THE CRUSADE

This evening we are beginning that part of the program that is intended to bring the Crusade for Christ to a climax. It is altogether fitting that we should do this by giving emphasis to the upbuilding of our church school. It is the business of this organization to win men, women, boys and girls to Christ and to the church and to bring them up in Christ.

Those of you who have read Pilgrim's Progress will remember the ' Palace Beautiful.' The Pilgrim, after a dangerous and strenuous journey reached this palace whose open door was "welcome" and whose atmosphere was peace. Here he found rest and refreshment; here he equipped himself for the strenuous journey that was ahead. Taking his cue from this, a brilliant Australian essayist tells of the "little palace beautiful." In this "little palace" there were four rooms; one looked out toward the North; another looked out toward the South and the other toward the East. In each of these rooms lay sleeping four beautiful children. In the room toward the North there lay sleeping the "child that never was". He was the little baby that was longed for and dreamed of but never came. Charles Lamb, one of the most pathetic and lovable characters in English literature was never privileged to be married. He had other home responsibilities that made such a marriage impossible. Hence he used to tell his stories to two dream children, William and Alice. When the stories were finished, the children would vanish. As they went, they would sometimes look at him sadly and say; "We are neither of Alice nor of thee, we are the children that never were."

In the room toward the west lay sleeping the child that "was". He was the little fellow who came and stayed just long enough to gather our hearts into his chubby hands and then went out to greet the Christ of little children who live on the other side. In the room toward the south lay the child that is the little fellow who is in your nursery tonight and whose living presence accounts for much of the sunshine of your life. In the lovliest and sunniest room that looks out toward the east lay sleeping the "child that is to be."
Then this wise essayist said, "We are to take all the love and understanding and intelligent care that we would have bestowed upon the child that never was, that we did bestow upon the child that was, that we would like to bestow upon the child that is to be, and bestow them on the child that is. We are to do this because the child that never was and the child that was do not need our prayer. We are to do this because the best help that we can render to the child that is to be is making the best possible men and women out of the child that is." This parable does not mean that we are not concerned in this campaign with the adult. We cannot be concerned with the child without being deeply concerned with the parents of the child, any more than we can be concerned with the parents and leave out the child. These two are bound up in their life with each other. If we get hold of the child, we have a great opportunity through that child to get hold of the parents.

One of the great prophets said "A little child shall lead them." That declaration has been illustrated times without number. How many I have known along the way who have been led into the church and into the church school by the hand of a little child.

We are interested in the adult because the adult so often fashions the live of the child. It is not easy to keep a child in the church school without the backing of the parents. These two are the parts of a living whole. They make up one family. To be vitally interested in one is to be vitally interested in the other.

In the making of this Crusade, we have three objectives.

1. We are seeking to win back those who once attended our school and do not attend any more. Here is one of the chief faults of the church - that so often it does not follow up the "sheep and the lambs" that go astray. Thomas A. Edison and Henry Ford both attended church school for a little while in their youth. When they began to drop out, nobody followed them up. Had they done so, they might have been as eminent churchmen as they were in the field of industry and invention.

2. We are seeking to win those of our own church family to the church school who are not now in attendance. We need these, whether they are young or adults,
What we as parents say about the members of the church is of value. What we do about it is of far greater value. Why is the average of the attendance in the public school so much higher than that of the church school? Of course, a vast amount of this difference is due to the fact that attendance upon the public school is compulsory. If it were left entirely to the parents and the children as to attendance at day school, that attendance would drop greatly. Let me say by way of parenthesis that while there is much illiteracy among us, we do not blame it to the fact that we have compulsory education. There are those who do blame their spiritual illiteracy to the fact that they were compelled to attend church and Sunday School when they were boys and girls. Such are usually not telling the truth.

Another reason why the church school is not so well attended is that often parents do not take it seriously. Any sort of a mild rain can keep them and their children away from church school, while a positive storm does not prevent them from going to public school. This is a dangerous way of telling your children that the values reached by religion are entirely secondary.

The third objective of the Crusade is the winning of men and women, boys and girls to church membership. In fact, the whole Crusade is to have this as its ultimate goal. We need to bear in mind always that the Church is central, that the Church school is one arm of the church. Any organization that does not minister to the life and strength of the church is not fulfilling its purpose.

Now the necessity for the Church to bestir itself in the work of Christian education especially pressing at this time. There is a rising tide of paganism in this country that bodes ill to the future of America. There are millions of boys and girls who have no religious training whatsoever. We are facing the fact that without the saving salt of Christianity, our national life will rot down. Who is to give this needed Christian teaching? It rests mainly upon two organizations.

1. It rests upon the home. The importance of the home we cannot discuss here.
2. The Church in these two illustrations must do what is done for the teaching of religion. This is the case because religion is utterly neglected in the vast majority of our public schools. This is not the case altogether but it is the case generally. It would be possible for a child to go through school until he graduated at the State University without ever hearing the name of God. This does not mean that state supported education denounces God, it does what is even worse, it ignores Him.

This has not always been the case. An editorial in the Atlanta Constitution declared recently that from 1776 to 1785 the reading in our public schools was one hundred percent moral and religious. From 1785 to 1820 the percent dropped to 50 percent. From 1820 to 1900, it dropped to twenty percent. From 1900 to 1920 it dropped to five percent. From 1920 to 1940 it dropped to less than one percent. Therefore, as never before, it is up to the home. Children are not so much born as made. What they become depends upon their training. When homes give no religious training whatsoever, therefore, the one chance that many a child has is to come to the church. If our church fails, many children will miss the one chance they have. We must not fail them nor fail the Lord.
THE CRUSADE

I.

The crusade upon which we have launched appeals to me because it is a crusade. God has matched us against an hour of crisis. The word crisis in Chinese, I am told, is written with two characters. One of them means danger, the other means opportunity. Those who really go on a crusade will change this crisis into an opportunity.

Of course, there will be those who will stand aloof. Some will refuse to see it as a crisis. Others will seek to meet the crisis with a whine and cheap complaints. Instead of thanking God that He has trusted them enough to match them against this your the would rather wail with Hamlet:

"The world is out of joint, oh! cursed spite
That I was ever born to set it right."

But for that reason Hamlet was born. That is the reason we are here. "I could make a better world than this", said a cynic to a saint one day. "Sure you can", came the answer, "that is the reason God put you here". But there will be those whose only crusade will be one of criticism.

There is a second group who will seek to content themselves by holding forth. Whatever fighting they do will be on the defensive rather than the offensive. I read of a church sometime ago that had managed to break even. Very few had died and been left out. Equally few had come in. The writer of this report closed with this appeal: "Pray for us brethren that we may hold our own. Now our Lord has promised to answer prayer but that is one prayer that I am definitely sure was not answered. Our Lord has promised infinite power for attack, but there is no promise or hope for the man who merely tries to stand still. As individuals, we are born on an incline. We either go up or down. The same is true of the church."
No church can hold its own. In many of our large cities, I have looked out from my hotel window to see deserted church buildings. They were no longer used for worship. The congregation had tried to hold its own and had lost everything.

But in this hour of great need there are those who are Christian enough and wise enough to say that our only hope is to go on a crusade. That was the secret of the unbelievable victory won by the Church in its infancy. Suppose those hundred twenty persons who made up the prayer meeting when Pentecost came had merely dug in. The Christian Church today would not even be a memory. But those early saints never allowed themselves to be put on the defensive. They always went to the attack.

When, for instance, Paul had a chance to defend himself before Agrippa, he began in good faith but he had not gone more than two minutes before he forgot himself and began to attack. He so laid siege to the heart of Agrippa that the king found the situation distressingly uncomfortable, as he declared: "With a little, thou wouldst persuade me to be a Christian." So aggressively did these early saints crusade that in a very few centuries, the eagle on the Roman banner had been displaced by the cross.

By this time the Church had become strong and powerful. By this time, many of her members had come to worship the god of things as they are. The Church in a large measure had lost its aggressiveness. It began to hold its own, to fight and argue over its creeds until before its members were aware of it, the sun had set and the night was on. A night that lasted for centuries. We call that night today - the dark ages.

By and by the day began to dawn, not by chance but because a certain Martin Luther who began a crusade some two centuries later when the night still hung over England like a pall, God his heart so warmed that he set out on a crusade. It was that crusade that brought our church to birth. It was that crusade that breathed on the wintry century like a gulf stream and caused the wilderness and solitary places to become glad and the desert to rejoice and blossom as a rose. Once again we as the sons of the saints are privileged to go on a crusade.
II.

Then I believe in this crusade because I believe in its objectives. That we may have a bird's eye view of what we are seeking to do, I am going over these objectives with you. The marksman that does not see his mark is not likely to hit it. Unless we know where we are going, we are not even going to know the road to take. What then are we seeking to do through this crusade for Christ:

1. We are seeking to train our people to recognize themselves as good stewards of Jesus Christ. Stewardship is based on the fundamental fact that God is the absolute owner of all things. "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." This is God's word. He has never relinquished his ownership to a single foot of it. All well, whatever is nature's belongs to God.

Not only is this God's word but we are God's children. We are His by right of creation. Not only so but as Christians we are His because we have acknowledged the claim of His love and dedicated our lives to it. At the very door of entrance into the Kingdom is this necessity - personal surrender. "Here, Lord, I give myself to Thee" is what every man must say in his heart or he cannot be a disciple of Jesus.

Now since God owns you, he owns your possessions. They were all His to begin with. Even if this were not true, they would be His because you are His. Since all that you have is God's, you are to act as this truth is the truth instead of acting as if it were a lie or just mere preaching. There are few errors that are so ruinous to character and usefulness as the conviction that because I possess certain wealth, that wealth is mine and that I have a right to do with it as I please. God called the rich farmer a fool, at least in part because he didn't know the difference between possession and ownership.

Now this doctrine of a right attitude toward money is, I repeat, of superlative importance. Jesus had more to say about money than he had to say about repentance or regeneration, heaven or hell. He had more to say about
money and matters related to money than any other subject upon which He spoke. Why? Because we live our lives in the realm of things. If we are right on the money question, we are apt to be right on every other. If we are wrong on the money question, we are likely to be wrong everywhere else.

We are concerned, therefore, in this crusade not simply that we raise $25,000,000. We are interested that we be Christian in relation to money. If we, through this campaign, could lead one-fourth of our people to be real stewards, the millions that we would raise would be as nothing in comparison to new spiritual power that would come to our church. Money wrongly used may become an unspeakable curse; rightly used it can be a vast blessing. To practice stewardship is to enrich ourselves and also to enrich others. This campaign is a campaign to teach our people to be Christian in relation to wealth.

2. This is a campaign to Christian education. It is seeking especially to do something for the nearly 20,000,000 boys and girls in our nation that are without any religious training whatsoever. To neglect to Christianize our boys and girls is to cheat ourselves. It is to throw away tomorrow.

Now and then I hear the discussion of this topic: "What our youth is thinking". Such a discussion is always silly. Our youth is thinking exactly what it is taught to think. What the children are in this community or in any other community is not in the slightest degree a matter of chance. It is a matter of training. We may believe this for these very definite reasons:

(1) This is the plain teaching of the Bible, the sanest of books. It says: "Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it".

(2) This is the teaching of modern science. If there is one point upon which modern psychologists agree, it is that a child is the product of his training.

(3) This is the teaching of law. The law of sowing and reaping. Whatev­er a man soweth in his field, he also reapeth. That is true also of what he sows in the
heads and hearts of his child. It would be a mad world indeed where we could
determine the quality of harvest in our fields and gardens but have to trust
chance in our own homes.

(4) To the testimony of the Bible, science and law, experience adds its
voice. In America today and around the world youth is thinking what it is taught
to think. We can change any generation for the better by the right training of
the children. Now these boys and girls of ours is the hope of tomorrow. If there
is to be a better tomorrow in America, it must come at the hands of better boys
and girls. If there are to be better boys and girls, we are to give them better
training. So in crusading for the building up of our church schools, we are
engaged in something that is absolutely essential if we are to have a worthy
nation.

3. We are seeking through this crusade to help the children not only of
our own land but of devastated lands throughout the world. To help these broken
and starving people is the least we can do, if we are to be Christian. But also
such help is a matter of enlightening self interest. There is little use in
undertaking to drive out the darkness from within a room with a club. There is
little use to fight against communism and false political faith with a verbal
club. If people are in dire distress, they will welcome any nostrum that
promises a cure. The only way to save the nations of Europe from false political
faith is to so help them that they will not be driven to utter desperation.

4. Then as a part of our world wide campaign, we are to seek in every way
possible to help make a lasting peace. You realize the necessity of that as
never before. Before this war, there were many isolationists. When we meet
difficulties in dealing with our allies, there are going to be those who will
be tempted to lapse back into isolation. But the trouble with that is that it
is simply impossible. Attention has been called to the fact that the continents
of one who seizes and separates them are only surface seizures. Down under the
ocean, you can't tell where Europe leaves off and where America begins. Humanity is also one. "The field," Jesus said, "is the world."

Because this is the case no man can be interested intelligently in the smallest child in America without being interested in his community, in his church, in his nation and in his world. However Christian we might be in America if the nations across the sea are not Christian, the boys we raise for Christian living will be dragged into another world war. Ours is one world. We must go toward a better day together or we must turn to blacker barbarism. Every objective that we have considered so far is a plain Christian requirement but it is also a matter of enlightening self interest.

5. The final objective is evangelism. This is a musical word that to many modern ears has lost its music. In many quarters, evangelism has fallen into disrepute. But this, I think, because we have fixed our gaze too much on the abuses of yesterday and have forgotten what evangelism really means. What is it to evangelize? Jesus was the supreme Evangelist. "He came into Galilee," says Mark, "telling the good news about God." That is what it means to evangelize.

What is the content of this good news? Briefly stated, it is this: Jesus told the people of His day that all men were God's children. That was true of Jew and Gentile. It was true of every nation of kindred tribe and tongue. The difference between them then was just this - one acted as a son and the other refused to believe in his own high privilege. Every man then is the son of God.

The second bit of this good news grew naturally out of the first. Since we are all God's children, we are all brothers one of another. We belong to one great family - the family of God. Suppose men were really evangelized after this fashion. That would be the answer to all our problems. This would mean universal brotherhood. It would mean that men would really learn war no more.

You can say, therefore, that evangelism is a fundamental necessity. Not only so, but it is a fundamental part of every other objective. All these would
help evangelism and evangelism would help all these. The right sort of evangelism would make a man Christian in the use of his money. However to reach the million of boys and girls without religious training is an evangelistic movement. It is in this fashion that we could win them to Christ. Our helping of broken people is a means of evangelizing. Our struggle for lasting peace is a help toward evangelizing and the right sort of evangelizing will be, in the end, necessary to bring to pass.

We have a chance in the world today such as no other nation has. One thing this war has done for us is to enable many of our boys to see first hand what our missionaries are really doing. Those who have heard the songs of Zion from those they regarded as black savages, those who have been nursed back to life by the tender hands whose fathers were head-hunters no longer need to be convinced of the worth of a Christian message. Our missionaries, according to Wendell Wilkie have created good will for us around the world. In this hour of crisis, two doors open to us. One is marked danger and the other opportunity. We can take either door but we must take one.

III

Now what can we as individuals do about this. I know how prone we are to let the very bigness of the task give us a sense of insignificance. But such an attitude is as false as it is un-Christian.

1. I can carry my part of the load. I can give. I can do the work of an evangelist. In so doing, I can help others. Along this road and this alone can I come to a rich religious experience.

2. It is only as we face up to this task that we can have a vital and victorious church. We must attack the foes that threaten our very life today or they will destroy us. As in the might of God we go against them and destroy them their strength will enter into ourselves. A crusading church is a strong and living church.
This crusade will not only help us individually and enrich our church but it will help to bring hope to a hopeless world. Dr. Warfield tells of meeting a bunch of ragged and dirty children upon the streets of a Polish city. He gave a small boy a piece of silver. Then he looked up to see a little girl standing on the steps of a shack. She held out her claw like hands for she was starving and said: "What have you got for me?". Before he could explain to her how he couldn't help her she toppled over and never regained consciousness again. That story touched my heart but there are millions of desperate people hungrily turning their faces toward us today with that same question: "What have you for me?" We have much if we are only willing to share it.
I am using the scripture reading as a background rather than a text. It has fallen to live through dangerous and difficult days. God has seen fit to match us against the desperate hour we are facing now, what is perhaps so far the greatest crisis in human history. We are told that in Chinese the word crisis is spelled with two letters - one meaning danger and the other meaning opportunity. We can so meet this crisis as to make it a deadly danger to ourselves individually, to our homes, to our church, to our nation and to our world. But there is a brighter side. We can face it in such fashion as to find it a door of opportunity for ourselves and for our church, our nation and our world. But one thing is sure this great hour is not going to leave us as it found us. It is a great danger. It is also a great opportunity.

How can we make this crisis into an opportunity?

We cannot do so by pitying ourselves because we have been matched against such a difficult hour. Hamlet was brilliant, thoughtful and useless. He could see but he could not act. He whined:

"The world is out of joint, O cursed spite; That I was ever born to set it right."

We are not going to change our crisis into opportunity by wailing. We are not going to do so through self-pity. "I could make a better world than this", a cynic said to a certain minister. "Certainly, you can", came the prompt reply, "that is the reason God put you here."

Let us face the fact then that we cannot change crisis into opportunity by whining. We cannot drive back the darkness by wailing at it. "It is better
to light the least candle than to curse the night." Back among my Tennessee hills a mother sent her two boys across the creek to get the supply of apples for the winter. When they had gathered the crop, enough to fill the wagon bed, they started for home. They had to cross a creek that was shut in by steep banks. As they climbed the further bank, the head gate came out of the wagon with the result that the apples all slid into the water. The older brother sent the younger on to tell the bad news. "Did you save any of the apples?" the mother asked. "Not one." "Well, what is Jim doing?" was the next question. "He is setting down on the bank of the creek, cussing." Well that was not a good contribution but it is about all some make. But cussing will not change a crisis into an opportunity.

Nor can we make an opportunity out of our present crisis by seeking to dig in a standing siege. Holding the fort may be good tactics at times in war, but it is utterly futile in matters of religion. Yet I heard a minister speaking on the Crusade this week offering a faint hope that if we did nothing else we could hold our own. I differ with him completely. Whatever else we do, one thing is certain we are not going to hold our own.

I once read a report of a certain church: "Number received on professional faith - none." And let me say in passing that any church that fails to receive a single convert is unworthy of the name of a church. It is not really a church. It is a mere organization that is being petrified by self complacency. In this church the number received by certificate was exactly equal to the number removed by certificate or death. The report closed with this stupid request. "Pray for us, brethren, that next year we may hold our own." Now I believe in prayer, but I do not believe in that prayer. God never has answered a prayer like that and never will. Individually and as a group, we live our lives on an incline. We either go up or down but no man or organization can stand still. To seek merely to hold our own is not only to head toward disaster but to do so by our own choice.

What then is our opportunity? It is not to lose heart and whine. It is not merely to hold our own. It is to attack. It is to go on a crusade. I like the
crusading idea. I like it because it is interesting. It has life in it. It
thrills with adventure. It has the lure of the far horizons. It is the one
method of victory. No football team ever makes a touchdown while the other side
carries the ball.

How did the Church of the first century change the world? Not by
wailing its weakness nor standing the siege. Every Christian was a crusader.
Two of them were dragged one day before the very court that had sentenced their
Master to death. The sentence of the court was this: "You are not to speak
at all nor teach in the name of Jesus". But these two crusaders answered promptly,
"We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard". The fact that these men
were not merely boasting was proved a few days later when they were again arrested.
This time the court complained: "Did not we tell you not to teach at all or
speak in the name of Jesus, yet you have filled all Jerusalem with your teaching."

Not only so but a little later when their enemies changed from words to
weapons, when the choicest young man of the early church was dragged out of the
city and mobbed, when almost all of them were chased out of the city, they still
did not go on the defensive. They were still crusaders. They went out to lay
almost violent hands upon every man they met to tell him of what they had found
in Jesus Christ. Thus they breathed upon the bleak winter of their day like a
springtime until the Roman eagle was displaced by the Christian cross.

By this time the church had grown strong. It had become interested in
things. It ceased in a large measure to crusade. It drew within its own walls.
and defended itself with the result that without their first realizing it the
sun went down and the night came on. It was a night that lasted for centuries.
We know that period today as the dark ages. The light did not break until a
crusader came on the scene by the name of Martin Luther. Then two centuries
later when Christianity in England was looked upon by multitudes as a dead
theory, there came another crusader by the name of John Wesley who ushered in a
new day. Our hope then has been the crusaders.

II

For what then are we crusading? It might be better to say – For whom are we crusading? This is a crusade for Christ. But what objective do we have in mind? In order to crusade intelligently we must know what we are after. To the ship bound for no harbor, no wind can be favorable. To crusade wholeheartedly, we must believe that the goals we seek are worth seeking. What are they?

1. We are seeking so to teach our people that they will recognize themselves as stewards of Jesus Christ. The practice of stewardship is not optional for one who is Christian. Being a Christian is optional but if we are truly Christian, we must be stewards. That is we must not act as if we belonged to ourselves, as if we had a right to live our own lives in independence of the will of God. To do so is sin in its very essence. We are to recognize that we are God's. We are to use our time, our talent and our wealth as He shall lead.

The stewardship of life is based upon this solid foundation. God is the absolute owner of all. That fact every one must recognize who believes in God at all. "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein." He made it, He owns it. He has never deeded away a single drop of water or a single grain of sand. The man who possesses it today will not possess it tomorrow. It has been fingered by other hands before our hands got hold of it. It will be fingered by other hands still when we behind the vale have passed. Not only is this God's world, but we are God's. We are His by right of creation. But if we are Christian, we are His because we have given ourselves to Him. We cannot be Christian on any other basis. God has no plan of salvation for an unsurrendered heart.

Now since we belong to God, and since this is God's world, it is plain common sense to face the fact that though we may possess we can never own. Since God owns all, we are to set aside some pit of our time and talent and some
bit of our money in acknowledgment of His ownership. Why so? This is not for God's benefit. It is for ours. The man who fails to acknowledge God's ownership by using some bit of his wealth for his fellows will sooner or later come to believe that he owns. The Rich Farmer confused possession and ownership. That branded him as a fool. Not only so, but he had shut God out of his life. To recognize God's ownership is to have His fellowship. To fail to do so is to walk alone.

Now it is difficult to get many people to practice stewardship in the use of their money because stewardship is the university of giving and so many of us have never passed through high school. The high school is tithing. He said explicitly to the people in His day, "This you ought to have done". The man who conscientiously tithes in a business like way is likely to graduate into a good steward.

We can see now that our primary objective is not merely the raising of $25,000,000. It is not the careful gathering of a part of one apple crop. It is the pruning and fertilizing of the orchard so that it will bear in increasing abundance. Having come from the farm, I know it is possible to milk a cow in such fashion as to dry her up. There is a way of getting money that might have the same dire effect. Paul tells us that he was fairly besieged by a bunch of beggars in a city he visited. They were begging him for the privilege of giving him some money. How did it come about? They first gave themselves to the Lord. This is a campaign of a new giving of self. That is to issue in streams of Christian giving that will help change human deserts into gardens.

2. The second objective that we are seeking is the building up of our Sunday-school. The fact that our Sunday-schools are smaller than they were a score of years ago certainly indicates that we have not been crusaders in this important field. Why should we go on a crusade now. We ought to go on this crusade because we have a ready and roomy field in which to reap. Almost half of the boys
and girls of America are receiving no religious training whatsoever. There are more than 17,000,000 of these who in this respect are being utterly neglected.

We ought to give attention to this because religion is a fundamental necessity. It is the saving salt without which a civilization rots down. We ought to crusade for these boys and girls because they can be won. If there is one fact upon which all intelligent people believe today it is this—that children are not so much born as made. What your child becomes depends far more than anything else upon the training that that child receives.

Who says so? Well, this sane old Book says it. "Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it." To that emphatic statement modern science says—amen. The psychologists assure us that children are not so much born as made. To that declaration also the law of sowing and reaping says—amen. Whatsoever a man soweth in his field, whatsoever he soweth in the heart of his child, that shall he also reap. To this also the voice of experience says—amen. We can change the thinking and acting of any generation by changing the training of that generation.

We ought to take this matter seriously because if we don't do it, nobody else will. All we have to do to have a pagan world tomorrow is to do nothing. All we have to do to move toward a Christian world is to win in this field. This is a matter we cannot leave altogether to the home. There are too many parents who have no religion. We cannot leave it to the public schools. The teaching of the public schools is not antagonistic to religion. It does not deny God. It does something that is often worse, it ignores Him.

Here is a part of an editorial that I clipped a few weeks ago from one of our leading daily papers. This editorial quoting a leading authority in the realm of education pointed out the decline in religious reading in our schools that has taken place since the founding of our Republic. From 1775 to 1786, 100% of the reading of the boys and girls in our schools was definitely religious.
From 1786 to 1825, 50% was religious. From 1825 to 1900, it dropped to 21%. From 1900 to 1920, it went down to 5%. Today it is less than 1%. If we don't Christianize the boys and girls of America, who will? We are their one chance.

3. The third objective that we are seeking through this crusade is to help to rebuild the shattered and broken peoples of those countries that have been devastated by war. To share their suffering with them is a necessity if we are Christian. But like all Christian duties, it is enlightened self-interest. How shall these people be saved from embracing political dogmas that we believe would be hurtful to them and to the world. You can only save them from this by saving them from desperation and despair. If people are starving they will listen to any fascist who offers a solution to their problem. We are to help rebuild these broken peoples because they need help and because we need their help.

4. We are seeking so far as in us lies to help bring to our bleeding world a lasting peace. We do this in the realization that we are one world. No man can be intelligently interested in the smallest child in America without being interested in his church, in his community and in the school to which his child goes. He must be interested in the activities of his community. He must be interested in his nation and the world. Because if another world war comes, your child will be drawn into it regardless of the way you have trained him.

Finally, this is a crusade of evangelism. I put this last because I regard it as fundamental. It is our all-inclusive task. The practice of stewardship is a most effective way of evangelizing. Money is power. You can use it for the making or the wrecking of men. To undertake to keep it is surely to lose it. But it can be changed into human personality. Invested in men and women, boys and girls, it will last forever. Just as stewardship is a method of evangelism, even so to evangelize genuinely is to result in the practice of stewardship.

To enlarge our Sunday-school is one of the best methods of evangelizing.
The overwhelming majority of those who come into our church today come through the Sunday-school. At the same time really to evangelize is to enlist those who are engaged in the important work of Christian education.

To help build up those who are bleeding and broken either in our own lands or in the lands across the sea is again a most effective way of practicing evangelism. I do not know just to what church the Good Samaritan belonged but I am quite sure that the man he rescued would have picked out that church as soon as he recovered. Everybody wants to go to a church where folks care. Real evangelism makes people care. People who care really evangelize.

Finally, evangelism offers the surest foundation for the building of a permanent peace. This war has many crimes to its credit but one helpful thing it has done: it has convinced some of the worth of Christian missionaries who had formerly looked upon missionaries as the most backward of all back numbers. Here for instance are seven young men wrecked on an island in the south seas. The island is in the hands of the Japs. But some wild looking natives found these seven young men. "A Christian", one informs them, then with his fellows he hides these soldiers. He feeds them, nurses the wounded back to health. All this they receive at the hands of men and women whose fathers had been cannibals and head-hunters. "The one individual", says a recent writer in the Saturday Evening Post, "that has held the respect of China for the white man has not been the statesman, the soldier, or the diplomat, but it has been the missionary."

It is then as we do the work of an evangelist that we lay one sure foundation for a secure world. This is the case for what evangelism means. What is it to evangelize? Look at the supreme Evangelist. "Jesus came into Galilee telling the good news about God." What is the content of that good news. It includes two parts. First, all men are God's children. The only difference between saint and sinner is that one takes the place of a son and the other does not. Since all men are sinners, all men are brothers. That is
evangelism. It is the kind of evangelism that we must believe and practice or blast civilization from off the earth.

III

Now, in the light of these facts, I believe that you will agree that we ought to take this crusade seriously. We ought to do so for at least three reasons:

1. We ought to do so because it is the only way we ourselves can be sanely, vitally and joyfully Christian. No man is strong enough to be a Christian without working sacrificially at the task. If you really desire the ability to say out of your own experience, "I know whom I have believed", go out from this hour to be with what you have and what you are a crusader.

2. This is the only way to build up a vital, thrilling, sacrificial church that will be able to command the respect of those who have had to sacrifice and suffer during these desperate days. If when our boys come home either with their wounds of body or wounds of mind, they see in our living and in our giving the marks of the Lord Jesus they themselves will not be faithless but believe.

3. Finally, this is the one hope of our world. We are not going to move into a new day merely by letting matters alone. We can so move by giving of our best. Dr. Warfield tells of being besieged on the streets of a certain Polish city by a pitiful group of starving children. He took a silver coin out of his pocket and gave it to a raggedy little boy to see the morning light of a new day of hope break over his pitiful face. Then he turned to see a little girl, no longer able to stand, stretching out her claw-like arms to him and as she stretched those fleshless skeleton hands, she asked this pitiful question: "Mister, what have you got for me?" Before he could explain that he had nothing, she fell into a coma from which she never recovered. She died of starvation. Not one little girl but millions hungry for physical bread and hungry for the Bread of Life are turning their wistful faces to you and me today with
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I. Few revolutions are more marked than that which has taken place in recent years in the liquor question. A quarter of a century ago liquor was an outlaw. It was a common bane, a veritable alatern. Today it is a prince. The kitchen slave has become a Cinderella. That which used to make the conduct of a man a bit questionable and the conduct of a woman disgraceful has now become a matter of good taste.

To such a degree has this become the case, that whereas one used to apologize for drinking, today in some circles, he feels called to apologize for not doing so. Is not drinking a mark of distinction according to most beautiful advertisements? A young lady, a member of my church told me how terribly embarrassed she often becomes because she feels that she must refuse a cocktail. Guzzling has become glamourized.

When I am at some hotel I seem especially lucky in getting a room beside some wild party. I had this experience in Atlanta some time ago. But there was one girl who refused to drink. The crowd brought every pressure. At last they called her a siss; that was hard to take. As a matter of fact, the sissy is the man or the woman who has to drink to bolster her ego. But she proved to her crowd she was not a sissy by using a language strong even as theirs.

Now, the fact that drinking has become so respectable that often people who are conscientious on the subject feel they must apologize for not indulging is most unfortunate. It is of all things what the liquor interests most desire. There is nothing for which they must deeply long than drinking become respectable. Yet I have always felt that the embarrassment ought to be on the other way around.
I have as much right to my convictions as my friend to his lack of convictions. Then there is this other fact, that while our attitude toward liquor has changed—liquor itself has remained the same. It may be labeled "Four Roses", but those roses do something to the man who plucks them that no man in the last analysis wants done.

Whatever our attitude toward liquor may be, it still shatters our nerves, benumbs our brains, slows down our reactions. The British Medical Journal confirms that one glass a year increases our chance of error 21 percent. That is, when we feel like we can handle the situation better than usual, we handle it worse. When we feel more sure of ourselves at the steering-wheel, we are far more sure of a wreck. A man who had had one drink of liquor cannot crook his finger or bat his eye or step on the brake as quickly as he could without it.

So popular has liquor become that a late Gallup Poll declared that 59 percent of the women in America drink to some extent. That fact says a distinguished physician lessens their chance of being the mothers of healthy children and increases their chance of being the mothers of illegitimate children. Liquor is still a poison. If I call on you some evening and you inform me that you have just been putting out some rat poison, but that you had a little left that you have made into some lovely sandwiches, I shall not feel embarrassed to refuse to share your poison with you.

Now, how did we get that way? As indicated, it is not because liquor itself has changed. In the first place, the fault is pretty well known. Prohibition was written into the Constitution by the Church—to speak more accurately, it was written into the Constitution by the Protestant Christianity. It was the result of years of teaching
years of prayerful and tearful propaganda; and in spite of the fact that we look back to those days as if to a horrible civil war, there was less drinking then than there has been ever before or since. The 4,000 Keeley institutions were reduced to 15. The parent of all these, the one in Illinois, in its boom year 1929 treated only 800 patients; for the fifty years prior to Prohibition, it had treated an average of 8,000 per year.

Then the liquor interest took up the propaganda. They used the press, they used popular fiction, they made immense use of the movies. They have a highly paid staff in Hollywood whose business it is to glamourize drinking. There is therefore only one thing to be done if America is not soon to become the drunkest nation on the earth. We must start again and give our people the facts about liquor. Bear this in mind, that the truth is all on our side. Science declares that liquor is a poison. It is an enemy of life and a friend of death. There is nothing alive that liquor will not kill; there is nothing dead that liquor will not preserve.
II. Why does the church have a right to speak on the liquor question? Because it is a moral question.

Some years ago a member of my church whose contribution was $3600 a year to the budget, wrote me a letter protesting a Prohibition meeting that was to be held in our church. He said it was purely a political question and I had no right there. I was on the spot. I saw that $3600 disappearing beyond the horizon, and I needed it. Therefore I wrote him a letter. "My dear Mr. Blank," I wrote, "I see from your letter that you are a convinced wet. It so happens that I am a convinced dry. Therefore, the only way I can keep my self-respect and keep your respect for me is to act like one. For this reason the meeting will go on." I received a lovely letter from him—and what is more, he kept paying his $3600. Why?

The church has a stake in the liquor question in the second place because liquor is against everything for which the church stands. What did Jesus call these followers of his—the salt of the earth. Everybody knows what salt is. The little girl defined it in her essay Salt, she said, is that stuff that makes food taste bad if you don't put in it in it. Salt gives a tang to the feast of life. Life grows stale without it. Much of the drinking is to give life a tang. But that tang doesn't last. It leaves the victim at last with an ill head and an aching heart.

Then salt is a great preventative. It stands before invading rottenness. The Church is salt in that it conserves and realizes the worth of personality and seeks to keep it from going to waste. Liquor on the other hand is a supreme waster. Only salt can be any kind of rival. If you want something to lay waste all of life—to destroy everything of worth—let liquor have the right of way.

That is even true economically. Our liquor bill in 1945 was
approximately 8 billion dollars. Of that 8 billion dollars a little more than 2 billion went towards paying taxes. In that same year, the crime bill was 15 billion dollars. The Superintendent of San Quentin declares that 40% of all crime has liquor for its source. Thus, while we spent approximately 2 billion dollars for taxes, we paid out 6 for crime. But of course this does not include loss through wrecks on the road, through mangled bodies, through sickness, through the upkeep of hospitals and insane asylums. 60% of all confirmed drunkards either die in institutes or die drunk. Economically, liquor is the worst of parasites.

III. But, some will answer, this is not a question of the harm of liquor but how best to handle a public enemy. Since Prohibition won't work, since it promotes bootlegging, why not have liquor stores?

First, permit me to say that the bootlegger is not a child of Prohibition—he is the child of the legalized liquor traffic. There was no such thing as bootleggers until the government sought to control liquor.

Second, I am opposed to liquor stores for the very good reason that they sell more liquor than is sold by bootleggers. I know that old story; the reason some folks buy liquor is you say they can’t have it! But to affirm that more liquor is kept out of sight and made than when ads are on display and advertised is simply to talk silly. Such an affirmation does not rise even to the sight of dignified nonsense.

If the way to sell goods is to hide them, then those who run Iveys, Efirds, and Belks stores are terribly silly. Instead of buying newspaper space and having expensive show windows, they ought to conceal their goods in some back alley and send a colored man out in the night with a few ties and pairs of socks in his pocket. The liquor folks believe that
is the way to sell liquor; hence, they spend approximately $100,000,000 a year in advertising. In the little town where I spend my summer, we have 5 liquor stores. The town has 1,300 population. They spent more for liquor in 1945 than for the groceries and dry goods together. Prohibition is not a perfect answer, but it is the nearest perfection we have tried.

IV. What makes liquor a problem? First there are those who want to drink it. Some of these drink out of curiosity—they began under social pressure. They are trying to get something that gives them a thrill, something that packs a punch. Among these there are always those who are allergic to liquor—who cannot drink moderately and who become addicts.

The second group helps make liquor a problem is those that desire to make money out of it. This is far more dangerous—the far more heartless. Some of those who drink are the most kindly of people, people with character and ability. Those, if they stay with liquor long enough, will see liquor destroy character. But the man who is willing to debauch others in order to put money in his pocket is about the most devilish man alive. If it were not for these 2 groups, liquor would be no more a problem than Sassafras tea.

There is a little group that help these 2 to operate. That is the good-natured folks like yourselves who deplore the ravages of liquor, but who shrug their shoulders and say that nothing can be done about it. That defeatist attitude bodes ill. If something can be done about dope, something can be done about liquor.

Mrs. Marshall tells in her book, "Together", of how the bootleggers sold liquor among the soldiers and her husband situated in Charleston, S.C.
The General went to the leading men of Charleston—lawyers, bankers, doctors, churchmen—and said that if this drinking did not stop, he would move the army. Moving the army meant loss of money. Word was passed down and the bootlegging stopped. The law against murder is only 65% effective. The law against liquor can never be 100% effective, but I am confident of this—Prohibition at its worse is better than any form of legalized liquor at its best.

For instance, the Canadians are a law-abiding people generally speaking. Some years ago I was conducting a preaching in Nova Scotia. In the town where I was preaching was a big brewery. That brewery made Apple Jack. Apple Jack if potent stuff; it would make Hickey Mouse slap the jaws of any lion. So heavy was the tax on that liquor that it sold for $20 a gallon. Yet a better grade of Apple Jack was being smuggled in from the West Indies and was being sold for .80 a gallon. That is, the drinker could save $19.20 per gallon by trading with the bootlegger. In that case I think I would just patronize the bootlegger and put the $19.20 in the collection.
"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink."

The liquor traffic has had a long and bloody history. It has wrecked more homes, blighted more hopes, spoiled more dreams, robbed more children, cheated more wives and lovers, weakened more bodies, filled more coffins and dug more graves than any other single evil that the world has ever known. One would think that such a cruel and deadly and ghastly enemy would not have a friend in the world. And yet centuries ago and to this day God must raise His voice in protest and cry, "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drunk." This is a message of warning, not for the dealer in liquor alone but for every one who directly or indirectly becomes partner in this hellish business.

I.

It is just ten years since Prohibition was written into the Constitution. This achievement was regarded by multitudes as the greatest piece of legislature in all human history. It was reform born not of the spasmodic efforts of a few fanatics, but of more than fifty years of zealous teaching and hard campaigning by multitudes of consecrated men and women. Prohibition was not a child of the brothel. It was not born of selfish lawlessness, it was rather born in the hearts of holy wives and mothers. It was born in the hearts of prayerful and thoughtful men. It was born in Christian homes, in country churches and city churches. It is in a peculiar way a child of religion. It is in a more peculiar sense still a child of Protestant religion.

The ten years that have passed since Prohibition was written
into the Constitution have been years of unprecedented prosperity. Be the causes what they may, no other nation has ever been so prosperous. There are those who believe that this prosperity at least is due to the fact that the world's supreme waster has been in some measure destroyed.

But there were those from the first who did not believe in Prohibition. There have been those thru these ten years who have persistently sought the child's life. This they have done not in any fair or legal fashion but with characteristic dishonesty and lawlessness. Among the forces of evil with which the law has had to reckon is the bootlegger. More powerful than the bootlegger himself have been other influences and have made his business possible and profitable.

But the bootlegger is not the child of Prohibition. He was here long before Prohibition was born. He is as old as the legalized liquor traffic. Of course, he was not so conspicuous in the days of the open saloon. When our national life was stained with the ghastly blood and grease spots of the open saloon, the smaller flecks of filth caused by the bootlegger were not so conspicuous. It is only since these larger black spots have been removed that the bootlegger has come into such hideous prominence. One who has a bulldog at his heels pays little attention to a misquito, but when the bulldog is dead that the misquito becomes troublesome.

Along with the bootlegger, shearing his guilt has been the corrupt official. Unfortunately the child Prohibition, born of Christian parentage has often had to be cared for by its enemies rather than by its friends. There are some faithful and loyal officials. Let us be thankful for them. An officer of the lat who is true to his oath today must needs have an iron-bound constitution. His encouragement to enforce
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the law is often slight while pressure brought upon him to violate is often very heavy.

But the most dangerous foe that Prohibition has today in my opinion is at the hands of many decent, respectable and otherwise law-abiding people. It is this class that is hardest to reach. It is this class that gives a touch of respectability to what would otherwise be utterly disgraceful. It is this class whose conduct is most reprehensible and most difficult to understand. It is this class that puts the tremendous weapon, public opinion, in the hands of lawlessness rather than in the hands of law.

I can understand the conduct of the avowedly criminal classes. The ignorant negro as he sells his wares in black bottom does not amaze me; the misguided foreigner with his inbred hatred of every form of government is comprehensible, but the sons and daughters of the flag, the children of those who fought in the Revolution, how these can constitute themselves as final authority and decide for themselves the laws that they will obey, is at once depressing and bewildering. They demand that the law protecting their life and property be enforced, but the law to which many a mother is looking to help her safeguard the sobriety of her sons and daughters is ruthlessly trampled under foot.

II.

There are excuses for such conduct. They are exceedingly familiar.

1. They have a right to break the law because of the way in which it was enacted. But if ever a law was fairly written into the Constitution with the sanction of the majority it was the case of the Eighteenth Amendment. But Congress voted to submit it to the states by a majority of 347 to 148. The votes of the various legislatures of the states show 79% for
and 21% against. It was ratified by every one of the forty-eight states with the exception of Connecticut and Rhode Island.

2. It interferes with personal liberty. That old chestnut that was cracked in the mouth of the caves ten thousand years ago, yet one of the women testifying for the wets in Washington the past week gave that as her reason for wanting Prohibition repealed. It interfered with the personal practices of the individual. So does every law insofar as those personal practices seem harmful to the common good. I own a car. What is more amazing, it is paid for. Yet, I cannot drive it as fast as I please. I cannot go down the street on either side I please, I cannot park where I please. I ran out of gasoline some time ago. Happening to have a milk bottle in my car I stepped down to the station to get it full of gasoline. I didn't know any better, but the keeper of the station did. I did not get the gasoline. He interfered with my personal liberty.

3. Another favorite objection that is hoary with age, is, "You cannot make people religious by legal enactment. That is true. It is further true that nobody is trying to do so. It is further true also that no enlightened man or woman thinks that anybody is trying to do so. It is written in the Decalogue, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." The law of the state forbids perjury and slander, but does anyone say for this reason that the state is trying to drive its citizens into the church. The Bible says, "Thou shalt not steal." So does the state, but does any one cry for religious liberty because of that fact. Every railroad company forbids its engineers, etc. to use liquor. Does that mean they are trying to force them into Sunday School?

What is the state after when it says, "Thou shalt not kill, or steal, or bear false witness? It is seeking to protect society. The same
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is the purpose of the Prohibition law. Everybody knows that a drunken man is a menace. You do not trust him at the throttle of a locomotive. You do not trust him at the wheel of an automobile. If he is unfit to handle a machine he is no more fit to discharge the delicate responsibilities of home life and social life. The primary purpose of the law is not to compel him to be religious, it is to forbid his being a beast. And to say that prohibition is an effort to compel folks to be religious by legal enactment is as utterly silly as it is false.

4. But the big reason for the violation of this law is that it cannot be enforced. This is the argument that the liquor interests have brought forward from the beginning. It is the argument that is being constantly reiterated and emphasized by an overwhelmingly wet press. It is an argument that they believe will sooner or later tell on the moral of those favoring the law. In that they are right. There are those who were once hopeful who have lost hope and who are on the point of surrendering to the liquor forces in despair.

Then, with amazing audacity the wets undertake to lay upon the law responsibility for all the abuses that have brought about for the violation of the law. If a law-enforcement officer is killed in the path of duty, that is a small matter. Yet small as it is, it is charged to Prohibition. If a bootlegger, in resisting arrest, is killed, a howl of rage is lifted to heaven. Our newspapers speak of it quite often as if he were a martyr to the cause of humanity. Those who die of poisoned liquor are killed by Prohibition. This reminds one of the boy's essay on pins. "Pins," he wrote "is good things. They have saved thousands of lives." The teacher read it in amazement and naturally asked, "How have pins saved so many lives? Charlie.

"He answered readily, "By people not swallowing them." And so have the wets
Now what have the wets to offer in the place of Prohibition? They suggest that we repeal or amend. If we repeal that puts us back into the liquor business. Assuming that nobody wants the open saloon back again, yet that suggestion by the wets puts the nation back into the liquor business. I read an article the past week expressing great approval of the English system of handling the liquor business. In England the saloon is open only five and one-half hours of the day. The English are a law-abiding people. This gentleman expressed vast approval of that system, but confessed that the laboring man of England was spending from twenty to twenty-five percent of his weekly salary for drink.

Another suggestion is light wines and beer, but when we had the open saloon light wines and beers constituted more than ninety percent of the drink. To have light wines and beer, therefore, is to bring the saloon back more than ninety percent at once. Of course, there are those who maintain that wine and beer do not intoxicate. They refer to the drinking Continental Europe. While these people do not drink to drunkenness as we do, yet they pay the price of their use of alcohol. Seven-tenths of all the wine in the world is made in Italy, Spain and France. They furnish the largest percent per capita in consumption of pure alcohol of all the nations in the world.

Germany is a bear drinking nation. During the war, however, their drinking was of necessity greatly reduced. Arthur Hunter, the Actuary of the New York Life Insurance Company declared that fatalities were twelve
percent greater during the twelve years preceding the war than during the four years of war. That is, the beer of Germany is more deadly than its bullets. The investigation conducted by forty-three life insurance companies reached the following conclusions. A moderate drinker decreases his expectancy by eighteen percent. A moderate drinker who goes into occasional excesses decreases his expectancy twenty percent. One who drinks more than two glasses of beer or one glass of whiskey decreases his expectancy eighty-six percent.

The one purpose of this suggestion by the wets is simply to make liquor more plentiful and easier to get for the coming back of any form of legalized liquor traffic does not in any sense do away with the bootlegger. It has not done so in Canada. One writer claims that it has increased it by one hundred eleven percent. It will not do so here. The liquor traffic is an outlaw. It always has been. You might as well expect a vulture to change into a skylark or for a rattlesnake to grow wings as for the liquor business to keep the law.

What then shall we do? Shall we surrender this costly victory for righteousness. A Democratic form of government means a rule of the people, but this does not require all of the people, it only requires a majority. A majority has voted dry. Having done so shall it weakly yield to the minority. Shall the dog wag the tail or the tail wag the dog? I see no reason for yielding to a minority when the only claim of the minority is that it is wet and has no respect for law anyway.
"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink."

-- Habakkuk 2:15.

Thus God warned men through his prophet in the long ago. The Bible is emphatic against the making and drinking of intoxicating liquors. But we do not need the Bible to know that this deadly traffic is wrong. The "woe" here pronounced will be just as emphatic in an almanac in a country store as it is here in the Bible. Dealing in liquor is a deadly wrong, not because the Bible says so, but because it is such. The Bible warns against it. Woe always follows in the traffic of liquor. If every one, living and dead, who has found that true in his own experience were to say "Amen" it would boom like a million cannonades and shake like a thousand earthquakes.

I.

We are on the eve of a great battle. It is a conflict whose issues are wider and deeper, I dare say, than the wisest of us know. What is the question that we are now calling upon you to decide? By way of clearing the issue, let me state to begin with what it is not.

1. It is not now a question of light wines and beer.

For years, our wet friends have led us to believe that if they could get light wines and beer, then paradise would be regained. They
were as emphatic as we in their renunciation of the saloon. It
must not return under any circumstances. But now that light wines
and beer are a foregone conclusion for a large part of the United
States, the cry against the saloon has become very faint and far away.
Beer is good, but it is not all that is to be desired.

Of course beer of 3.2 per cent alcoholic content is not
intoxicating. This is the verdict of the wets. But what is the basis
of their assertion? Floyd Gibbons tells us that it is the average
of pre-war beer. Some are stronger, some lighter. Pabst Blue Ribbon
had only 2.9 per cent. British authorities say that beer of 3.2
per cent alcohol is intoxicating. Every beer-drinker, I am sure, knows
this to be the fact. A certain magazine editor, who has a genius for
being on the wrong side of every question, said recently that such
beer was slop. However, he laid down three rules for the drinking of
it: First, do not drink it while at work. Work and beer will not
mix. Second, do not drink on an empty stomach. Third, Drink slowly;
take a glass and then wait two hours. But his crowning statement is
that when he wishes to lose his mind - that is when he wishes to get
drunk, he prefers raw liquor, thus declaring that there are two
doors to dead drunkenness - one the beer door, and the other the
liquor door.

If this beer is not intoxicating, one thing is sure,
it will not sell. If it will not sell, it will not bring in revenue.
Therefore, it will defeat the purpose for which it was created. Only
intoxicating beer sells. I know what a great food drink it is. It
makes thin folks fat and fat folks lean. It is running over with
vitamins. But the one thing that makes folks drink it is because
it makes them partly or wholly drunk. You had just as well open
a store in this city to sell empty banana stalks as to sell beer
without alcohol. Only this past week, our papers carried notices of
a certain firm in New Jersey that was then engaged in emptying five
thousand cases of near beer into the sewer. Think of all that fine food, our liquid bread, as one enthusiast calls it, going into the sewer because nobody would buy it. And the one reason was that it would not make them drunk.

What shall we say, then, of those men who voted to legalize beer, when the constitution of the United States forbids the manufacturing and selling of intoxicating drink. Their one getting out place was on the plea of technicality. I read the arguments before the legislature of Texas over a week ago. R. J. Boyle represented the wets. His one argument was this. That the congress and the legislature had a right to define intoxicating liquors. If they define 3.2 per cent as not intoxicating, then it is not. If they define 10 per cent as not intoxicating, it is not. If they define 99 or 100 per cent, it is not intoxicating. They can still be true to their oath of office. For nothing is intoxicating that they say is not. If they declare that carbolic acid is malted milk, then babies will cry for it more than they used to cry for castoria. But this is not a question of beer. That is already guaranteed to most of the United States.

2. This is not a question of the best method of handling the liquor problem. Our anti friends do not believe in prohibition. It is up to them, therefore, to suggest some better way of control. If I should suggest, for instance, the election of our governors by popular vote, you would expect me to suggest how they were to be elected in the state. If I should propose the abolishing of the Jury System, it would be up to me to offer something to take its place. Such is the case with the wets. But they have no such suggestion to offer. We do not have before us, therefore, the consideration of two different methods of controlling liquor. What then is the question? It is this: Shall we repeal or shall we not? Prohibition, they say, has not proved a success. It is a cage in which we have made an effort
to keep that nest of vipers called the liquor traffic. But some
of these snakes have escaped and stung folks to death. But our
anti friends, instead of suggesting a better and stronger cage,
simply say, "Open the cage door. Smash it into fragments. Let the
serpents out." Then, after they have got themselves well hidden
and intrenched, they appoint a committee. Only last week, there was
a notice declaring that a company of women had met at one of our
leading hotels to devise means of liquor control. But it stated in
smaller type that this was to be done if, and when, the 13th Amendment
was repealed. They had nothing to suggest until that was passed. Another
sister writes, in one of our local papers, declaring that the wets
would have something to offer; that a committee of women was studying
the liquor situation in Europe to get suggestions. But these were not
reported so far. We are, therefore, asked to repeal prohibition,
which means the restoration of the saloon. Carter Glass, who fathered
the amendment in the beginning, refused to support it for this very
reason - that it sought repeal and put nothing in its place.

II.

The wets affirm that prohibition should be repealed.
We deny it. I am going to confine myself to answering their arguments.
They are old and familiar. But they die hard.

1. Prohibition ought to be repealed because it is impossible
to enforce it. You cannot, they affirm with righteous indignation,
make people religious by legal action. We agree, nothing of the kind
was ever intended or undertaken. The law against murder is not to
make you good, it is simply to protect society. The law against
stealing is not to make me honest, it is to protect your property.
The law against drunkenness recognizes the fact that a drunk man is a
menace. That was true in the day when he could drop the reins on the
neck of his horse and perhaps get home. It is doubly true when he can
not drop the steering wheel of his car with equal safety. Wherever
liquor is, the life of the non-drinker is always endangered by it.

We face the fact that prohibition has had stormy sailing. We acknowledge with sorrow that it has not always had the right backing on the part of its friends. When it was written into the constitution, we felt that the battle was over. But in the language of Shakespeare, "We had scotched the snake, not killed it." And our foes have been coming consciously and persistently. They have shown themselves powerless and unscrupulous beyond our expectations. Let me mention a few of them:

(1) One of the worst has been a consistently wet press. For some reason, the vast majority of our papers have done their best to poison public opinion against the enforcement of this law. If an officer was killed in line of duty, he was written up as a bit of a fool. If a boot-legger was killed, he was a martyr to personal liberty. Nothing has been left unsaid that would discredit the law. Now suppose our wet press had been as diligent in its search for something good to say about this law as it is to say about beer, what a volume of right public opinion they might have created! To hear them speak about beer, you would think it was the one hope of our poor fallen race. Here, for instance, is an article in which Ben Burney is interviewed. He says beer would produce a new American type of music. Here is another from Buck declaring that a revival of music was coming with beer - that suds would cement family life. "In the old days", I quote, "beer used to keep people home. Saturday night particularly used to be 'home night'." What an utter insult to the intelligence of those of us who lived in those days! When did alcohol ever cement a family? And Saturday night, of all nights in the week, was the one of direst debauchery. The one night of all others in which the father came home latest and drunkest and most broke. Yet these articles go out all over the United States, pure bunkum and bologna, it is true, in not rising to the height of dignified nonsense. Yet they are written in the
conviction that you can persistently say the most false and stupid things until a large number of people will believe them.

(2) Then, we have suffered much by having to trust the enforcement of this law to the hands of men who were themselves lawless and thoughtlessly unfriendly to it. There have been notable exceptions I know. Thank God for the officer today who is straight and clean! He must needs be a man of iron-bound, constitution. A great many of them are not. It is true in every city in America. It is true here. If common rumors are to be trusted, we have officers in our county who ought to at least be impeached, if not put in the penitentiary.

(3) The third hindrance I mention has been the respectable patronizer of the bootlegger. Of all the foes, I believe this is the worst. The negro peddling his wares in Black Bottom, foreign-born riff raff, ignorant of our laws and traditions, these could never discredit a law. But men in whose veins flow the blood of ancestors who fought in the Revolution - men who demand the protection of the law for their life and property, but who make a joke of this particular law because it does not appeal to them personally - these men may often have done more to discredit prohibition than any other class in America. But in spite of all these foes, Mr. Woodcock who has a right to be the best informed man on this subject in the United States, declares that the prohibition law is 36 per cent efficient, while the law against murder is only 65 per cent.

2. Our congressmen and senators tell us that the Eighteenth Amendment ought to be repealed, because they have a mandate from the people to repeal it. Now, any intelligent and informed man knows that that is absolutely false. Mr. Hoover was for the repeal and Mr. Roosevelt was for the repeal. How then, could a vote for either of them be construed into a vote for repeal. The American people may repeal the Eighteenth Amendment, I do not know and you do not know,
but they have not done so yet, and the vote was no more a vote
to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment than it was to repeal the law
of gravitation. Yet some of our dry congressmen justify themselves
for voting wet, because they say the platform was wet and the people
have spoken. Yet, when the platform of 1928 was dry and Al Smith
defied his platform and ran as a wet, these same politicians applauded
him for having the courage of his convictions. But they themselves
have simply declared a moratorium on conscience. But here is the
part of that same mandate from the people that all of them seem to
have forgotten. The platform pledged them to pass such measures as
would promote real temperance and safeguard against the return of the
open saloon. The beer bill was passed with dispatch and with wild
enthusiasm. But what about safeguarding against the return of the
saloon? We no longer hear that mentioned. Here is Floyd Gibbons speaking
as a wet and for the wets. "You have heard congressmen and preachers
and even a lot of wet brothers and sisters say that the saloon was gone
forever. But it is coming back. It is right around the corner. Only
we won't call it a saloon. No sir, our old puritan conscience will
not let the word back into circulation. Here's the way brewers, I
would like to see beer handled.

"First, the licensed beer shop at which the old man could
stop and meet his friends and come home chuckling, instead of kicking
the cat." According to that, these prohibition days have been hard
on cats. But they have been fine on boys and girls. Attendance
upon our high schools has increased since prohibition went into effect,
nine times as fast as the population. Attendance upon our colleges
has increased ten times as fast as the population. If prohibition has
led to the kicking of cats, it has also helped in the education of
boys and girls and young men and women."

But the quotation continues, "And then this for the missis,
8.

'Hello, is this Schmidt's market? You got, maybe, some nice spare-ribs? Good, and say, Hans, don't forget a dozen bottles of beer. Sure, light beer. Better make it two dozen bottles.' That is the way it's got to be if beer is going to wear respectable clothes and and go to work for the Government. Honest, open sale of beer in groceries, delicatessen, any food shops, is the consensus of policy on the part of brewers. They depend upon it to wipe out the prejudice against beer, to even beer up in those years between "Ten nights in a Bar Room" and the "Democratic Repeal Plank." What beer needs is dignity. And if it takes its place on the grocery shelf along side of sugar, coffee, breakfast food and vanilla extract, mother and sister needn't be afraid to take home a few unwrapped bottles right in the market basket."

But here we come to the sweetest part of it all - "It seems that the wets really meant what they said when they vowed that the saloon was gone, never to return. But city officials rose up. It was all very well, they said, for people with the price of a meal to get their beer in a swell hotel or restaurant, but what about the boys in the greasy overalls, and the grime of labor? No use asking them to buy bottled beer and carry it home to ice-boxless homes, etc. There you have it. You must have a saloon for these boys of the greasy overalls. They are not able to own an ice box. They are not able to keep cool milk for their children. They are not able to even give them a glass of ice water. But they themselves must have a comfortable place in which to drink their beer. How true it is to the damning facts of the case! And yet he himself would not realize that he was making an argument of which the devil himself would have been ashamed. He proceeds to tell us what honest men the brewers are, and how they will earnestly try to elevate the public. It is an old gag. They have been elevating the public for scores of years. But they have not got it any higher than the gates of hell yet. If our conscientious
brethren, they have a mandate from the people to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment, they also have a mandate to safeguard us against the saloon. But this part of it, they have utterly forgotten.

Third, we ought to repeal prohibition in order to bring back prosperity. How any man with intelligence enough to learn the multiplication table would ever make a statement of that kind is more than I can understand. But it is a dangerous argument just at this time. Many people are in desperate straits. The nation is sick. I knew a sick man some time ago, whose wife had to make the living by taking in washing, to spend their savings of $75.00 on a quack remedy. It was pitiful, but the poor fellow was desperate. It is the case with many people today. They have reached the place where they say things cannot be any worse. Any change might be for the better, and so they are more easily duped then if things were prosperous. As a matter of fact, things could be worse. They are vastly worse in those countries where they have plenty of liquor to produce prosperity.

But as a matter of fact, liquor drinking never made any man prosperous. To make such a claim is to throw dust in the eyes of reason, and spit in the face of common sense. Such men as Fisher of Yale, Cooley of Harvard, Douglas of the University of Chicago—all men of the very first rank in the field of economics, proclaim the absurdity of liquor bringing prosperity. Liquor is an outlaw. It is a parasite. It is a blood-sucker. You might as well count a dog prosperous because of his abundance of fleas and ticks as to expect a nation to become prosperous through liquor.

But it is going to put some hundred and twenty-five or a hundred and fifty millions of dollars in the treasury! But even at that, it will cost infinitely more than it pays. The revenue that it gets will be wrung largely from the empty hands of those least able to pay. The organization against the prohibition amendment is not large, but it represents more than forty billions of dollars in wealth.
One of its members gave as his reason for the legalizing of beer, that it would save his corporation ten million dollars annually. Now, you must know that one of the greatest dangers that threatens our nation today is the accumulating of the wealth in the hands of the few. And this is a move to lessen the burden of those that ought to pay, and put it on the stooped shoulders of those who are least able.

Fifth, we ought to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment in order to get rid of the bootlegger. But will this get rid of him? If so, why and how? Where did the bootlegger come from? Who is his father? Not prohibition! The Bootlegger was as old as Methuselah when prohibition was born. The bootlegger is a child of liquor. It is a worthy son of such a sire. It has all its father's greed, and its father's aversion to the keeping of any law. Government beer will be taxed $5.00 a barrel, Bootlegger beer will be taxed nothing a barrel. What beer will be the cheaper?

We hear much praise of the Canadian system. I spent ten days last summer preaching in the province of Nova Scotia. There was a big brewery in one of the villages that I visited. It was owned by a bootlegger from the United States. The Canadian government does not own its liquor. It sells it. There were four hundred thousand gallons of apple cider being made into apple jack. When finished, it would retail for $5.00 a quart, $20.00 a gallon. But I was told by a man of unquestioned integrity that a better grade of liquor was being smuggled in from the West Indies and being sold for eighty cents a gallon. What a bootlegger paradise! He could buy liquor, sell it to his customer for $5.00 a gallon, get rich himself and save his customer $14.00. Therefore, I am told that the bootlegger has increased in some provinces as much as 110 per cent.

Fifth, the final reason for the repeal of prohibition is that there is more drinking today than ever before. You see, our anti friends are great for temperance. I look for Heacox and Dupont to found a great
university just to teach temperance. When it comes, I am going to
appoint Mrs. Sabine as Dean of Women. But as a matter of fact, people
are not drinking more than ever before. Even as well known an authority
as Hugh Fox, of the United States Brewery Association, acknowledges that
that is the case. It is only natural that it should be so. Liquor today
is left out of sight. It is not advertised. Surely it is not as common
as when you see it in every newspaper and magazine, and then breathed
its fumes whenever you passed down the street.

One of our papers carried an article recently, in which a Keely
Care Infirmary in Illinois declared that they treated more patients in
1929 than in any other years except 1906 and 1907. That sounded quite
convincing, but in those pre-prohibition days, there were nearly
four hundred Keely Care Institutions in the United States. Now, there
are only about fourteen or fifteen. Most of these are almost empty.
This institution in Illinois, which is the mother of the lot, declares
that in fifty years, they have treated four hundred thousand patients.
That is eight thousand a year. In 1929, their peak year, they treated
eight hundred. That is only one in ten. And the number of these
institutions has been decreased about 95 per cent.

There is drinking going on today, too much of it. But
this drinking is being done in the vast majority of cases by those who
are financially able to afford it. In the home of the highest salaried
man in Houston, I engaged in a discussion with one of the leading Bankers
of Texas on the question of prohibition. He was against it. Finally,
this young man, who was head of the Hughes Tool Company, broke in with
this remark, "I go into the social life of Houston. Liquor is almost
always offered. Sometimes my wife and I are the only two who do not
drink. Yet, he continued, I work four thousand men in my factory.
In all the years that I have been there, and that is since the war,
I have never had to lay off but one man because of drunkenness. The
day-laborer, the small drinker, is not doing the drinking today. He
will do it if the saloon comes back."
Then, the final argument is that women are taking to drink. If that counts for anything, the record ought to show that they did not drink in pre-prohibition days. And yet one of the Chicago papers reports that fourteen thousand drunk women were found on three streets in Chicago one night. It ought to be shown further, that in those countries where the saloon is open, women are sober. Yet in England I have seen women and men jam up against the bar like pigs around a swill trough. One police officer said that nine out of every ten drunks that were arrested in England were women. Prohibition is not perfect, but I have yet known no wet who has anything better to offer. If you want something that will wreck body, mind and soul, if you want something that will poison the blood of your children, for the children of drunkards are 300 times as susceptible to disease as the children of sober people, if you want to turn something lose upon our people that is evil and only evil without the slightest measure of anything good, then try any form of alcoholic liquor. As a foe of mankind, it is without a rival. "See unto him that giveth his neighbor drink!"
WHY REPEAL?

Tomorrow the citizens of Alabama are to vote on a question of the most vital interest to our own state and to the nation as a whole. In fact it would be next to impossible to over-estimate the importance of this vote. If to the gods of drink and greed we strike our flag, it is a probability that amounts almost to a tragic certainty that the 18th Amendment to our constitution is lost. If, on the other hand, we stand by our convictions, if we say to the forces of lawlessness, "You shall not pass," there is every hope that we will save this great reform, both for ourselves and for our sister states, as well.

What is the issue that we are to decide? We are not voting on differing methods of controlling the liquor traffic. Should I propose to abolish the jury system in this county, you would naturally expect me to suggest something in its place, but the wets propose to abolish the 18th Amendment without offering any substitute. Practically all agree that liquor is an unmixed evil. It has had a long and bloody history. It has wrecked more homes, robbed more children, cheated more wives and lovers, crowded more jails and penitentiaries, filled more coffins and dug more graves than any other single foe that our world has known. We drys have undertaken to cage this beast of prey by means of prohibition. This cage has not been entirely effective. Again and again the monster has broken out in order to satisfy its insatiable lust for blood. But what remedy is offered by the wets? Not a better and stronger cage, but the wrecking of the one they have. We are asked to abolish prohibition with nothing offered to take its place, which means the return of the saloon in its wicked worst. We are asked to
take this step for the following reasons:

1. We are to vote for repeal in order to lessen taxes and to restore prosperity. Now if liquor is to decrease taxes, it must be drunk. But everybody knows that as the consumption of liquor increases, the efficiency of the consumer decreases, physically, mentally and morally. Therefore, to buy prosperity with liquor is to put money above men, coin above character.

The real wealth of the nation is not in its bankstock or merchandise, but in its manhood and womanhood. To barter these for gold, therefore, is to sell our supreme birthright for a mess of putrid pottage.

But such a transaction becomes the more unreasonable when we realize what we do not even get the pottage. To say that liquor brings prosperity is flatly contradict every sane and accredited economist that I know. Ask Fisher of Yale, Carver of Harvard, Douglas of the University of Chicago. Of course drink fills the pocketbooks of those who make and sell it. During the month of May, Washington, D.C. spent in round numbers, $500,000.00 for beer. For every dollar of this that went to the Government, 33 went to those engaged in its manufacture and sale.

Then those who pay taxes in this fashion are as a rule the ones least able to do pay. One of the most pressing dangers in America today is the accumulation of our wealth in the hands of the few. These plutocrats are almost uniformly against prohibition. Why? One of the claims that the bringing back of the saloon would save one corporation in which he is interested as much as $10,000,000 a year in taxes. Who, then, would pay this $10,000,000? The over-full hands of the rich would be spared at the expense of the empty hands of the poor. Meanwhile the taxes received would be far more than eaten up by the lowered efficiency of the worker, by the increase of the expenses for orphanages,
hospitals, jails, penitentiaries, hangmen, coffin-makers and grave-diggers. No, liquor is not a bringer of prosperity, it is a parasite, a blood-sucker. You might as well count a nation prosperous in proportion to the number of its highwaymen, or a dog in proportion to the number of his ticks and fleas, as to count a nation prosperous because of the abundance of its saloons.

II. We are asked to vote for repeal in order to rid ourselves of the bootlegger. But will this destroy him? What right have we to think so? Who is the father of the bootlegger? Who gave him birth? Not prohibition. He was hoary with age before prohibition was born. His daddy is the liquor traffic; his mother is greed. He was as plentiful as blackberries in the days of the open saloon. What right have we to believe that the return of the saloon would exterminate him? Has legalized liquor done that for Canada? Last summer it was my privilege to spend ten days in Nova Scotia. In the village where I spent most of my time was a large brewery owned by an American bootlegger. Canada does not make its liquor. It only sells it. This liquor retails for $20.00 per gallon, $5.00 per quart. Meantime I was informed by reliable men that a better grade of liquor was being smuggled in from the West Indies Islands and sold for 80¢ a gallon, 20¢ a quart. What a paradise for the bootlegger! And I am told that in some provinces he has increased 110%. You might as well expect a rattlesnake to grow wings as for the open saloon to destroy the bootlegger.

III. We should vote for repeal in the third place because of party loyalty. If you tell me that I must vote wet in order to be loyal to the democratic party, I answer that there is a higher loyalty than loyalty to the party, and that is loyalty to my own convictions. That was the loyalty of Governor Smith in 1928 when he repudiated a dry platform and ran wet. But a wet vote
is not in the highest sense party loyalty. If our platform calls for repeal, it calls with equal emphasis for safeguards against the return of the saloon and for the federal protection of dry states. But these have been absolutely forgotten by the wets. The plain truth is that to vote wet is the height of disloyalty, for any party, either democratic or republican, that is founded upon the liquor traffic is doomed to destruction. This liquor business may offer itself at best as a life preserver, but in the end it will certainly prove a millstone. No question is ever settled until it is rightly settled. However the present election may go, believe me the right-thinking people of America and especially of our Southland are never going to live at peace with a legalized saloon, and the party that aligns itself with it is headed for political suicide. If you wish, therefore, to save your party from final work toward the utter ruin of your party, vote wet dry.

IV. We are to vote for repeal in order to save ourselves from the condemnation and contempt of our sister states that have already gone wet. What a crime they tell us to make our neighbors pay a small federal tax on gasoline when we could save them from such a tragic ordeal by merely making drunkards out of our boys and girls! If we vote dry, we expose ourselves to the charge of living in the Bible Belt. But personally this does not frighten me in the least. That is my belt, and liquor can never live among those who take the Bible seriously. It says, "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink!" It says, "Look not upon wine when it is red for at last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." I believe this, and say so without the least shame, and I am by no means convinced that the South is so benighted as to need to import a missionary from Tammany Hall to correct our Bible-warped consciences. We are going to vote our own convictions, to dress our lives before our own mirror and not before
that of the outsider who has little knowledge of and less sympathy for our traditions and our convictions.

V. Finally, we are asked to vote for repeal in order to promote temperance. But will the return of the saloon de this? Is it reasonable to expect that it should? Do the advertising and display of goods of other kinds help or hinder their sale? Does the dry goods merchant seek to sell his wares by having the stamp of outlawry put upon them and hiding them away in some back alley? Is this the method employed by the makers of cigarettes? Is it good sense to believe that the liquor traffic that now has the stamp of the criminal upon it will lose all its appeal by being brought out of the back alley onto the main street, then honored by the approval of the Government, and the protection of the flag? To believe such rot is to throw dust in the eyes of reason and to spit in the face of common sense.

But there is more drinking now than in the days of the open saloon! Who says so? Only the wilfully blind, the Rip Van Winkles, the bought-and-paid-for, and certain misguided youth who have no memory of the open saloon. When you make this assertion, how much of this knowledge is first hand? How much drinking have you seen? Since the 18th Amendment was enacted, attendance upon our high schools has increased nine times as fast as the population. Attendance upon our colleges has increased ten times as fast. How many of these young men and women have you known to be ruined by drink? How many drunkards do you know, men who in all probability will live drunk and die drunk. How many did you know in the days of the open saloon? Every village and hamlet had them then. Today, many of us do not know a single one. And as for drunks - many of us saw more on a single Saturday afternoon than we have seen during the whole thirteen years that prohibition has
been in effect. If more liquor is drunk now than ever before, where are the drunkards? Not in our Keeley Cure Hospitals. Almost 75% of them have had to go out of business. To affirm, therefore, that the open saloon will support temperance is to outrage both reason and experience. Of course we are not claiming that prohibition is 100% efficient. There is some drinking among our young people, but not nearly so much as the wets would lead us to believe. The bulk of drinking is being done by the high society crowd that is able to pay for it. The 10% drunker, the laborer who in the days of the saloon was kicked out and sent home on Saturday night with empty pockets, is almost completely a thing of the past.

The Hughes Tool Company of Houston, Texas, employed in pre-prohibition days from 4,000 to 4,500 men, yet the manager of this factory told me that in the years he had been with it, and that was since the World War, he had only had to send one man home because of drinking. Think of it, some 4,000 to 4,500 men coming sober and fit for work every day in the week for more than ten years! That could not have happened under any form of legalized liquor on the earth.

Take England for example, England is one of the best governed and one of the most law-abiding nations of the world. In England, the saloons open at 12:00 o'clock noon, and close at 2:30. They open again at 6:00 and close at 9:00. Why these late hours? Because they discovered by actual experience that if they opened in the morning, they could not get their workers to go to work. As it is, on almost every street, in every city or town, one meets purple nosed, flabby-cheeked, blur-eyed drunkards, such as we never see in this country any more. What is even more tragic - many of these drunkards are women. A police officer
in London declared that nine out of every ten drunks arrested in that city were women. In Scotland, drunkards are even more in evidence. In Glasgow, I am told there are whole streets that have to be closed to traffic on Saturday afternoon because of the multitudinous drunks. Do you know anything like that in this country? You do not, yet Scotland has saloons while in this country the saloon is outlawed.

Here, then, is the question that you will decide tomorrow—shall we have the open saloon or shall we not? Every lever of home, every friend of humanity ought to vote against the return of the saloon, for this traffic does not make for prosperity, but poverty, not for wealth but for want. It does not destroy the bootlegger, but makes his presence perpetual. It will not make our people more sober, but more drunken and debauched. That has been its record in the past. That will be its record on tomorrow. There is not an evil that confronts our world that it does not make into a greater evil. It undermines the good that it does not tend to destroy. I wonder, therefore, that such a damnable foe has a single friend to speak in its defense, but the final decision is up to you. God grant that you may not by your vote add to the saloon tragedy of an already sorely burdened and perplexed people!
SALTING THE EARTH

Matthew 5:13.

"Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is henceforth good for nothing."

My text is the same that we used at the morning hour.

Salt is the great preventative. Its purpose is to keep out all that would destroy, all that would mar, all that would make for moral rottenness. The sphere of the activity of salt is the here and now. What we are doing towards salting, Jesus would not see fit to tell us, but He would tell us that it is our business to take this world with its foes that make for disintegration and utter rottenness, and safeguard it and sweeten it with our lives. It is a costly performance, but it is infinitely worthwhile. There is no better way to use life. We cannot use it in a richer way and be Christians at all.

The question that confronts the people of Alabama is not modification. That is put on the ballot by the wets simply to deceive. That is typical of their tactics in every generation. For them to reform any liquor law is always to repeal it. Two years ago we had a good organization of prominent women headed by Mrs. Sales. It was an organization for prohibition reform. But as soon as the 18th Amendment was repealed, this organization was disbanded. They were not seeking reform, they were seeking repeal. They were seeking to put the United States in the liquor business and make liquor as easily accessible as possible.

The truth is that the wets never have kept any promise
that has to do with the curtailing of the liquor traffic. For any man, therefore, to take a promise of theirs seriously would indicate an extreme case of senility or softening of the brain. During my first year in the ministry I swapped horses. The gentleman who traded with me had a horse whose eyes stood out on the side of his head in such a fashion that he could have looked at his tail without turning around. We hitched him up, and we went around the block. That was the only time he ever moved. The next time I hitched him, he balked. Everybody in the village had a remedy for a balkling horse, and we tried every remedy. One said he would go if we would put dirt in his mouth. And I said in the language of the scriptures, "The land is before you!" But still he didn't move. We tried putting stones in his ears, but still no moving. Then we put "high light" in him and he fell down and lay as if dead. My friends sympathized with me for being taken in like that. But if I had traded horses with that gentleman every month for half a lifetime and been skinned every time, I suppose their sympathy would have turned into contempt.

II.

Why are we asked to repeal our liquor laws? Why are we urged so earnestly to go into the liquor business? You would naturally expect our wet friends to urge this because of the immense values that inhere in the liquor traffic. But however much they may believe in the intrinsic value of liquor, not one single one of them will ever repeal because liquor is a good thing. They will tell you, in fact, that they hate the open saloon as much as you do. And yet their hatred vanishes like the mist before the sunrise as soon as liquor is legalized, as is evidenced in many of our wet states. The only wet argument in favor of liquor would be the
pointing out of the merits of the stuff. But such arguments will never be brought forward for the simple reason that they do not exist. Whether we make liquor an outlaw in the state or not, every intelligent wet knows it is an outlaw in the very nature of things.

First, it is an outlaw in the body. These physical bodies of ours are not helped by liquor, but hurt. Such eminent physicians as Doctors Kelly and Mayo declare that there is not a disease known to medicine for which liquor is a cure. On the other hand there are deadly diseases that liquor causes. It lowers the resisting powers of the body. Statistics show that those who work in breweries in Germany have 100% more sickness than other workers. This is true because of the larger quantities consumed.

Second, liquor is a foe to mind. It affects the high nerve centers. Instead of being a stimulent, it is a depresser. Every bodily movement is retarded by even a slight quantity of liquor. After taking one drink, you cannot bat your eye or work your finger as quickly as you could before. You cannot write a line on the typewriter as readily or as accurately. You cannot catch a base-ball as skillfully. Liquor lowers every movement.

Not only is this true, but the faculties first paralyzed by liquor are the higher faculties. It dopes Dr. Jeckyll and gives the stage to Mr. Hyde. The timid man becomes more bold. The modest girl flings away her modesty. Nobody, man nor woman, is to be trusted who is under the influence of liquor. The careful driver becomes careless when intoxicated. He takes risks that he would not otherwise take. In addition to this, his movements are retarded two-fifths of a second. His greater risks are made further dangerous by his lessened capacity to meet them. That is the reason that drinking liquor always increases automobile accidents.
Liquor is an outlaw of society. There is not an organization that makes for a healthful and well ordered state that liquor does not undermine. It is the foe of the home, the foe of the Church, the foe of the school. It is the foe of law enforcement. It is the foe of good government. It is the foe of everything that makes life beautiful and worthwhile. It is the foe of physical decay and intellectual decay. It is estimated that 40% of the insanity of our nation is traceable to liquor. It lies back of 60% of our divorces. It aids delinquency. It aids prostitution. It is that son of the devil that is the foe of all that is right, and the friend of all that is wrong. And this, the liquor forces themselves will not deny. We are not, therefore, to legalize liquor because there is nothing good in it. We are to legalize liquor because prohibition is so bad. The whole brunt of the battle is right here.

Third, why is prohibition so bad? Let me enumerate a few of threadbare arguments.

1. It is bad because it is impossible to make people religious by legal enactment. It is bad, because the state has no right to interfere in the personal habits of its people. But the purpose of this law is in no sense interfering with the religious liberty. No dry believes that a man is religious simply because he does not drink. The law against murder is not to make you a Christian, it is to protect human life. The law against stealing is not to make you a saint, it is to protect property. We believe that ignorance is bad. Hence we have a law of compulsory education. We believe that certain diseases are contagious, therefore if one contracts such disease, he is quarantined. During the meningitis
epidemic in Texas a few years ago, we were forbidden under a penalty of a fine of $9.70 even to spit, even though we might manufacture our own. The State is constantly interfering, and we are free in proportion as we accept that interference.

2. We must repeal prohibition in order to destroy the bootlegger. That is one of the most popular arguments, and one of the most stupid. The poorest way to get rid of anything is to destroy that which produces that something. For instance, if we desire to get rid of apples, all that would be necessary would be to destroy all the apple trees. The man who would suggest the destruction of peach trees - that man would be regarded as a fool.

Now, the bootlegger is an evil fruit. But on what tree does he grow? Who gave him birth? Not prohibition. He was a dangerous and beastly outlaw years before prohibition was born. What gave him birth? Legalized liquor! In a day when every man had a right to make liquor and every man a right to drink it, the bootlegger had no place. As soon as liquor was legalized and taxed, he came into being. He is the offspring of the saloon. When I spoke at Bessemer last Sunday, an ex-saloon man came forward saying, "I used to run a saloon and I was a bootlegger. So was every other saloon-keeper that I ever knew."

Why do we say that legalizing liquor will not destroy the bootlegger? The first reason is against him. Liquor has to pay a heavy tax. Bootlegger liquor is cheap. Men who drink are not patriotic enough, as a rule, to pay to the legitimate trade two to ten times as much as they would have to pay to the bootlegger. In Nova Scotia, legal applejack sells for $20.00 a gallon. The better grade is bootlegging at 80c.

Then, assuming a desire on the part of the Government to destroy the bootlegger, it is far easier to do so in dry territory than in wet. A drunk man in dry territory argues the principles of
bootleg liquor. In wet territory it is not easy to tell whether his source of supply is legal or illegal. If we really wish, therefore, to destroy the bootlegger, our chances are far greater under a dry system than under a wet.

Not only is the argument that legalized liquor will destroy the bootlegger contradicted by reason, it is contradicted by facts. In the old days, bootlegging was carried on on an enormous scale. There were more speakeasies in New York than legal saloons. Today the president of the Breweries Association is an authority for saying that half the liquor consumed in 1934 was bootleg, and the legitimate trade sold two billion dollars worth. And Mr. Choate of the Internal Revenue is our authority for saying that bootlegging instead of declining has increased. He says that increase has been 100%. To say, therefore, that legalized liquor will destroy the bootlegger is to outrage reason and give the lie to plain and comparable facts.

3. But the supreme reason for getting rid of prohibition is to promote temperance. Our wet friends agree with us that liquor is a deadly foe. We are against it, and they are against it. So here we fight shoulder to shoulder. We are both out to promote temperance. There is only a difference in method. We seek to promote it by making liquor as difficult to get as possible. They seek to promote temperance by making the liquor as plentiful and as accessible as possible. Which remedy do you think is the more reasonable? Which bears the sanction at once of common sense and of facts?

The wets tell us that more liquor is drunk under prohibition than when legalized. Look at the reasonableness of that. The bootlegger cannot advertise his wares. He cannot tell the public about them upon billboards, over the radio, in newspapers, and magazines. He cannot put them on display, in plateglass windows, or cheerful and brightly-lighted windows. The bootlegger is of necessity
a thing of the back alleys. Yet our wet friends have the affrontry to tell us that that is the best way to sell it. If so, why is it not true with other commodities? Almost every program on the radio, seven days a week, is an advertising program. Why? Because people who have something to sell believe that it pays to advertise. When Black's and Burger-Phillips seek to sell gentlemen's furnishing, they tell the public about them. Of course they are making a great mistake. They ought to send out a man in the midnight hour with a collar-button and a pair of socks tucked under his shirt, if they really want to get rich. The Hill Grocery Company arrays his goods in three hundred stores; tells the public about them. A judicious advertiser makes them as attractive as possible. But it is only because they do not know any better. The best way to sell them is for some colored man to stick an onion and an Irish potato in his pocket, and be spewed out some back alley.

No, this is a flat outrage to common sense. The use of cigarettes has increased approximately 1,000 percent in recent years. What has done it? Advertising? We are told that there is not a cough in a car load; to reach for this instead of that. We are told that however far gone we are, they will pick us up. There is nothing that persistently advertised cannot be sold. The newspapers have so advertised a big hunk of rancid cheese; if he were to come here to speak today, the city auditorium could not hold the people, not because of any worth in him, but because he was well advertised.

Not only is it probable that liquor put on display and well advertised would be sold in larger quantities, but it is borne out by the facts, that the wets would have us believe that nobody cared for liquor but when it is prohibited, that where it is flaunted in our faces every day nobody ever tastes it. Yet in the same breath they tell us that legalized beer will bring a revenue of $1,300,000. For that to happen, we would have to drink a million and forty
thousand barrels. That quantity would cost us wholesale $14,560,000. If the retailer made anything, it would cost the consumer from eighteen to twenty millions of dollars. Here is the way we expect to educate our children on liquor. that folks do not drink, and for every dollar they get in taxes, they pay twenty for it.

And by way of parenthesis I wonder where that twenty million is to come from! Surely not out of some hidden fund of which we know nothing. It will have to come out of the pay checks of those least able to afford it. For, to make eighteen to twenty million dollars out of legitimate trade means that the average man must buy fewer clothes and fewer groceries. If the father and mother drink beer, the children are cut down on milk and wholesome food. One dairy in a certain state reports that it sold 750 gallons less milk in 1934 than in 1933. The children were denied wholesome food in order to supply the parents with unwholesome poison. An appeal to the census shows that drinking and all the evils that go with drinking have increased everywhere that appeal has gone into effect. Arrests for drunken driving have increased in some cities as high as 14 percent. Automobile accidents have increased 16 percent. More people were killed in the United States in 1934 than in 1933. To claim that legalizing liquor and making it accessible to men and women and children will make for temperance is to sandbag the reason and outrage your common sense.

4. But this special concern of the wets is the young people and the women. First - young people. They are drinking so dreadfully in dry territory. Now, there is some drinking. Though it is the Brewers that say that under the reign of the 18th Amendment less than one tenth of one percent of our college and high school students knew the taste of beer. I think they are a bit off. But that is their own declaration. There is too much drinking among young people. But to pass from a city like Birmingham to one like Chicago is like
passing out of the Tropics into the North Pole. Those in the penitentiaries, 19 years and younger, fifty years ago in New York State were 19 and 7/10 percent.

Women are drinking too. This, we acknowledge with sorrow. But if the argument of the wets is valid, they have to show that women do not drink where liquor is legalized. But the New York Times is responsible for saying that arrests for drunkenness increased 75% in Boston during the first three months of repeal. When I was in London, a police officer told one of our party that nine out of every ten drunks that they arrested in London were women. Women are not only the patrons today, but the bar-tenders, and some of those who attend the bar are not over sixteen years of age.

IV

There are only two classes who give us trouble in handling the liquor problem. But for these two, the liquor traffic would be as harmless as the traffic in sassafrass tea.

1. We are disturbed by the man who wants to drink liquor. Sometimes this man is to be pitied because he has become a slave. Sometimes he is a cautious and conservative drinker. Sometimes he only takes it at conventions or when he desires to celebrate. But there is always a militant crowd who fight for legalized liquor because they like it, and liking it, they want it as accessible as possible.

2. There is the crowd that wishes to make money out of it. It is a habit-forming drug in which its addicts invest largely. Some make money by selling it; some through rentals; some, like newspapers and magazines, by advertising. It is this latter crowd with which we can sympathize least. We can be sorry for the man who is a liquor slave. But the man who cares nothing for it, but sits like a spider in his office, and spins his web for his brother
in order to make money out of his weakness - that man is despicable.
I have had men tell me of certain saloon-keepers who were fine fellows. They would say proudly, "He never touches a drop!" I always feel like saying, "The dirty scoundrel!" A man that won't drink his own poison ought to be drenched in it. This Book says that no drunkard shall enter the Kingdom. But not must be the hell for the man who makes drunkards for money!

I know the easy excuses we make. People are going to have liquor, we say. If they don't buy it from me, they will get it from somebody else. Yes, there will always be more or less stealing going on, but I am not, for that reason, going to become a thief. There will always be a few killings in my state, but I am not for that reason going to become a murderer. There will always be more or less liquor, but there will never be a drop of it for the satisfaction of my own appetite or for my lust for gold, that I have legalized.

And remember this as you vote - whatever the state may say about liquor, it cannot change its nature. Legalize it how you may, it is still the devil's own dope. Though you repeal it, you cannot repeal the wrecks it causes. You cannot repeal the homes it destroys. You cannot repeal the souls it damns. Some time ago a man rattled the bars of a prison cell in Philadelphia. And when he got attention, he said to the officer: "Why am I here?" "Don't you know?" was the answer. "No", he said, "I was too drunk." You are here for murder." "Oh, my God!" he sobbed, "don't tell my wife." "It was your wife you killed," was the answer. Repeal liquor how you may, you cannot repeal a tragedy like that.

Why, then, vote for repeal? Because liquor is a poison; because it means to put out of the way of human progress one of its obstacles; because it gives us the only chance of banishing the bootlegger; because it is our only possible hope of temperance;
because it is the only way to safeguard our youth, and to have a clean and wholesome womanhood? To vote for prohibition is to help salt the earth. To vote for liquor is to help to rot it down. May God help us to face the facts!