the "Demon Rum." Among these, Thomas Coke and Bishop Asbury were the more distinguished and prolific.⁴⁶ Their sermons were effectual both in influencing the impressionable public against the evils of drink and in publicizing opposition aroused against intemperance.

Some local church groups organized temperance societies; others disagreed audibly and vehemently with their ministers and the radicalism with which they identified. After one quite strong temperance sermon, the Methodist minister noticed a barrel of rum located on the church steps. This was definitely a practical joke, one clear illustration of contempt for and disregard for the reform attempts.⁴⁷

These preachers and their sermons were most effectual in creating enthusiastic audiences in the West, some approving and others disapproving. Their revivalism and camp meetings were at their height, such popularity being due mainly to the warmth and friendliness of close camp life in contrast to the loneliness and isolation characteristic of frontier life in general. During the 1780's Peter Cartwright, James Finley and other Methodist itinerants brought evangelism with its high emotionalism to the rough, steady frontiersmen who gladly welcomed its appearance. The well known James Finley, an experienced revivalist with years of conversion experience,

stated that at a single revival meeting he had over one thousand converts sign the temperance pledge. These "Methodist fanatics", defined as Westerners refusing to drink, were often harassed and condemned unmercifully by the less moralistic element of western society. 48

Peter Cartwright also recognized the growing split among the frontiersmen concerning temperance. He had a difficult time trying to retain "non-dram drinkers" as Methodist pastors because there were on the circuit so many who drank heavily, so few who abstained. One particular case illustrates this conflict. A well known and popular minister was also a confirmed drunkard. When the temperance issue presented itself, he and thirteen loyal members broke from the church. This split continued until a revival was held. Then the obstinate thirteen and approximately forty other reformed drinkers returned to the original congregation. The unfortunate preacher "alas, was unregenerate and 'lived and died a drunkard.'"49

At the same time conferences were being held in the East where Methodists met and organized their efforts against intemperance, these often featuring such enthusiastic speakers as Cartwright and Finley.

The first General Conference of Methodist preachers on record was held in 1780. Two questions were raised concerning alcoholic beverages: "Shall we disapprove of the practice of distilling grains into liquor? Shall we

disown our friends who will not renounce the practice?"⁵⁰
The ministers chose to "disapprove both."⁵¹

Again in 1783 the Methodists had a similar conference where a decision was made to suggest that the membership abandon the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicating drinks; however because this was but an admonition, a suggestion, and not a command, it did not effectively remove from the Methodist societies all drinkers.

Another conference was held in 1788, its importance due primarily to a visit by the eminent physician, Benjamin Rush. Doctor Rush's appearance and his message were alluded to in the biography Life of Reverend Jesse Lee:

The celebrated Dr. Rush visited (it) and delivered an earnest and animated address on the use of ardent spirits, taking the broad ground then so strongly occupied by the Conference, and since then so signally taken and maintained by the temperance reformation....He insisted that allowable cases requiring their use were very few, and seldom occurring, and, when necessary, but very little ought, in any case, to be used; and he besought the Conference to use their influence to stop the use, as well the abuse, of ardent spirits. ⁵²

For the next several years, no one general conference was of particular significance until that held in Virginia in 1797. At that meeting the delegates of the Methodist Episcopal Church passed a resolution which drew them and their congregations together in a common union against the evil alcohol.

Resolved, that we ... do pledge our honor, as well as our word as Christians, not only to abandon the use of ardent spirits ourselves except as a medicine, but also to use our influence to induce others to do the same. ⁵³

In the early decades of the nineteenth century only two General conferences of the Methodist Episcopal faith were memorable, those held in 1812 and 1816. In 1812 Reverend James Axley presented a resolution declaring that "no stationed or local preachers shall retail spirituous or malt liquor without forfeiting his ministerial character among us."⁵⁴ This was a more advanced idea than previous ones introduced as it included fermented liquors with the distilled ones. A heated debate was followed by a vote against the resolution. ⁵⁵

A similar resolution, with the elimination of the reference to malt liquors, was presented to the representatives at the 1816 Conference. It was easily passed and accepted. ⁵⁶

From then on steady advances were made until finally the Methodist Conference, along with other religious organizations, declared for the total prohibition of all sale and use of intoxicants. The clergymen of new England were particularly responsive to the appeals and suggestions made at these conferences. Many of them gave up drinking completely; most reduced the drinking at the ordinations which had previously been excessive. ⁵⁷

Two of these self-reforming Methodist clergymen, later to become distinguished figures in the temperance movement, were Heman Humphrey and Hustin Edwards, Humphrey, later a famous president at Amherst, preached a series of six sermons on intemperance at his home church in the town of Fairfield,

Connecticut. This was probably the first such series of sermons, an idea later made famous by Beecher's six sermons. 58

Reverend Justin Edwards, the more well known of the two, began as a pastor in Andover, Massachusetts in 1815. 59 A preacher of powerful sermons, Edwards was also a forceful temperance writer, being the author of several papers and tracts. In his Temperance Manual Edwards advanced the idea, later common to all temperance reformers, that "entire, perpetual abstinence" 60 was the only means to prevent drunkenness and eventual ruin. Written in the middle 1820's, the manual was instrumental in bringing acceptance to this idea of abstinence. Edward's Well-Conducted Farm, published in 1825, was more widely circulated than the manual and was the main reason for Edward's rise to public attention. This tract was a description of the farm of I.V.S. Wilder, esquire, of Bolton, which he conducted according to strict principles of temperance. Convincingly it advocated abstinence of farm laborers for moral and economic reasons. 61

The Presbyterians also urged temperance on their fellows, as they too were influenced by the social breakdown after the war, and the partial success of the early national reform attempts. Their organized efforts however began at a later date than the Methodists, clearly indicating their dependence on the initiative and the aggres-

sive leadership of this earlier group. It was not until 1797 that any unified move was made by any Presbyterian Synod. In that year, the Presbyterian Synod of Pennsylvania advised its ministers to preach against the evils and causes of intemperance.⁶²

Four years later the General Association of Presbyterian Churches appointed a special committee to report on conditions of the liquor traffic. In 1811 the delegates to the Association, urged by Rush, appointed another committee " to devise measures which, when sanctioned by the General Assembly, may have an influence in preventing some of the numerous and threatening mischiefs which are experienced throughout our country."⁶³ This committee's response to this directory was quite noncommittal and guarded. It noted that there was a definite increase in intemperance; however "after the most faithful and prayerful inquiry, they were obliged to confess they did not perceive that anything could be done."⁶⁴

This pessemistic attitude aroused Rush who demanded another committee be appointed to re-analyze the situation. A report made by this new committee registered the prevalence of drinking:

We are ashamed but constrained to say that we have heard of the sin of drunkenness prevailing - prevailing to a great degree - prevailing even among some of the visible members of the household of faith. What a reflection on the Christian character is this; that they who confess to be bought with a price, and thus redeemed from iniquity, should debase themselves,

by the gratification of appetite, to a level with the beasts that perish! ⁶⁵

A year later in 1812 another report was delivered urging all Presbyterian ministers "" to deliver public discourses on the sin and mischief of intemperate drinking." ⁶⁶ This report also strongly protested against tippling houses as public nuisances and demanded action against them. The Presbyterian Church from this point was committed to an aggressive policy. Later sessions emphasized this policy and pushed for further enactments and restrictions against intemperance. ⁶⁷

The Quakers were another religious group publicly opposed to the use of intoxicating liquors. Rush reflected his Quaker background as he led other individuals who recognized the need for immediate temperance. His ideas were similar to those stated at the 1794 yearly meeting of the Quakers; the body declared that all those who imported, produced or sold distilled liquors would not be allowed to contribute to or be employed by the Society of Friends. ⁶⁸

Another Quaker and friend of Rush's, Anthony Benezet, was also influential in ~~the~~ temperance reform. In 1774 he published the first attack against the habitual use of ardent spirits. This small pamphlet had the cumbersome title: "The Mighty Destroyer Displayed in Some Account of the Dreadful Havoc Made by the Mistaken Use as Well as Abuse of Distilled Spirituous Liquors." It was a simple

analogy between the ravages of strong drink and the havoc wrought by prolonged war. Although a man could endure untold horrors of armed conflict he could not as easily or satisfactorily endure the desolation and apathy effected by spirituous liquors. Benezet felt that distilled liquors "'steal away a man's senses and render him foolish, irascible, uncontrollable and dangerous.'"⁶⁹

Other religious sects, ones developing with the Great Revival, also took a lead in promoting temperance reform. In 1814 the Universalist Church requested its local societies not to allow liquor at their meetings. Previously in 1800 they had declared against holding their meetings in taverns, as had been frequently done.

The African Methodist Church, organized in 1816, set forth in its discipline strong statements opposing drunkenness and drinking unless necessitated by medical reasons.

Another, the Baptists, in 1797 resolved to keep church members and their associates away from the influence of this evil habit.

The United Brethren and Dunkards made a similar resolution in 1804 against the selling of intoxicants. The Brethren a decade later insisted upon total abstinence by all of the membership. In the 1820's this sect declared against the promotion of distilleries by their own laymen and their preachers and admonished their ministers to strive diligently against intemperance. Such an aggressive policy was

strengthened in 1833 with the adoption of a firm resolution
for the total prohibition of all liquor traffic.⁷⁰

Lastly, another and more unique sect was also aware of this problem and attempted in its own peculiar way to solve it. Led by William Miller, the Millerists saw Christ's Second Coming introduced by the "elimination of the curse of drunkenness."⁷¹ Demanding such a change, Miller declared: "'Behold the Bridegroom cometh! For your soul's sake drink not another draught lest He come and find you drunken."⁷²

The support of these new and later dominant sects was very necessary to the eventual success of this movement. However the basic drive from the established Congregational Church in the New England area was of singular importance because it demonstrated a desire for reform from within the more mature and less emotional element of society.

The Congregational minister who so ably and forcefully led in this campaign and, in doing so, strengthened his church's position among the other religions, was Lyman Beecher. Born in Guilford, Connecticut in 1775 to an eccentric blacksmith and his fourth wife, both strict abstainers, Beecher was always such a "pigmy size" that he was often forced into a silver tankard, "the indignity for which in later years he took revenge on all wine containers."⁷³ At Yale, under the influence of its president, Timothy Dwight, he was

noted more for his enthusiastic and vigorous activity against drinking than for his scholarly achievement. ⁷⁴

In 1808 when he began his ministry in East Hampton, Long Island, his thoughts were stirred and his resolutions became firmly set by observations and readings, specifically of Doctor Rush's pamphlet on ardent spirits. Later he based many famous attacks on knowledge acquired from Rush's works, modified by Beecher's own learnings. ⁷⁵

Two years later he moved to Litchfield, Connecticut where he became provoke with the liquor-drinking clergy. ⁷⁶ His protests were made public in 1811 at a meeting of the General Association of the Litchfield Congregational Church. Following this a committee was appointed to study intemperance; it could find no solution. Irritated, Beecher moved that this committee be disbanded. A second committee, of which Beecher was the chairman, was appointed. Soon this group reported recommendations encouraging total abstinence, a decision which satisfied Beecher. ⁷⁷

In 1812 at a similar meeting in Sharon, Connecticut Beecher influenced the acceptance of the following strong recommendations: the district assemblies, church members, farmers and mechanics were to abstain from alcoholic beverages and voluntary associations were to be set up to aid in such endeavors. ⁷⁸

The next year he formed a committee designed to eradicate intemperance, some of its members being Calvin Chapin, Heman Humphrey, Asabel Hooker, Timothy Dwight, and Tapping Reeve. ⁷⁹

Beecher was responsible for many such local organizations during his sixteen years at Litchfield, truly "the most laborious (years) of his life."⁸⁰ During these years his persuasions and demonstrations were decisive in their effect on his contemporaries. His opinions were quoted often; his name was highly regarded in every educated household.

After 1826 his forcefulness and vigorous enthusiasm were recognized by more Americans, and even Europeans, as a result of the publication in America and England of Beecher's famous "Six Sermons on Intemperance." In the autumn of 1825 this was suggested when two of his intimate friends began drinking heavily, and became total drunkards.⁸¹ Advocating total temperance, Beecher put complete responsibility upon the moderate and temperate individuals, placed his reliance on moral principles and moral persuasion.

What then is this universal, natural and national remedy for intemperance? It is the banishment of ardent spirits from the list of lawful objects of commerce by a correct and efficient public sentiment, such as has turned slavery out of half of our land and will yet expel it from this world. It is the buyers who have created the demand for ardent spirits and made distillation and importation a gainful traffic; and it is the custom of the temperate, too, which inundates the land with the occasion of so much and such unmanageable temptations. Let the temperate cease to buy and the demand for ardent spirits will fall in the market $\frac{3}{4}$ ths, and ultimately will fail wholly, as the generation of drunkards shall hasten out of time.... Let the consumer do his duty, and the capitalist, finding his employment unproductive, will quickly discover other channels of useful enterprise.... That no measures will avail short of rendering ardent spirits a contraband of trade is nearly self-evident.⁸²

To emphasize the destructive nature of alcohol, Beecher drew a colorful picture of the physical and mental deterioration resulting from this. In one of his six sermons, "The Signs of Intemperance," he described the following physical characteristics of the inebriate: full and red visage, tremors of the hand, rheumatic pains, liver contractions, inflammation and laceration of the lungs, all "filling the stomach with air and the head with fumes and the soul with darkness and terror."⁸³

To avoid such consequences Beecher suggested "The Remedy of Intemperance," a selection of numerous recommendations. Information on drinking should be universally extended; associations to supervise this great project should be organized. All agricultural and commercial establishments should exclude liquor as a form of payment to the laborers. Young men should set "'glorious examples'" and all professions should "'volunteer in this cause.'"⁸⁴

And now, I would say, Resolve upon reformation by entire abstinence while the argument is clear, and the impression of it is fresh, and your judgment is convinced and your conscience is awake, be persuaded, not almost, but altogether.⁸⁵

No other temperance declarations had such wide circulation and publicity in the United States and throughout the world. Acting as a call to arms for the temperance forces, Beecher's sermons profoundly affected the work of such organizations; the number of them and their activity increased manifold within the next several years, truly beyond all expectations.

However before realizing the relative importance of such rapid advances, the situation following the Revolutionary War and the growth from that period must be considered. By so doing, the gradual and later accelerated increase is more easily understood.

The idea of temperance societies was a new one calling for man to exhibit his intelligence and responsibility for his betterment. It demanded much of his will power and patience. The first organization of men with such characteristics were actually notable revolvers, shunning the customs of society and striving for an idealized perfection. They were ordinary men whose laborers, not receiving their daily " 'leven o'clock bitters "⁸⁶ not their rum after plowings or raisings, protested with trivial annoyances and denunciations. Early temperance men were marked men for whom no one worked, who were ridiculed and cheated, whose property was damaged or destroyed. Even the more moderate were viewed as the worst fanatics.⁸⁷

The courageous men who formed the first society were two hundred of the more respectable citizens of Litchfield, Connecticut. Some of the members were Frederick Wolcott, Daniel Sheldon, Tapping Reeve and Benjamin Tallmadge.⁸⁸ The banding together of this association was first recorded in the Federal Herald of 13 July 1789. The author of this account, although unaware of a constitution or by-laws of the society, acknowledged its temperance pledge.

We do hereby associate and mutually agree that hereafter we will carry on our business without the use of distilled spirits, as an article of refreshment, either for ourselves, or for those whom we employ; and that, instead thereof, we will serve our workmen with wholesome food, and the common, simple drinks of our production.⁸⁹

This great first however was not immediately followed by the development of similar organizations. In fact over fifteen years lapsed before any further steps were taken. In 1805 two societies were organized although the vagueness of their purposes, membership and influence removed them to obscurity. An association of paper manufacturers in Philadelphia was established with objects to "improve their art" and ameliorate the conditions of "worthy unfortunate journeymen" and their families. Also they resolved to put all their efforts to "restrain and prohibit the use of ardent spirits in their respective mills."⁹⁰ In Allentown, New Jersey an association called "The Sober Society" was formed; little is known of it.⁹¹

The next significant temperance group and actually the most important in early temperance history, therefore, was the one formed in 1808. This society, formed in Moreau, New York,⁹² was the first with a constitution, by-laws and anti-intemperance aim.

Doctor Billy J. Clark was the leader of the Moreau reformers, a young, enthusiastic and dauntless physician. He read Rush's essay, as did Beecher, and realized that his own observations were indeed correct.⁹³

Also the lumberjacks who dominated the community found "too much compensation" for their discomforts and hardships with rum and other distilled liquors. ⁹⁴

Realizing the need for advice, Clark sought out his minister, Reverend Libbeus Armstrong, pastor of the First Congregational Church in Moreau. One March evening he appeared at the parsonage. He was so deeply troubled that he abruptly stated: "Mr. Armstrong, I have come to see you on important business." Raising his hands in hopelessness, Clark continued, "We shall all become a community of drunkards in this town, unless something is done to arrest the progress of intemperance."⁹⁵

The discussion and agreement that followed this outburst led to a meeting to form a society. On 30 April 1808 the citizens of Moreau and Northumberland congregated in a schoolhouse near Clark's home. There a constitution and by-laws were adopted and ratified by the signatures of forty-three men present; there were no women in the society which became known as the Union Temperance Society of Moreau and Northumberland, Saratoga Springs, New York. ⁹⁶

The feebleness of this beginning effort was illustrated in the written constitution of the society. Article IV Section I stated that

No member shall drink, rum, gin, whisky, wine or any distilled spirits, or composition of the same, or any of them, except by the advice of a physician, or in case of actual disease (also excepting at public dinners,)...provided this article shall not infringe on any religious rite. ⁹⁷

As such, this does not refer to the common social custom of furnishing strong drinks at funerals and weddings. Clergymen could continue their drunkenness at ordinations and installations of church pastors. The reputation of a town, the Moreau leaders realized, was proportionate to the quantity and quality of rum, brandy, gin and wine furnished. In a sense, these early brave reformers were "very temperate with their temperance."⁹⁸

In spite of the constitutional weakness, the influence of this society steadily spread, a fact reflected in the increased membership. Very early in its history, the society elected Benjamin Rush and John Murray to honorary membership. Judge Cowans was one of its first and most active members. Author of an admirable treatise on law, Cowan was chosen president of the Saratoga County Temperance Society in 1829. Dorchester characterized these three influential greats, Clark, Cowan and Armstrong according to their occupations:

...(in the mind of the doctor) convictions formed from the effect of ardent spirits on man's physical constitution, in the mind of the lawyer from the effects on human society, and in the mind of the clergyman from the effect on man's moral and religious interests.⁹⁹

With such impressive members, the society exercised an appeal both wide and comprehensive, although the response it received was disappointingly small.¹⁰⁰ By 1810 only about one thousand circulars were sent out.¹⁰¹ The use of such circulars, other pamphlets, broadsides and speeches, the pledge and constitution, all such propagan-

da tactics used by the organization, became characteristic of the later, more aggressive crusade.

One result of such exertions was the formation of another society in the towns of Milton and Greenfield in Saratoga County. On 19 April 1809 Sidney Berry, surrogate of Saratoga County and first president of the Moreau society, established the neighboring organizations.¹⁰² Little is known of this society except that it followed a principle of total abstinence from distilled spirits.¹⁰³

These closely connected groups had no influence on the formation of another in Massachusetts. In the early months of 1813 several noteworthy citizens called for a convention which ultimately resulted in the first temperance society in the state of Massachusetts. The leadership of this reform body, all members of the Congregational General Association of Massachusetts, included Jeremiah Evarts,¹⁰⁴ Samuel Worchester, Jedidiah Morse, Abiel Abbott, Reverend Benjamin Wadsworth, Doctor R. D. Mussey, and Doctor J. Storey. These men met 4 February at the State House of Boston where they drew up a constitution.¹⁰⁵ A week later the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance was formally founded¹⁰⁶ with the stated purposes

to discountenance and suppress the too free use of ardent spirits and its kindred vices, profaneness and gaming; and to encourage and promote temperance and general morality...¹⁰⁷

As the society grew its leadership gradually became stronger, more impressive and influential. Besides

Jedidah Morse, Jeremiah Evarts, Eliphalet Porter, all distinguished clergymen, there was Samuel Dexter, a Cabinet officer under John Adams, and Timothy Pickering, a Cabinet member under Washington and Adams. Caleb Strong, another associate, was the governor of Massachusetts from 1800 until 1807 and again 1812 until 1816. ¹⁰⁸ These and others led in the development of over forty local auxiliaries between 1813 and 1818 ¹⁰⁹ and numerous committees of correspondence which attempted to maintain contact among the locals. ¹¹⁰

The enthusiasm however that characterized the early growth soon diminished and the organization fell into inactivity. Reverend Doctor Marsh in his Autobiography emphasized this change.

'The society did little beyond observing its anniversary, the preaching of a sermon, after which preacher and hearers would repair to tables richly laden with wine, and was therefore without efficacy in rooting out the evils.' ¹¹¹

The one lasting accomplishment of this, the first society for temperance formed in Massachusetts, was the publication of several tracts and pamphlets to enlighten the the unknowledgeable public. The most famous were written by Mason L. Weems, an Episcopalian clergyman and traveling book agent who had a very active and lively imagination. ¹¹² The famous biographer of Washington, Weems published in 1812 an urbane and slightly ribald treatise with the quaint and curious title of

The Drunkard's Looking Glass, or the Drunkard in Sundry very Interesting Attitudes: with Lively Representations of the Many Strange Capers which He Cuts at Different Stages of his Disease. At first When he has a drop in his Eyes, second, When he is half stewed, third, When he is getting a Little on the Staggers or so; And fourth and fifth, and so on, Till he is quite Capsized or Snug under the Table with the Dogs and can Stick to the Floor without holding on.¹¹³

Weems presented here some advice, "Six Golden Receipts against Drunkenness," each is interesting for its uniqueness, ingenuity, wit and wisdom.

1. Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake. Also cider, beer, ale, etc.
2. Never fight duels. Nine times in ten memory of the murdered drives the murderer to the bottle.
3. Never marry but for love. Hatred is repellent; and the husband saunters to the tavern.
4. Provide against old 'Bachelorism.' Age wants comfort, and a good wife is the second best in the universe.
5. Never stand surety for a sum that would embarrass you. And if you want, suffer a little rather than borrow, and starve than not pay; for debts and duns have filled the world with sots.
6. Hot coffee in the morning is a good cure for dram-craving. And a civic crown to him who will set the fashion of coffee at dinner.¹¹⁴

Newspapers, as well as tracts such as Weems', were published with the principle aim of examining and condemning intemperance. The weekly National Philanthropist, its motto "Temperate drinking is the down-hill road to intemperance," aroused educational agencies and young people.¹¹⁵ This was succeeded by the Journal of Humanity, established by the society at Andover, edited by Edward Hooker.¹¹⁶ The religious journals, Christian Spectator and New York Observer, were also concerned with this reform.¹¹⁷ Another was

the Connecticut Observer which contained several strong temperance articles. Of these the most perceptive and challenging was written in 1826 by Reverend Doctor Calvin Chapin, "Total Abstinence the only Infallible Antidote." 118

Such literary abundance, and the clerical strength behind the movement, led to the creation of hundreds of local temperance societies with constitutions, pledges and by-laws similar to those of ^{Town of} Moreau ^{the state of} and Massachusetts. The majority of these were independent reforming bodies, united only in their similarities and not in their organization.

An attempt to centralize and to unite such groups was made in 1826. Then the American Temperance Society was organized; it became for a short time the voice and conscience of a militant, organized union. The leaders were national leaders expressing a national sentiment openly, more courageously than ever before. 119

This "organized army" ¹²⁰ was formed as a response to Beecher's six sermons. In Massachusetts several of Beecher's associates on the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions decided the time for definite action had arrived. Justin Edwards called a meeting for 13 February 1826 to discuss "What shall be done to banish the enemy from the United States?" ¹²¹ At the meeting this society was formed, its purpose as stated in the constitution being vehement opposition to intoxicants.

...believing that the use of intoxicating liquors is for a person's health, not only unnecessary, but hurtful, that it is the cause of forming intemperate appetites and habits, and that while it is continued the evils of intemperance can never be prevented. 122

The sponsors of this society were well known, educated men, militantly driven by high ideals, skilled in the arts of emotional appeal, influence and propaganda. Leonard Woods was a theology professor at Andover Seminary; Justin Edwards, another member, was one of his students. Frances Wayland was later a great president of Brown University, then a Baptist pastor. Benjamin Wisner was the influential minister of the historic Old South Church. S. V. S. Wilder was an internationally recognized businessman and director of the American Bible Society.¹²³

The vigorous activities of these figures were aimed at ~~very~~ high ideals, much higher than those proposed by earlier societies. Salvation was no longer possible through the doctrine of temperance alone; total abstinence was demanded. The moderate attempts that had dominated between the Revolutionary War and 1820's had absolutely failed. Heavy drinking continued; to the great majority of drinkers, moderation was only a meaningless grouping of letters.

Through the Society this new doctrine was publicized, taught and re-taught in order to convert the public. The mine of information of letters relating personal experiences, many treatises and meeting reports were excellent propaganda materials used by its members. Such thorough activity led to the signing of thousands of pledges promising total abstinence. By 1835 the Society asserted that over 3000 ministers, schoolteachers and other professionals had signed. Medical societies urged compliance with this doctrine by heartily endorsing the campaign; over one hundred doctors signed pledges.¹²⁴

The effectiveness of such exertions was widespread, far reaching both in time and in miles. There was a vast increase in the number of temperance societies; small cells and large units were drawn together in a well regulated system. Local societies, both of religious and medical natures, combined to form state societies and chose delegates to attend regional and state conventions. From information easily ascertained from such unified work, unreformed areas were discovered to which agents and missionaries carried their doctrine and pledges.

By 1827 there were 222 local auxiliaries located in the area bordered by North Carolina in the south, Maine in the north, and Kentucky and Indiana in the west. This number was increased to 1000 in 1829,¹²⁵ of which the most noteworthy organization was the New York State Temperance Society.

Formed 17 January 1829 by a wealthy, liberal businessman, Edward C. Delavan, this New York society contributed an abundance of pamphlets and testimonials, as well as courageous leadership.¹²⁶ The Reverend Jeremiah Day, president of Yale College, and John March organized a similar society in Hartford, Connecticut a short four months later; many of its members belonged to the New York society and brought to the new society the prestige of the older.¹²⁷

Other state societies were formed by the end of this year in New Hampshire, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Virginia

Valuable men, Dr. Hassock of New York, Dr. Sewall of Washington, D.C., and Lewis Cass of Michigan, joined the ranks of the temperance crusade through these societies.¹²⁸

Such growth, seen as the end result of earlier endeavors, was noteworthy of success, but, seen as an example of future activities, seem insignificant in comparison. By 1831 the number of local societies increased to 2200 with a total of 170,000 members. Within twelve months 800 more locals were added. Within yet another year the addition of 2000 increased the total to 5000 locals with a total membership of 1,250,000 citizens.¹²⁹

The growth of local societies was not the only means of registering the progress; the everyday zeal and enthusiasm of common men and women exemplified it as well. Housewives boycotted stores distributing spirituous liquors. Manufacturers and sellers abandoned businesses that caused them to lose the respect of their contemporaries. Temperance houses became well known as taverns or hotels which accepted the temperance standard, that being abstinence from spirituous liquors.¹³⁰ College commencements became serious occasions not disrupted by the usual hilarity common to excessive drinking. College men organized. Amherst ^{particularly} was "enthusiastically dry;" 75% of its student body members of the temperance society. Dartmouth and Oberlin also organized diligent temperance bodies.¹³¹

The population was enthusiastic; the local societies

were zealously attempting to convert all drinkers. But what they were converted to depended on the localities. The American Temperance Society had succeeded almost too well. An impetus for greater reform, the Society was unable to control the enthusiasm that resulted; it became only a central clearing house for most temperance literature.

In 1833 an attempt was made to clarify the objectives and coordinate all local programs. The executive committee of the American Temperance Society called for a meeting in Philadelphia of delegates from all local and state societies. The response received was most optimistic, over four hundred delegates representing twenty states and one territory accepted.

Chancellor Reuben Walworth of New York presided at the convention. He was so tactful and so wise that harmony was preserved in spite of the multitude of opinions voiced. The very first discussions exposed these basic differences of attitude and temperament.¹³² The type of pledge, temperance or abstinence, was the first question. A conservative minority voted for no pledge at all, retaining the right for the individual to pledge publicly or privately according to his conscience. A radical minority desired a pledge that would prohibit the use of fermented, malt and distilled liquors. Both groups had some backing. However it was soon obvious that the majority wanted neither extreme; it would accept only a pledge to refrain from the consumption of spirituous liquors.¹³³

The superficial unity evidenced on this point of dis-

cussion was carried through in the next debate on the liquor traffic. Gerrit Smith introduced a proposal that began this heated debate.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this Convention, the traffic in ardent spirits, as a drink, is morally wrong; and that the inhabitants of cities, towns, and other local communities should be permitted by law to prohibit the said traffic within their respective jurisdictions. 134

The discussion which followed brought out more differences of opinion. The convention had began on a note of unity; it closed with much discord and disagreement in the air.

After this convention and a similar one in 1836 the delegates returned to their states, many in full agreement with the Convention, many opposed to its proposals. A large number of these returning reformers were met by factions opposing agreements made in Philadelphia. The New York Society refused to agree to the Convention's decisions; 2000 New York locals did not accept the new pledge. The temperance element in Ohio split between the two extremes. Such dissention resulted in a general decline in the temperance movement. 135

There were other social reasons for this new disinterested attitude toward temperance that occurred in the late 1830's. Such temperance advocates as William Lloyd Garrison and Gerrit Smith were also extreme abolitionists. The Southern temperance leaders felt that both reforms, temperance and abolition, were identical, denied both because of their impassioned feelings against abolition.

The Northern abolitionists were disapproved of by the more moderate temperance reformers. Thus the temperance movement suffered from this universal reform leadership.

Another reason for the decline was the economic panic of 1837 and the successive long years of depression. During these unfortunate times the basic necessities of life were demanded and not the luxuries, which included moral reforms. Also people turned to drink simply because of the hardships suffered and the compensation found in the alcohol. All major reforms, therefore, including temperance were pushed into the background for several years. ¹³⁶

When temperance as a strengthened movement next appeared to the public, its character had changed ; it had taken on a more extreme element. This was due to its recent decline. Temperate methods used to gain reforms until the 1830's had appeared successful at first but when further change was attempted, the shortcomings and surface unity were evidenced. Because no concrete change was effected in the social drinking patterns, more extreme measures were demanded. By this is registered the failure of the moderate phase of temperance reform.

Benjamin Rush's "Essay on Effects of Ardent Spirits"

Moral and Physical Thermometer of Intemperance¹³⁷

Scale from Zero, Showing the Progress Downward

	Drinks	Vices	Diseases	Punishments
0				
10	Punch	Idleness Gaming	Sickness	Debt
20	Toddy Egg Rum	Peevishness	Hand Tremors Morning Puking	Jail
30	Grog Brandy & Water	Quarreling Fighting	Bloatedness	Rags Black eyes
40	Flip, Shrub	Horse-racing	Inflamed eyes Red nose & face	Hospital Poor House
50	Bitters infused in Spirits & Cordials	Lying Swearing	Jaundice Sore & Swelled Legs	Bridewell
60	Drams of Gin, Brandy, Rum In Morning	Stealing Swindling	Hand Pains Hands & Feet Burn	State Prison
70	Same, during Day & Night	Burglary Murder	Madness Despair	Gallows

FOOTNOTES

1. Harriet Martineau, Society in America (London, 1837), II, 296.
2. John Allen Krout, The Origins of Prohibition (New York, 1925), 98.
3. Krout, 98, and Martineau, 296.
- ✓ 4. Alice Felt Tyler, Freedom's Ferment (New York, 1944), 308.
5. Daniel Dorchester, Liquor Problem in all ages (New York, 1884), 109.
- ✓ 6. Tyler, 309.

Flip is a liquor made of rum, beer and sugar that is usually heated. Perry is a beverage made from pears, as the name implies. Cherry bounce is any alcoholic beverage flavored with cherries. Sling is an alcoholic drink of gin, brandy or rum and sweetened water. Toddy is the same, spirituous liquors and sweetened water. A punch then was quite similar to that of today, wines, spirits or fruit juices flavored and sweetened. *Source* (Craigie, Dictionary)
7. Krout, 60.,
8. H. K. Carroll, One Hundred Years of Temperance, a Memorial Volume of Centennial Temperance Conferences held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1886), 124.
- ✓ 9. Tyler, 310.
10. Greeley, Recollections of a Busy Life, (New York, 1873), 99-100.
11. H. A. Scamp, King Alcohol in the Realm of King Cotton (Chicago, 1888), 205.
- 12. Tyler, 310. ~~311~~!
- ✓ 13. Tyler, 311.
14. Krout, 60.
15. David J. Pittman and Charles R. Snyder, Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns (New York, 1962), 104.

16. Dorchester, 161.

17. Ibid.

In 1810 Adams wrote to Doctor Benjamin Rush referring to these early efforts: "I only acquired the reputation of a hypocrite and an ambitious demagogue by it. The number of licensed houses was soon reinstated; drams, grog, and sotting were not diminished, and remain to this day as deplorable as ever." (Ibid.)

18. Dorchester, 160.

19. Dorchester, 162.

20. Ibid.

This failure, according to Dorchester, was due to the social weakness for intoxicants: "It was too closely interwoven into the web of society to be easily eliminated; and instead of diminution, its sway and power were soon greatly increased. It was the period of the greatest moral darkness in the history of our nation." (Ibid.)

21. Ernest H. Cherrington, Evolution of Prohibition in the United States of America (Westerville, 1920), 42-43.

22. Cherrington, 44.

23. Dorchester, 163.

24. Ibid.

✓ 25. Tyler, 313.

26. Cherrington, 44.

27. Krout, 62.

28. Dorchester, 171.

29. Krout, 71-72.

30. Dorchester, 171-172.

31. Cherrington, 40.

32. Krout, 71-72.

33. Oswald, 111.

34. Tyler, 344; and Krout, 73-74.

35. Krout, 34.

36. Dorchester, 172-173.
37. Dorchester, 173.
38. Dorchester, 163.
39. Cherrington, 52-53.
40. Dorchester, 163-164.
41. Jeremy Belknap was chosen by Rush to supervise all temperance work in New England. They kept in close communication through letters. This particular communique was written in 1789.
- ✓ 42. Tyler, 319.
43. Krout, 66.
44. Krout, 67-68.
45. Krout, 68.
- ✓ 46. Tyler, 313.
- ✓ 47. Tyler, 321.
- + 48. Tyler, 313. *unatq. fr.*
49. Tyler, 321.
50. Krout, 66.
- ✓ 51. Tyler, 313.
52. Dorchester, 173.
- ✓ 53. W. H. Daniels, The Temperance Reform and its Great Reformers (New York, 1878), 52-53.
54. Krout 321.
55. Cherrington, 71.
56. Ibid.
57. Lyman Beecher in his Autobiography made the following observation: "At the ordination at Plymouth, the preparation for our creature comforts, besides food, was a broad sideboard covered with decanters, liquor, and sugar, pitchers of water, etc. There were found all the various kinds of liquors then in vogue, for when the Consociation arrived, they always took something

to drink around... [it] looked like a bar, a very active grog-shop.... None of the Consociation were drunk, but that there was not at times a considerable amount of exhilaration I cannot affirm.... It was the maximum of hilarity."

58. Dorchester, 178.
59. P. T. Winskill, The Temperance Movement and its Workers (New York, 1892), 39.
60. Justin Edwards, The Temperance Manual (New York, n. d.), 30.
- ✓ 61. Winskill, 39.
62. Daniels, 53.
- ✓ 63. Winskill, 34.
- ✓ 64. Tyler, 320.
65. Dorchester, 187.
- ✓ 66. Winskill, 34.
67. Cherrington, 70.
68. Cherrington, 69.
69. Cherrington, 38.
70. Cherrington, 69-72.
- ✓ 71. Tyler, 318.
- ✓ 72. Tyler, 319.
73. Winskill, 34; ~~and~~ Daniels, 62.
74. Krout, 81; ~~and~~ Dorchester, 177.
75. Krout, 81.
76. Daniels, 62.
- ✓ 77. Winskill, 34.
78. Daniels, 65; ~~and~~ Krout, 85.
79. Krout, 86-87.
80. Lyman Beecher, Autobiography (New York, 1864), II, 301.

- ✓ 81. Winskill, 36.
- 82. Beecher, II, 34ff.
- ✓ 83. Daniels, 74.
- ✓ 84. Daniels, 79-89.
- ✓ 85. Daniels, 89.
- ✓ 86. Daniels, 52.
- ✓ 87. Daniels, 52.
- 88. Krout, 68.
- 89. Dorchester, 165-166.
- ✓ 90. Winskill, 33.
- ✓ 91. Winskill, 33.
- 92. Specifically in the areas of St. Edward, Sandy *House* Hill and Glenn's Fall. (Armstrong, 18-19.)
- 93. Lebbeus Armstrong, History of the Temperance Reformation (New York, 1853), 18.
- 94. Krout, 21.
- 95. Armstrong, 18-19.
- 96. Armstrong, 18-20.
- 97. Daniels, 53. *ma*
- ✓ 98. Daniels, 54.
- 99. Dorchester, 105.
- ✓ 100. Tyler, 314.
- 101. Dorchester, 186.
- 102. Krout, 80.
- ✓ 103. Winskill, 34.
- 104. Evarts was the distinguished lay editor of the Panoplist, a religious periodical which included numerous articles opposing the liquor traffic. The October 1810 article, "Arithmetic Applied to Moral Purposes," showed that more money was spent in a New England town for drinks than the total invested in churches and schools. (Dorchester, 178-179.)

105. Krout, 89-90.
106. Cherrington, 91.
107. Krout, 90.
108. Krout, 91-92.
109. Cherrington, 91.
110. Tyler, 321.
- ✓ 111. Winskill, 39. *This is a quote w/in a quote*
112. Krout, 94.
113. Mason L. Weems, Three Discourses (New York, 1929),
cover. *Title page.*
114. Weems, preface.
- ✓ 115. H. W. Blair, The Temperance Movement (Boston, 1888),
427.
- ✓ 116. Winskill, 41.
117. Krout, 139.
- ✓ 118. Winskill, 40.
119. Daniels compared this movement of 1826 to that of
1808 when he said: "That was a respectable show of
morality, following the lead of public opinion;
this was an organized army fighting the King's
great enemy in the King's Almighty name." (56)
- ✓ 120. Daniels, 56.
- 121. Daniels, 55. *madeq.*
122. Edwards, 17.
123. Krout 108-110.
- ✓ 124. Tyler, 325.
125. Cherrington, 93.
126. Winskill has a comprehensive study of Delavan, 41-44.
- ✓ 127. Daniels, 57-58.
128. Winskill, 45.

129. Cherrington, 93.

Tyler disagrees on the number of societies formed each year. His totals are the following: 1831-2000 units, 1833-4000 units with 500,000 members. The wide variation allows for much disagreement and confusion.

130. Krout, 143-144.

- 131. Tyler, 326.

132. Krout, 132.

133. Tyler, 327-328.

- 134. Tyler, ~~329~~ ³²⁸; Krout, 132.

" 135. Ibid. Philadelphia,

✓ 136. Ibid.

137. Dorchester, 175.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Armstrong, Lebbeus. History of the Temperance Reformation. New York: Fowlers and Wills, 1853.

Although Armstrong tended toward verbosity, this book included a great deal of information relevant to this subject. He was especially good on the Moreau Society, of which he was a member.

Beecher, Lyman. Autobiography. New York: Harper and Brothers, 3 volumes, 1864.

An excellent source, presenting an intimate knowledge and an apparent understanding of the subject.

Edwards, Justin. The Temperance Manual. New York: American Tract Society, n. d.

An interesting account, well illustrating typical religious criticism of intoxicants. The testimonials seem quite revivalistic.

Greeley, Horace. Recollections of a Busy Life. *New York's Tribune Press, 1873.*

An account containing some information on the social conditions in New England during this period. Quite well written.

Martineau, Harriet. Society in America. London: Saunders and Otley, 3 volumes, 1837.

An enjoyable book, well written, presenting perceptive interpretations of American life made by a foreigner. Sparse information on temperance reform, but very good on the more general social conditions.

Weems, Mason L. The Drunkard's Looking Glass in The Three Discourses. New York: Random House, 1929.

A very imaginative literary work that was very helpful in bringing this early period more to life.

Secondary Sources

Blair, H. W. The Temperance Movement or the Conflict

between Man and Alcohol. Boston: William E. Smythe Company, 1888.

A sourcebook for histories of later temperance movements, but little relevant to the early organizations. Instead of specifics of that period, much social commentary.

Carroll, H. K. One Hundred Years of Temperance, A Memorial Volume of Centennial Temperance Conferences Held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: 1888.

A very detailed account of conference activities, actually too much so for this thesis.

Cherrington, Ernest H. Evolution of Prohibition in the United States of America. Westerville, Ohio: American Issue Press, 1920.

A very readable resource that was excellent for the early colonial period. A chronological study of temperance activities peculiar to each year was very enlightening, a great aid.

Craigie, William A. and James R. Hulbert, eds. Dictionary of American English. 4 volumes, Chicago; Chicago Press, 1940.

Daniels, W. H. The Temperance Reform and Its Great Reformers. New York: Nelson and Phillips, 1878.

A very good source especially thorough on Lyman Beecher and the early temperance societies.

Dorchester, Daniel. Liquor Problem in all ages. New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1884.

An excellently researched, very thorough analysis of the problem. Essential for this thesis.

Krout, John Allen. The Origins of Prohibition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925.

Another invaluable source, containing much material resulting from original research.

Oswald, Felix L. The Poison Problem or the Cause and Cure of Intemperance. New York: Appleton and Company, 1887.

This is a world history of drinking with myriad examples of teetotalers. It is quite biased and con

tains little information pertinent to this period. No dates are given when relating facts, making it difficult to gather specifics from it.

Pittman, David J. and Charles R. Snyder. Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

General information, particularly trends in each period and psychological generalizations. Very little relevant information.

Scamp, H. A. King Alcohol in the Realm of King Cotton. Chicago: Press of the Blakely printing company, 1888.

A history of temperance reform in Georgia over a period of 150 years, this contains several interesting sketches epitomizing southern action. Written somewhat colorfully but in a stilted manner.

Tyler, Alice Felt. Freedom's Ferment. New York: Harper and Row, 1944.

An excellent source for the period; one chapter of well chosen and researched material.

Winskill, P. T. The Temperance Movement and Its Workers. 4 volumes. New York: Blackie and Son, Ltd., 1892.

Not very well written but factual, particularly detailed on the activities of Lyman Beecher.