



“A mighty alliance of moralists and progressives, suffragists and xenophobes¹”
Temperance Movement coalitions in the United States
at the end of the nineteenth century

Alison Buck - 2258676

ali.elizabeth.buck@gmail.com

Master of Arts in History
Cities, Migration and Global Interdependence
Governance of Migration and Diversity

Supervisor: Marlou Schrover

2019

¹ Daniel Okrent, *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition* (New York: Scribner, 2010).

Contents

INTRODUCTION 2

THEORY 3

Frame Theory..... 3

Constructed Collective Identity..... 4

Collective Action..... 6

Resource Mobilization 7

HISTORIOGRAPHY 9

MATERIAL AND METHODS 13

HISTORICAL CONTEXT 15

Anti-Saloon League and The Temperance Movement 15

PROHIBITION COALITIONS 17

State’s Rights Lobbyists 17

Immigrant Lobbyists 21

Gendered Lobbyists 26

Labour Lobbyists 30

THE VOLESTEAD ACT 34

CONCLUSION..... 35

Reference List..... 36

INTRODUCTION

Within the United States, a paradox of morality has existed surrounding alcohol and other substances since the beginning of the twentieth century². As a country dependent on vice run under the guise of a separation of church and state, there has existed a public denunciation of the use of various vices based in fear of undermining societal cohesion for centuries. Over the past 100 years, moral rhetoric has been used by anti-immigrant groups to demonize changing demographics based on shifts in practices of consumption. This moral crusade was led by several advocacy groups, all falling under the broad scope of the Temperance Movement, which sought to reduce American consumption of alcohol, ranging from adopting more restrictive regulations on the strength of alcohol sold, to the full abolition of the alcohol industry. The ratification of the 18th Amendment to the United States Constitution in 1919, prohibiting the sale and distribution of alcohol, thus ushering in what is commonly known as the Prohibition Era, demonstrated the strength that the Temperance Movement had gained in the previous decades. At the forefront of the Temperance Movement was the Prohibition Party, whose main political platform was complete prohibition of alcohol in the United States. Recent re-examinations of the party's political agenda have revealed an underlying anti-immigrant theme to the prohibitionist movement. Beer was perceived as an immigrant industry, with leading brewers originating from Germany and top consumers descending from Ireland and the United Kingdom. Throughout the thirteen years known as the Prohibition Era (1920-1933), politicians and lobbyists on the right blamed immigrants crossing over the borders, of both Canada to the north and Mexico to the south, for bringing in prohibited alcohol when less than eight per cent of all alcohol consumed during this period came from outside the United States. The restriction of alcohol led to the development of underground networks of bootleggers and smugglers, often from within immigrant neighbourhoods in large cities, but whose patrons included other Americans with a 'wetter' appetite than their compatriots.

This thesis will examine the development of these coalitions and the overarching interaction of actors in the half century before Prohibition officially went into effect. From feminists and suffragettes to the Klu Klux Klan and xenophobic organizations, across the political spectrum people were declaring their allegiance to Temperance and denouncing alcohol. Why did these groups with differing agendas come together around the question of alcohol? What compromises were made in order to form these political coalitions?

² Daniel Okrent, *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition* (New York: Scribner, 2010).

THEORY

Paris Aslanidis critically examines social movement literature throughout the twentieth century³. Drawing from his review, the key features of social movement literature which will be utilized throughout this research are based in the theories of resource mobilization, the Political Process Model, and constructed collective identity. The comprehensive paper provides detailed explanations of social movement literature from a variety of theorists, from which I have extracted the most relevant concepts for this research. Beginning with *frame theory* as a tool to group actors involved, I will examine how these actors frame the work of their individual groups as well as the groups they formed coalitions with. Next, I will utilize constructed collective identity theory to explore how these groupings developed: why did leaders of these groups interact and when did they do so? Following this will be an exploration of collective action to analyse how action was taken based on the collective identities constructed. The final theory will be looking at *resource mobilization* as a mechanism for providing agency to actors, the roles of specific actors from each sector of the coalition will be examined through this theory.

Frame Theory

A frame is “an interpretive schemata that simplifies and condensed the ‘world out there’ by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of actions within one’s present or past environment.”⁴ This helps scholars to simplify and organize the means by which they are analysing sources. Although William Gamson distinguishes frames from schemata based on the fact that “collective action frames are not merely aggregations of individual attitudes and perceptions but also the outcome of negotiating shared meaning,” I will be using the term “frame” as presented by Snow and Benford as this is cited more regularly in other literature⁵. Gamson’s distinction is important for analysing individual persons’ sources as part of a whole identity without assuming that the individual is representative of the complete identity.

When the question of Temperance is presented, the frames through which differing members of the political coalition involved in enforcing it viewed the role of alcohol in society led to differing motivations for restricting or prohibiting the liquor industry. This research examines the frames presented by the Suffrage Movement, the Prohibition Party, religious writings, political perspectives, immigrant groups, and labour organizations. The portrayal of alcohol as vice morally corrupting the working American, a thief robbing laborers and their families of wages, a traditional method of production and viable income source

³ Paris Aslanidis, *Critical review of social movement literature*. (University of Macedonia, 2012).

⁴ David A. Snow and Robert D. Benford, *Master Frames and Cycles of Protest* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992) 137.

⁵ William A. Gamson, *The Social Psychology of Collective Action*. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992) 111.

for immigrant populations, or a substance enslaving the American people demonstrates the importance of framing in discussions of prohibition.

Drawing on the framing mechanisms presented by Snow and Benford, this research will utilize *motivational framing* and *strategic framing* to analyse primary sources from key actors in the fight for and against prohibition in the fifty years leading to the official ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Volstead Act which initiated the thirteen year period known as the Prohibition Era⁶. Motivational Framing examines why certain issues were presented the ways that they were, the motivations behind word choice. Similarly, strategic framing examines the purpose of presentation in conjunction with other publications. Motivational takes a micro-level approach, with emphasis placed on the background of a situation while strategic framing is a macro-level analysis incorporating the anticipated outcomes of specific presentations of an issue. Throughout the Temperance Movement, the alliances formed and manners in which each group spoke of or supported one another can be analysed through the strategic frame while personal sources must be approached from a motivational frame as they reveal individual motivations rather than organizational strategy.

By specifically looking into and expanding on the *action frames* and how “identity and strategy can work together to shape the framing work of movement actors” as presented by McCammon, Hewitt, and Smith (2004: 548), this thesis will examine then individual needs of groups as well as the intersecting interactions of these groups within the temperance movement. In the framing of alcohol used, groups were able to appeal to motivations of other groups in order to expand their support for temperance and eventually prohibition. These frames allow us to trace which issues were central to movements and which were periphery issues based on the compromises made when coalitions were formed.

Constructed Collective Identity

The Temperance Movement was constructed of a number of major groupings of actors who fell into one of three main categories: Wets (those who drank and rejected the Temperance Movement), Dry-Drys (those who neither drank nor tolerated drinking), and Wet-Drys (those who supported the Temperance Movement but drank personally). The construction of these identities and their utilization allowed for lobbying actors to identify potential allies on their side of the movement, “in order to construct a powerful collective identity which can generate mobilization, the ‘we’ of the in-group has to be coupled with a ‘they’, an out-group against which action can be directed.”⁷

⁶ David A. Snow and Robert D. Benford, *Ideology, Frames and Cycles of Protest*. (International Social Movement Research, 1988).

⁷ Bert Klandermans, *The Social Psychology of Protest*. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997).

Those who were solidly on one side of the debate, the Dry-Drys or the Wets, were rare to alter their stance in relation to the liquor question.⁸ Depending on the smaller, more precise group dynamics, which will be examined in later chapters, the rationale for positioning themselves in such a way varied. The Wet-Drys on the other hand were more flexible in their convictions, strategically placing themselves on the fence and absorbing various levels of moisture in their beliefs depending on compromises needed to be made to advance their own political agendas. These actors tended to view the potential of Prohibition as a side note or secondary issue to other more pressing issues. Conversely, the Dry-Drys used the inverse mentality to attract attention for their cause based off other happenings in society and the political world.

While “only identities that carry political relevance can be said to matter for the creation of a social movement,” once the movement has been created, it is what gives political agency to actors who become involved.⁹ The growth of the Temperance Movement allowed for actors to negotiate their part of the collective identities which developed, thus allowing for the larger identity which distinguished their wetness to secrete political agency to the smaller organizations within each group. Identifying oneself collectively therefore became both a means of political mobilization as well established a political goal for the group – either enacting Temperance legislation or advocating against it.

Key utilizations of identity framing came from women’s movements – both the WCTU and suffragists – who gradually aligned their movements around a reformation arguments whereby the right to vote would allow for the betterment of society because women had insight which men lacked related to home issues.¹⁰ During this period, identity politics was focused on establishing one key identity which would tie people to issues: American, Christian, mother, immigrant, labourer, man, alcoholic, black, or any other identity which would simplify someone down to a singular player in movement, allowing for support of specific political opportunity structures based on these collective identities (McCammon, Campbell, Granberg, Mowery 2001).¹¹

⁸ Daniel Okrent, *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition* (New York: Scribner, 2010).

⁹ Paris Aslanidis, *Critical review of social movement literature*. (University of Macedonia, 2012).

¹⁰ Lyndi Hewitt and Holly McCammon, *Explaining Suffrage Mobilization: Balance, Neutralization, and Rage in Collective Action Frames 1892-1919*. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University, 2004).; Michael McGerr, Political Style and Women's Power, 1830–1930, *Journal of American History*, Volume 77, Issue 3, December 1990, Pages 864–885, <https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.2307/2078989>

¹¹ McCammon, Holly J., Karen E. Campbell, Ellen M. Granberg, and Christine Mowery. "How Movements Win: Gendered Opportunity Structures and U.S. Women's Suffrage Movements, 1866 to 1919." *American Sociological Review* 66, no. 1 (2001): 49-70. <http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/2657393>.

Collective Action

Gamson identifies three components of collective action: injustice, identity, and agency, which can be utilized as bases within motivational and strategic framing¹². *Injustice* is crucial in the formation of collective action as it demonstrates a perceived sense of moral or social wrongdoing which instigates action - although the use of it is refuted by Snow and Benford in relation to religious organizations based on institutional senses of immorality rather than individual.¹³ Personal morality is one which is derived from structural surroundings, thus religious senses of injustice will be included in this analysis. *Identity* is presented as “the ‘we-ness’ of collective mobilization, ‘they’ are usually responsible for ‘our’ grievances.” Benford and Snow call attention to the “boundary framing” inherent in identity framing, which constructs dichotomies between “good” and “evil” in social movements.¹⁴ Expanding on this theory comes the case of prognostic framing, whereby factions falling on either side of the dichotomy “still interact, recognizing one another’s indispensability, they differ in terms of their prognostic framings and the techniques they advocate and employ” in order to achieve shared goals.¹⁵ Finally, *agency* is “the process of amplifying the realization of the capacity of personal involvement to alter conditions.”¹⁶ These three components are interwoven in collective action, with identity and agency being primary factors which respond to injustice, while injustice can also create a sense of identity and provide agency.

The collective action of social movement is derived from the strength of the collective identity within the movement and the accessibility of resources which can be mobilized. Clemens identifies *social capital* as a crucial resource for “transforming social ties, trust in specific persons, and localized capacities for collective action into such macrosocial outcomes as economic performance and political efficacy.”¹⁷ Often separated, framing and resource mobilization are often deeply interwoven rather than separate entities. Snow and Benford claim that “that framing process have come to be regarded, alongside resource mobilization and political opportunity processes, as a central dynamic in understanding the character and

¹² William A. Gamson, *The Social Psychology of Collective Action*. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992).

¹³ Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (2000): 611-39. <http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/223459>.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Clemens, E. (1999). Securing Political Returns to Social Capital: Women's Associations in the United States, 1880s-1920s. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 29(4), 613-638. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/206976>

course of social movement,” this thesis draws on this interwoven analysis to examine these characteristics and how they are applicable to the temperance movement in the United States.¹⁸

Resource Mobilization

Originally developed by John McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, *resource mobilization* provides agency to the actors involved in social movements and collective action by identifying the participants as resources in themselves.¹⁹ As previous scholars assumed that mobilization of people occurred only when grievances arose, they ignored the continuous underlying grievances which allow for a broader collaboration between movements which are able to identify a unifying thread.²⁰ Throughout the late nineteenth century this threat became the Temperance Movement, a national social movement made up of a variety of actors advocating for the prohibition of alcohol as a solution to underlying social issues ranging from a loss of Christian morality, to racial relations, to feminism. Aslanidis analyses the common critiques of resource mobilization as an aspect of rational choice theory, arguing that “the use of a very restricted set of variables” as found in non-rational approaches, “fail to recognize the fundamental fact of the complexity of collective action and its multidimensional nature.”²¹ I do not find these concepts mutually exclusive, but rather as complimentary. The multidimensional aspect of the temperance movement allowed for actors to mobilize around one issue -that of temperance – while also maintaining a connection to their individual social issues. This thesis will look into the compromises made in mobilization of actors as resources: what compromises were made and which elements were eliminated to foster coalitions?

Aslanidis claims that resource mobilization theory is best suited to “movements of affluence,” rather than being accessible to the general population.²² While affluence does help to mobilize personal contributions to social movements, I will be examining actors which fall along the spectrum of affluence, mobilizing the resources they have available both in favour and in opposition to the Temperance Movement. This will demonstrate that while affluence may play a role in the breadth of mobilization available, the primary resources mobilized in social movements are non-monetary and the success of movements is based more in the ability to mobilize individuals as part of groups on either side of the debate.

As the rationale for mobilizing resources differed within and between groups, the grievances identified by groups cannot be assumed identical. Temperance was the end goal for some groups, while for others it was just a mechanism for achieving further goals, “structural forces of society produce a somewhat

¹⁸ Snow and Benford, 2000.

¹⁹ McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82, no. 6 (1977): 1212-241.
<http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/2777934>.

²⁰ Paris Aslanidis, *Critical review of social movement literature*. (University of Macedonia, 2012).

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

standard substrate of grievances over which forces related to changes in the capacity to raise resources and organize effectively come into play and define whether mobilization takes place.”²³ The ferocity of one’s attitude towards the liquor question dramatically affected their ability to successfully mobilize themselves and other people.

A classic critique of the theory is the overt dependence on rationality, ignoring the role of emotions in unifying social actors. James Jasper (2011) utilizes the analogy of a “moral battery”²⁴ to mobilize actors based on collective identities incentivizing social change while Aslanidis (2015) contests this by claiming “resource mobilization theory is customized for movements of ‘institutional change’ and not those of ‘personal change,’ such as religious sects.” Throughout the half century leading to the Prohibition era, the most vocal advocates for Temperance were religious groups- namely Protestants – who spoke out in direct opposition of the drinking practices of Jewish and Catholic people. This is indicative of the moral argument presented by the former author but does not mutually exclude the institutional from the personal changes as indicated by the later. Instead, this movement is demonstrative of the overlapping interests and influences presented on moral grounds to alter *both* personal and structural factors through resource mobilization.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴James M. Jasper, *Emotions and Social Movements: Twenty Years of Theory and Research*. (Annual Review of Sociology 37(1) 2011) 285–303.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

The time period known as the Prohibition Era in the United States has been studied extensively by historians interested in this “Noble Experiment.” For many, the focus is on the development of bootlegging networks and subversion to the restrictive Amendment.²⁵ Novels such as *The Great Gatsby* are emblematic of the Prohibition Era, glorifying the elite experience of the roaring twenties through exuberant parties full of reckless Old Money and New Money families, where liquor poured freely despite the law. Little has been written about where these coalitions came from, how they developed, or why. As such,

Daniel Okrent’s *Last Call: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition* (2010) presented a novel interpretation of the coalitions developed surrounding the liquor question. In this, he claims that “Prohibition changed the way we live, and it fundamentally redefined the role of the federal government” by bringing together people from across the political spectrum on both sides of the debate in “a mighty alliance of moralists and progressives, suffragists and xenophobes.” The Temperance Movement leading up to Prohibition is referenced in passing throughout this book, whose emphasis is on the unlikely actors vocal immediately prior to and throughout the Prohibition era, thus as I am interested in the development of these coalitions and their utilization of the momentum of the Temperance Movement for the advancement of their own political agendas, I will be examining the origins of these coalitions and their early development beginning in the 1870s and extending to the early 20th century.

The Eighteenth and Ninetieth Amendments to the US Constitution went into effect within eight months of one another, the first initiating the Prohibition Era and the second granting women the right to vote. While individually, these Amendments are ground-breaking, the coalition of forces supporting both is much more interesting than the wording of the Amendments themselves. Daniel Okrent thoroughly analyses the “unspoken coalitions” of Suffragettes, Prohibitionists, nationalists, Protestant groups, and labour organizations. While thorough, this book fails to take into account the origins of these coalitions, instead focusing on their existing collaborations after 1900 which ignores the initial goals of each group involved. His analysis is heavily dependent on the economics of the prohibition era and the two decades preceding it, ignoring the longer social relationships which developed prior to 1900, drawing mutual support for prohibition from these unlikely factions. This research will fill in the preceding coalition development omitted by Okrent’s writing by consulting the diary of Frances Willard, Sam Small’s *Pleas for Prohibition*, and the party platforms of the Prohibition party from inception to the repeal of Prohibition. Secondary sources include *Jews and Booze: Becoming American in the Age of Prohibition*, which analyses the role of Jewish immigrants and their descendants in subverting Prohibition legislation through religious exceptions.

²⁵ Okrent, *The Rise and Fall of Prohibition*. 2010.

Women's associations are the most widely examined coalitions of this era, with scholars emphasizing the relationship between the WCTU and suffragists in the decade prior to 1919, when both the eighteenth and nineteenth amendments were ratified. The emergence of women as political actors is discussed due to the shift in the conceptualization of politics presented by their form of collective action politics²⁶, while other scholars have examined women in relation to other social movements at the time by utilizing opportunities for political advancement from all parties involved²⁷, and still others have examined the divergences within the suffrage movement and temperance²⁸.

Around the world, the question of Temperance was also being debated, but no other movements were as successful in legally restricting access to alcohol as the United States was. England²⁹, Sweden³⁰, and the Cape Colony³¹ – among other nations - were home to their own temperance movements as well during this period, but with different emphasis placed on their debates. What made the United States' temperance movement successful to such a degree? The breadth of the issues tied to alcohol allowed for a constituency

²⁶ McCammon, H. & Campbell K. (2002) Allies On the Road to Victory: Coalition Formation Between The Suffragists and The Woman's Christian Temperance Union. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*: October 2002, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 231-251.; Clemens, E. (1999). Securing Political Returns to Social Capital: Women's Associations in the United States, 1880s-1920s. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 29(4), 613-638. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/206976>; Dannenbaum, J. (1981). The Origins of Temperance Activism and Militancy among American Women. *Journal of Social History*, 15(2), 235-252. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/3787109>; DuBois, E. (1987). Working Women, Class Relations, and Suffrage Militance: Harriot Stanton Blatch and the New York Woman Suffrage Movement, 1894-1909. *The Journal of American History*, 74(1), 34-58. doi:10.2307/1908504;

²⁷ McCammon, H., Campbell, K., Granberg, E., & Mowery, C. (2001). How Movements Win: Gendered Opportunity Structures and U.S. Women's Suffrage Movements, 1866 to 1919. *American Sociological Review*, 66(1), 49-70. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/2657393>; Goodstein, A. (1998). A Rare Alliance: African American and White Women in the Tennessee Elections of 1919 and 1920. *The Journal of Southern History*, 64(2), 219-246. doi:10.2307/2587945

²⁸ Blocker, J. (1985). Separate Paths: Suffragists and the Women's Temperance Crusade. *Signs*, 10(3), 460-476. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/3174261>

²⁹ Rappaport, E. (2013). Sacred and Useful Pleasures: The Temperance Tea Party and the Creation of a Sober Consumer Culture in Early Industrial Britain. *Journal of British Studies*, 52(4), 990-1016. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/24700889>

³⁰ Bengtsson, H. (1938). The Temperance Movement and Temperance Legislation in Sweden. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 197, 134-153. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/1020867>

³¹ Mills, W. (1980). The Roots of African Nationalism in the Cape Colony: Temperance, 1866-1898. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 13(2), 197-213. doi:10.2307/218873

of actors to develop a broad social network and to take advantage of the mechanisms other groups were using to mobilize support for their movements.

Okrent argues that “the alcoholic miasma enveloping much of the nation in the nineteenth century had inspired a movement of men and women who created a template for political activism that was still being followed a century later.”³² Yet his analysis of the century is brief and focuses heavily on the economic consequences of prohibition and on large German breweries in the Midwestern part of the United States. In referring to immigration, regulations in favour and against immigration during this period are ignored in his analysis, which instead looks at the activism of immigrant communities: “The patterns of European immigration were represented in the ranks of those most vehemently opposed to legal strictures on alcohol: first the Irish, then the Germans, and, close to the end of the century, the Italians, the Greeks, the southern European Slavs, and the eastern European Jews.” This activism is important to keep in mind but ignores the other political influences that attracted support from immigrant populations such as the Prohibition Party Platform advocating for easier naturalization procedures during the 19th Century (although this sentiment shifted dramatically in the 20th Century as the First World War approached).

Prohibition was ultimately supported by both progressive and conservative parties, with strategic planning from groups such as the Anti-Saloon League (ASL) to present the question of Temperance in such a way that multiple actors who ordinarily would have been in opposition to one another were able to unify over restricting use of alcohol. Okrent balances the perspectives of anti-Prohibitionists and Prohibitionists, highlighting the concentration of Wets in cities and Drys in the rest of the country. To him, the three main groups promoting living a dry life were populists, suffragettes, and nativists – yet he fails to examine the overarching unity of these groups, instead opting to examine their individual relationship to the liquor question. Claiming that “the rise of the suffrage movement was a direct consequence of the widespread Prohibition sentiment,” insinuates that the women involved in the Temperance movement were lacking the agency necessary to advocate for their own right to vote and separates the issues, and instead tacking on to the momentum of Temperance the issue of suffrage.³³ There were both Wet and Dry suffragettes who advocated loudly and clearly for both issues. For many women, it was their work within the Temperance movement which caused politicians to view them in a political light and thus consider the role women could play in politics if given the right to vote. Suffrage and Temperance were both important movements during this era, but they developed in collaboration with one another rather than as addendums to each other.

³² Okrent, *The Rise and Fall of Prohibition*. 2010.

³³ *Ibid.*

Brief attention is paid to the connection between Prohibition and Abolition of slavery in this book, mostly in regard to the role which state rights were playing in both debates. Several prominent politicians make reference to the perceived enslavement of white men to alcohol, with Richmond Hobson arguing that “there are nearly twice as many slaves, largely white men, today than there were black men slaves in America at any one time.” This rhetoric is racist and reflective of the collaboration established between the Prohibitionists and Ku Klux Klan which emerged at the end of the 19th century, a unity which is Okrent explores shallowly and fails to distinguish from the anti-immigrant rhetoric which emerged early in the 20th century. This collaboration is more apparent when examining the dichotomy of Northern and Southern alignment on Prohibition: when posed as a question of temperance and morality, it received far more support than when presented as a potential federal law – Okrent argues because a national Amendment would require that Southern states who were still hesitant to acknowledge the validity of the Fourteenth Amendment, which granted citizenship to those born in the US thus counting blacks who had born into slavery equal citizenship to whites. Understanding that Prohibition would be undermined by those Wets determined enough to continue drinking, “they [Southerners] valued genuine racism more than false temperance.”³⁴

Historians studying the Prohibition Era focus on the outcome of coalitions rather than their development. In examining how and why these coalitions developed, the evolution of their ideas can be seen. Social movements are constantly evolving and when only the outcomes of movements are examined, the evolution of those movements, and the responses to political, societal, and cultural demands are lost. This thesis will fill in those gaps, examining the evolution of the women’s movements, immigration groups, labor movement, states’ rights activists.

³⁴ Ibid.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

To identify the coalitions involved in the temperance movement and their development, this thesis relies on the journals of Frances Willard, president of the WCTU; Pleas for Prohibition, a manifesto written by Reverend Samuel W. Small; the collection of prohibition pamphlets from the Alcohol, Temperance and Prohibition Collection within the Alcoholism and Addiction Studies Collection at Brown University; and the Prohibition Party national platforms from 1872 to 1920. In this research, network analysis and frame analysis were the primary methods utilized to identify coalitions formed. In searching for the terms “temperance”, “Prohibition”, “immigration” or “migrant”, “female” or “woman”, and “labor” the connections between groups with interests in these sectors of society were identified. In identifying the members of forming coalitions, a network analysis was utilized to identify when and why key actors interacted with one another on questions related to temperance.

This research was begun with an analysis of political platforms of the official Prohibition Party from 1872 to the passage of the 18th Amendment in 1919. By examining the Party platforms throughout this period, the evolution of rhetoric and coalitions of partnerships can be traced. This includes the shift in attitude from welcoming immigrants with rights equal to those of naturalized citizens to a rejection of immigrants; an advocacy for universal suffrage regardless of nationality, race, or sex to a focus on suffrage for women while ignoring other vote-less groups; and the de-secularization of society. This period of time aligns with the growth of the largest women’s organization in the world at the time, the Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) which staunchly supported the Prohibition Party despite the members lacking voting abilities. This research will examine the relationship between religion, Prohibition, and the suffrage movement as it evolved from the 1870s to the ratification of both the 18th Amendment and 19th Amendment to the US Constitution, abolishing the liquor trade and granting women the right to vote, respectively. This party was selected due to its stance as a third party in the traditionally two-party system of the United States and the immediate coalition it attempted to form with women’s movements in general.

The Frances Willard Digital Journals is a collection of over 2,400 transcribed pages of text from the journals that the suffragist and social reformer kept from 1855-1896. Original journals are held in Evanston, Illinois, USA at the Frances Willard Memorial Library and Archive. Online transcriptions of the handwritten journals were completed by historian Carolyn DeSwarte Gifford. Willard lead the Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) from a domestic group of activist women to the largest and most influential women’s organization in the world. The group campaigned for women’s suffrage, world peace, social justice, and prohibition of alcohol. This research only examines journals 45-49 and 75-89, which were kept from January 1875 to December 1896 during her time as a member and then tenure as president of WCTU. While these journals are representative of the opinion of only one woman, her prominence within

the growth of the movement and the notes included in her journals from meetings is indicative of the support for her ideas from other women in the United States at this period.³⁵ “Temperance” was written most often in journals 48-49, where it appeared 18 and 8 times, respectively. In journals 45-47 the term appeared only five times, while journals 75-89 had it written only four times. “Liquor” appeared a total of nine times during this period. “Suffrage” appeared 8 times total between journals 45 and 47-49, while “women’s rights” appeared twelve. The term “women” appeared 424 times in her journals, but was mostly included in the title of WCTU, thus “suffrage” was searched to focus more closely on the rights of women that Willard advocated for. From these journals, it is clear that Willard had a strong international network, evidenced by the locations recorded in the journals throughout the US and United Kingdom, as well as the references made to distributing “paragraphs, pamphlets, articles” in Australia, Africa, India, and Canada. Using these journals as the base for social network analysis, it was clear with whom she was meeting, where those meetings took place, and the purpose of such meetings. This served as a base for identifying other actors involved in the temperance and other social movements.

The religious affiliation of the WCTU led to the manifesto *Pleas for Prohibition* written by Reverend Sam W. Small in 1890. This thirteen-chapter volume explores the moral and legal arguments for prohibition in the United States, drawing direct lines between the press, political parties, state sovereignty, religious groups, contemporary social issues such as the abolition of slavery, and economic justifications³⁶. Throughout the manifesto, Small proposes a variety of solutions ranging from sequestering liquor men to one region of the United States to the complete abolition of alcohol and of economic relations with countries which allow its consumption. Frequent reference is made to the “corruption” of those within the liquor industry and of the role intoxicating substances play in contributing to or causing other social issues. The publication of this work aligns with the advocacy of the WCTU, and Small highlights the direct negative impact alcohol played in family life, citing “the good and Christian women of the country” who suffered from the effects of drunken men. Through an examination of the coalitions identified in this manifesto, this research will be able to further explore the complex intersections of issues laying on both sides of the prohibition debate. In these *Pleas*, Reverend Small makes specific claims without providing specific sources to back these claims up, arguing “but so obvious a fact [about the dangers of alcohol and increase in criminality associated with its drinkers] needs not to be supported by specific citations,” thus references made to specific numbers have only been included if they have been verified by additional statistics. In his

³⁵ Digital Journals of Frances Willard, 1875-1896, Journals 45-49 and 75-89. Retrieved from <http://www.franceswillardjournals.org/about.php>

³⁶ Samuel W. Small, *Pleas for Prohibition* (Atlanta, GA: Printed for the author, 1890). Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/cu31924031432051/page/n5>

manifesto, the same words used to analyse the Willard journals were utilized to identify overlaps in movements.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Anti-Saloon League and The Temperance Movement

The Anti-Saloon League (ASL) was a political platform with the singular goal of enacting the prohibition of alcohol. Through songs, cartoons, and political activism, the ASL was able to officially pass an amendment to the US constitution prohibiting the sale and distribution of “intoxicating substances” within the United States. Morality, they claimed, was threatened by the abundance of alcohol within immigrant communities undermining traditional American values. Although ASL was politically powerful, they recognized the difficulties in helping to garner support for a federal level prohibition law in a country with growing number of German and Irish immigrants, each of whom brought drinking cultures to the United States. Beer Gardens, established by Germans, provided a more-family-friendly alternative to Saloons, which traditionally only hosted men. In their rhetoric and propaganda, the organization framed saloons rather than alcohol itself as the problematic – evidenced by their avoidance of demonizing beer gardens, restaurants which served alcohol, and hotels.

A group of Christian women began organizing against alcohol in what became known as the Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU). Based in Ohio, this movement expanded to a national and ultimately to an international level under the leadership of Francis Willard. The ASL collaborated at the end of the 19th century with the WCTU to advance the Prohibition platform, demonstrating an organizational shift from the ASL’s original opposition to just saloons to a larger prohibition agenda. At this point, women were not yet able to vote, thus their engagement in politics was rooted in activism and persuading men who had voting power to vote in favor or against specific issues. ASL courted women with similar prohibitionist platforms and promises for female suffrage.

Three main political organization supported prohibition, although based in different rational: the Labor lobbyists, as alcohol disadvantages the working class by making them unproductive and robbing them of their wages; Nationalists claimed to have the solution to the alcohol problem in reducing immigration, but as with other platform promises, this is ‘intimately associated with a pleasing fiction rather than any acceptable data or logic’ (Small p. 65); and finally, the Prohibition Party, which held a balance of power in many Congressional districts and ran on the main platform of complete Prohibition of alcohol, suffrage for women, and oscillated between anti- and pro-immigrant sentiment.

These groups have been researched on their own in relation to prohibition, but the origins of their connections have yet to be examined, as far as I know. In examining the reasons why these groups came

together, a broader picture of the truly intersectional nature of social movements can be analysed. Multidimensional processes are necessary for any social movement, and the temperance movement in the United States provides an excellent example of how compromises in coalition formation can build enough support to pass legislation in spite of financial interests in opposition. Of course, coalitions are useful for broadening the support for a cause, but what is often overlooked is what is given up in order for these compromises to be made? Why were these compromises made at the times when they were and under what circumstances?

PROHIBITION COALITIONS

State's Rights Lobbyists

One major factor contributing to the US Civil War was the debate over State versus Federal rights. Although the war ended in 1865, the role of the Federal Government is a debate which is raging even in 2019. The decades immediately following the Civil War were fraught with a continuation of this debate and a questioning of the legitimacy of the Federal Government to enforce laws in states. While there were many Wet-Drys, or people who would vote dry but personally drank, in the South, the concept of a federal legislation on Prohibition made many uncomfortable as it conflicted with traditionally Southern beliefs that States should have autonomy over their own legislation. Samuel Small, a reverend from Tennessee, published his manifesto *Pleas for Prohibition* in Atlanta in 1890, arguing from a moral frame for the abolition of alcohol under the same justification which was used to advocate for the abolition of slavery. Enacting patriotic rhetoric and statistics, Small blamed the continued divisions within with United States on “the slavery question,” although in his mind, by this time, the enslaved were those who drank rather than those who were forced to work for free:

“But, in the United States of America, **‘the land of the free and home and the brave,’** 187,177 drink dealers hold government permits to belough, pauperize, brutalize, and **enslave our brethren, our fellow-citizens.** The actively employed dram-shop army of slave-drivers in our country numbers nearly 500,000 men. **The roadways of the slave caravans of Africa are not bordered with so many bones or studded with so many skulls as the roadways of the liquor traffic in these United States**”.³⁷ (Emphasis by author- AEB).

By framing alcohol as a threat to the freedom of Americans, Small provides agency to the substance and insinuates that those producing it are assisting in the enslavement of Americans – wording which is itself insinuates anti-Patriotism and an attack on Americans. Small does not make an explicit distinction between white and colored consumers of alcohol until later in the work, but the passive allusion mitigating the experience of the enslaved black person in the United States is indicative of Small’s racial perceptions. Both a reverend and journalist, Small had acquired a dedicated following – particularly in the political realm

³⁷ Samuel W. Small, *Pleas for Prohibition* (Atlanta, GA: Printed for the author, 1890), 19. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/cu31924031432051/page/n5>

after being appointed to secretary to the US commissioner general of the Paris Exposition of 1878 by President James Garfield. This ensured the widespread distribution of the manifesto, which refers to racial relations but focuses more directly on the moral arguments made regarding the abolition of slavery and the prohibition of alcohol. As framed by Small, and assumedly read by his followers, it is not racism in the South which caused the continued racial conflicts but rather the accessibility of liquor that escalated tension to confrontation:

“It is not the purpose here to discuss the general relations of the two races in the South. The conflicts between them, however related to prejudice and politics, are simply referred to that the fact may be emphasized that **liquor drinking supplies the most frequent spirit of and occasions for these embroilments**. A drunken white man and a drunken negro meet as flint meets steel over an open keg of powder... **One gallon of whiskey, ‘good or bad,’ is enough to raise ‘a race war’ wherever the whites and blacks are congregated.**”³⁸

Small claims that it is liquor which fundamentally alters the levels of tension in a situation and therefore exacerbates the underlying racial differences between whites and blacks, leading to conflict. In making no note of the conflict between men of the same color, Small intentionally frames alcohol as a tool of exacerbating existing tensions and insinuates that these tensions are inherent between races rather than as a result of structural inequalities. Acknowledging the prohibition of alcohol to blacks whilst they were enslaved, Small further goes on to claim that: “the results of such prohibition upon the health, morals, and productive capacity of the negroes are clearly separable from all the other features of their condition as slaves ...the contrast between the race sober and the race free and addicted to liquors is very great. It reveals the mightiest evil that has come to them as a consequence of their emancipation” insinuating that it was the introduction of alcohol rather than the release from slavery and later discrimination in the job market which led to decreased productivity.³⁹ The racial question is inseparable from the question of states rights, as many states in the South refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Fourteenth Amendment arguing that the ability to recognize citizenship is a state right and not a federal one. While Small abstains from making his own remarks on racial slavery, he is not shy in claiming alcohol as a “far more lawless and dangerous

³⁸ Samuel W. Small, *Pleas for Prohibition* (Atlanta, GA: Printed for the author, 1890), 19. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/cu31924031432051/page/n5>

³⁹ Ibid.

conspiracy against public laws and public authority than were ever the Ku Klux Klans and White Leagues of the Southern States,” both white supremacy groups which threaten and attack immigrants and people of color.⁴⁰

Contrasting this racial perspective, the Prohibition Party argues in favor of universal suffrage and leads the discussion between state and federal powers towards the issue directly of alcohol rather than race:

“That in this time of profound peace at home and abroad the entire separation of **the general Government** from the **drink traffic**, and its Prohibition in the District of Columbia, the Territories and in all places and ways over which (under the Constitution) Congress has control or power, is a political issue of first importance to the peace and prosperity of the nation. **There can be no stable peace and protection to personal liberty, life or property until secured by National and State Constitutional Prohibition enforced by adequate laws.**”⁴¹

The Party does not argue for national supremacy over state rights, rather for collaboration between the two forms of government, despite running on a national platform. Carefully choosing the phrase “drink traffic” rather than just drink, the Party is positioning themselves so as not to harm the production of liquor at this period, but the distribution of it. As producers were often immigrants or of immigrant background, this distinction is important for preventing a direct impact on immigrant labor organizations. This is also reflected in the reference to liberty for property, which can be read as reference both to property which is damaged by drunk people as well as the property which would become worthless if alcohol production in general was outlawed such as distilling machines, wine barrels, and fermentation tanks.

The platform published critiques of both the Democratic and Republican parties for their close relationship to the liquor-traffickers, arguing that at no time “effort has been made to change this policy [of allowing liquor traffic].”⁴² Democratic and Republican Party members took no official stance on either side of the debate as a party, but individual members identified their personal beliefs on the matter. Samuel Small argues morally for the national imposition of legislation regarding Prohibition, claiming that in light of the Christian nature of the United States (although it should be noted there is no official religion in the

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Prohibition Party Platform, 1880. Retrieved from http://www.prohibitionists.org/Background/Party_Platform/Platform_Index.htm

⁴² Prohibition Party Platform, 1884. Retrieved from http://www.prohibitionists.org/Background/Party_Platform/Platform1884.htm

United States and legislation is required to maintain the separation of Church and State), it is necessary for the Federal Government to enact this change for the benefit of its citizens:

“The United States has taken **national authority** to exercise **the right of Prohibition** in the interest of ‘the general welfare’ in numerous instances. There can be no question, therefore, of the common understanding that, **in matters over which the States have granted jurisdiction to the Federal government, the sovereign power of Prohibition belongs to it.**”⁴³

In calling for Federal Legislation, Small is framing prohibition as a right inherent to the government by means of improving the welfare of the nation. Both patriotic and caring, this quote argues that due to the detriment alcohol is causing to the ‘general welfare’ of the country, it is a national issue rather than one which can be left for states to decide for themselves. Reflecting on the attempts made by smaller state legislations to prohibit or reduce the traffic of alcohol, citing their failure as rationale for enacting Federal legislation, Small argues that if not for the financial influence of distillers and other liquor people, Prohibition would have been passed via popular vote:

“Wherever prohibition has failed to secure a popular majority, it has been because of the **opposition of present political parties and the corruption funds of distillers, brewers, and saloonists...** Wherever it has been repealed (as in Rhode Island), it has been **from disgust of the cowardice, corruption, and perjury of the party and officials responsible for its non-enforcement.**”⁴⁴

As the Prohibition Party argued in their platform two years prior to Small’s publication, blame for the failure of Prohibition was placed on the two leading political parties and the influence of money coming from alcohol corporations. The repeals which occurred are evidenced by Small to demonstrate the need for this legislation to be enacted on a federal level, where once adopted and enforced universally it would be

⁴³ Samuel W. Small, *Pleas for Prohibition* (Atlanta, GA: Printed for the author, 1890), 13. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/cu31924031432051/page/n5>

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 35.

more difficult to overturn with financial incentives. Small and the Prohibition Party had contrasting views on the efficacy of Democratic and Republican parties in advancing prohibition legislation.

Small viewed the Republican Party as the “first hopes” for enacting Prohibition, “since it had been the ruling party during the struggle which ended slavery in the United States, and had been continued in power to accomplish the settlement of the status and privileges of the freedmen, it was natural that all other reforms should be brought to its doors for adoption.”⁴⁵ Once again insinuating the relationship between enslavement and alcoholism – Small hoped to free those he saw as entrapped in their dependency on alcohol. The Prohibition party took another stance, condemning both major parties, the Democrats and Republicans, for their lack of action in fighting the alcohol issue and complicity in the corruption coming from the liquor people, and calling for support of these parties to be halted:

“That there can be no greater peril to the nation than the existing competition of the Republican and Democratic parties for the liquor vote. Experience shows that any party not openly opposed to the traffic will engage in this competition, will court the favor of the criminal classes, will barter the public morals, the purity of the ballot and every trust and object of good government for party success. Patriots and good citizens should therefore, immediately withdraw from all connection with these parties.”⁴⁶

Insinuating that the current leading parties are corrupt and willing to “court...the criminal classes” in exchange for morally correct decisions, the Prohibition Party is simultaneously highlighting the immorality of drinking and undermining the existing political structure. A clear dichotomy is established between Wet and Dry parties and the morals and patriotism of voters are drawn into question. Their distain for each existing party is clear: Republicans had been in power for the previous 24 years and not enacted any legislation to curb the liquor industry on a national scale, and Democrats declared Prohibition too radical of a stance to take, opting instead for localized temperance laws if desired by popular vote.

Immigrant Lobbyists

Generally, when scholars examine Prohibition and the period leading to it, a distinct focus is placed on the Germany Beer Industry in Chicago – and for good reason. Large beer producing families established themselves in Chicago, St. Louis, and other cities in the Midwest as westward expansion caused new cities to develop with the goal of attracting European immigrants from the coastal cities. Between 1850 and 1890,

⁴⁵ Samuel W. Small, *Pleas for Prohibition* (Atlanta, GA: Printed for the author, 1890), 19. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/cu31924031432051/page/n5>

⁴⁶ Prohibition party 1884

the population of the United States tripled while beer consumption increased by twenty-four-fold.⁴⁷ Brewers became the cornerstone of immigrant populations, financing saloon keepers who often “cashed pay checks, extended credit, supplied a mailing address or a message drop for men who had not yet found a permanent home, and in some instances provided sleeping space at five cents a night.”⁴⁸ Expanding from more than just saloons where one could waste away a pay check after work drinking excessively and avoiding one’s family, they became community centres which offered security, comfort, and a space to meet others from ones cultural background. Okrent estimates that around 80% of licensed saloons were owned by first-generation Americans during this time, creating a separation of American from immigrant cultures. In her analysis of the parallel expressions of political activism, Marni Davis argues that anti-Semitism and Prohibition both aligned along the anti-immigrant sentiment which had been growing in the United States since the end of the Civil War:

“Alcohol symbolized **foreign power and alien behaviour**, and Prohibitionists insisted that its abolition would **protect American political and economic interests and force immigrants to conform to American moral standards**. Some Prohibitionists went further, claiming that the presence of immigrants in the United States *was* the problem.”⁴⁹

Drinking in America was perceived as an action or activity imported by foreigners despite the prevalence of alcohol in even the first colonies, which technically were comprised of immigrants, but the Puritans building these colonies or other immigrant groups were the ancestors of anti-alcohol activists. Okrent claims that since its foundation, in the United States, “drinking was as intimately woven into the social fabric as family or church.”⁵⁰ The anti-immigrant sentiment has been explored more closer to the World Wars of the twentieth century, often conflating the war with this sentiment. Prior to even the threat of that war, anti-immigrant sentiment was brooding in the United States, which had recently expanded into the present-day Western United States, taking over land which had belonged to Mexico and establishing a border along the Pacific Coast. No longer just a land sought out by immigrants from Europe, the United States now began to visibly change to include former Mexicans and people from Asia who arrived at the border.⁵¹ The East

⁴⁷ Okrent, *Last Call*. 2010.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ Davis, Marni. *Jews and Booze: Becoming American in the Age of Prohibition*. NYU Press, 2012.
<http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/j.ctt16gzq64>.

⁵⁰ Okrent, *Last Call*, 2010.

⁵¹ The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed in 1848, ending the Mexican-American War and transferring what is now the Western US from Mexico to the United States. Those residing in that area were able to choose within one year whether to become US citizens or retain their Mexican citizenship. Maintaining their Mexican citizenship did not require them to relocate to present day Mexico.

Coast still received large populations of European immigrants, notably Jews from Russia and Eastern Europe who were fleeing persecution.

At the head of the Temperance Movement was the WCTU, a Protestant group which condemned drinking in general, especially drinking practices of Catholic and Jewish populations. The Catholic populations in the United States during this time came primarily from Germany and Ireland and the Jewish populations from Eastern Europe. The large influx of immigrants during this period brought with it the taste for alcohol they were traditionally accustomed to. Alcohol was nation's fifth largest industry at the turn of the century: Wine and beer often associated with European tastes and immigrants while whiskey was an American product.⁵² Distillation practiced utilized in making whiskey were imported by the Eastern European Jews who came to the United States throughout the 19th century and were utilized as a means of economic mobility:

“Jews had opposed the anti-alcohol movement because they sensed its **underlying moral coercion and cultural intolerance**, but also for economic reasons: beer, wine, and liquor commerce had served as a source of both **individual and communal upward mobility for American Jews since before the Civil War.**”⁵³

Pressure exerted by more conservative Protestants were often in favor of Prohibition, marking a distinct difference in the perceived morality of alcohol between religious groups. Historically, Jewish people has been granted a monopoly on alcohol production in what is currently Poland thus the immigration of approximately two million Russian Jews from 1880 to 1920 due to persecution exacerbated an existing gap in cultural drinking practices, which led to the emergence of a Kosher wine industry in the US. Prohibitionists viewed this as an external threat to societal cohesion and began conflating alcohol with immigration:

“The Prohibitionists are no longer a vanguard fighting an **intruder**; they are **free men seeking to resist the tyranny of a usurper** in a citadel of sovereignty, and **to expel him from our borders forever.**”⁵⁴

This brief quote exemplifies the anti-immigrant, Prohibitionist, and idealization of freedom – invoking once again Prohibition as a patriotic act. It insinuates that Prohibitionists are no longer attempting to keep out the “intruder” but that the borders have been infiltrated and freedom is at risk, thus in order to preserve

⁵² Davis, *Jews and Booze* 2012.

⁵³ Davis, Marni. *Jews and Booze: Becoming American in the Age of Prohibition*. NYU Press, 2012. <http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/j.ctt16gzq64>.

⁵⁴ Samuel W. Small, *Pleas for Prohibition* 1890, 54.

freedom this intruder (alcohol) must be forced out. Framed as a battle, Small is exacerbating the dichotomy between the wets and dries, positioning the two at moral odds with one another and demonstrating his dedication to fighting for Prohibition. The imagery of a battle exacerbates the grouping of Patriotic, dry, Americans against wet members of the liquor industry – insinuating their un-patriotism and un-Americanism.

As historically Jews had been a targeted group, this migration was not unanticipated but did increase the Jewish population in the United States significantly, at a time when anti-immigrant sentiment was growing. Orientation toward traditional religious practices prompted Jewish People to create and support an emerging kosher wine industry and distilling practices. Particularly due to persecution, Jewish people felt a strong sense of commitment to preserving the traditional practices which they could and actively campaigned against the Prohibition lobbyist threatening to impose regulations which would infringe on their right to practice religion. The campaigning was successful as after the Eighteenth Amendment, prohibiting the traffic and sale of intoxicating beverages, passed, there were exemptions for religious uses of wine passed during the sixty-sixth congress⁵⁵. Jewish people argued for their right to consume alcohol based on the belief that alcohol abuse was “not a Jewish concern,” arguing that the issues associated with alcohol were rooted in the “drinker who failed to exercise self-control” thus Jews who expressed “moderate drinking habits” were not the problematic immigrants.⁵⁶ Without pointing out other immigrant groups directly, the attempt to separate the substance from the user was crucial to the growing anti-Prohibition lobby within the alcohol industry.⁵⁷

Immigration to the United States was not a new phenomenon, and the previous waves of European immigration had established a culture of beer and wine drinkers, to the point that by the end of the nineteenth century almost eighty percent of the pure alcohol consumed was contained in those beverages.⁵⁸ As these beverages tend to be lower in alcohol than spirits, reaching this eighty percent threshold was an impressive indication of how many beers and bottles of wine were being consumed in this era. Jewish immigrants grew grapes to make wine for their religious ceremonies, often in partnership with Italian and Slavic immigrants who would use the same grapes to make their own *sour wines*. These immigrant groups, particularly the Jewish population, were fierce critics of the temperance movement, opposing the movement’s “underlying moral coercion and cultural intolerance” and the economic detriment it would have on their communities

⁵⁵ Act of October 28, 1919 [Volstead Act]. Sixty Sixth Congress to the United States Government.

⁵⁶ Davis, Marni. *Jews and Booze: Becoming American in the Age of Prohibition*. NYU Press, 2012.
<http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/j.ctt16gzq64>.

⁵⁷ Davis, *Jews and Booze*, 2012.

⁵⁸ Welskopp, Thomas. 2011. "Prohibition". *Immigrant Entrepreneurship*.
<https://www.immigrantentrepreneurship.org/entry.php?rec=87>.

as “beer, wine, and liquor commerce had served as a source of both individual and communal upward mobility for American Jews since before the Civil War.”⁵⁹

Reverend Small was one of the leading figures pushing this “moral coercion” on the country, adamantly criticizing immigrant groups who he viewed as refusing to assimilate and opting to drink instead. He opposed the publication of journals and newspapers in languages other than English; he claimed that many of these opposed Prohibition which was “not strange, considering the European notions and habits of peoples for whom they are printed.”⁶⁰ He was particularly critical of the German Press, which was written in German with contributions from the beer industry often included. The strength of the German beer lobby was enough for Small to “charge distinctly” those publications for “the crude, illogical, and unpatriotic views of the masses of the German reading citizen.”⁶¹ He maintained a perspective that German-Americans were not real Americans, and instead sought “to struggle for the Germanizing of America rather than the Americanizing of our German immigrant masses.” Whilst never clearly stating what his perception of Americanized immigrants would be like, Small did allude to his belief that they would be white, speak English, be Christian, and abstain from alcohol. His racial perception of alcoholics, support for state’s rights and opinion on the changing societal norms of the Southern United States came forward as he described the ideal society which was being threatened by the drink:

“When the white people of the South call to one another to preserve the supremacy of the white race in that section, to guard the integrity of white government and white social domination, against the rule and ruin of the black masses of ignorance, passion, and prejudice which once cursed them, and are eager for a return to power, they are denounced as still rampant with the spirit of rebellion, and as defiant of the Constitution and the laws of the nation.”⁶²

While other nations combined temperance and eugenics movements during this period, claiming that both foreigners and alcohol threatened the purity of people, the United States did not have a major eugenics-temperance alliance until after the eighteenth amendment had already passed.⁶³ Thus, Small’s white supremacist rhetoric is a surprising feature in his manifesto. The South was still healing from the losses suffered during the Civil War, and racial equality was a far away dream, thus Small’s use of white

⁵⁹ Davis, Marni. *Jews and Booze: Becoming American in the Age of Prohibition*. NYU Press, 2012. <http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/j.ctt16gzq64>.

⁶⁰ Small, (1890), 89.

⁶¹ Small (1890), 90.

⁶² Small (1890), 91.

⁶³ Nelson, Robert. (2016). Prohibition and Eugenics: Implicit Religions That Failed. *Implicit Religion*. 19. 307-335. 10.1558/imre.v19i3.30841.

supremacy in a piece published in the South is indicative of the bridges he was attempting to build between state's rights lobbyists and the anti-immigrant as well as white supremacist groups to unify them behind the temperance movement. This had minor success with women's organizations, which were divided over whether or not alcoholism was inherited or developed as a result of societal values⁶⁴.

Gendered Lobbyists

The Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), founded 1874 in Cleveland, Ohio established a women's network working towards goal of total eradication of beverage alcohol from American life. As members of "the sex specially aggrieved by the traffic in alcoholic drinks and the consequent intemperance of husbands, fathers, brother, and sons" women's issues such as domestic abuse, the inability to divorce, and restrictions on working opportunities encouraged women to become involved in the Temperance Movement⁶⁵.

Women often suffered domestic violence at the hands of their drunk husbands and fathers, leading to a demonization of alcohol as the mechanism for allowing this behaviour. In unifying with other women who wanted to protect themselves and their children, women's organizations began to form. Recognizing that social movement and organizing alone would not change society, women began campaigning for the right to vote in the 1840s in the US with the first official suffrage organizations coming into existence in 1896. Judith Allen (1987: 22) argues that the Temperance Movement allowed women to advocate for their rights in a manner which was less confrontational to their abusive husbands than directly identifying their destructive behaviours:

"Ill-used' wives of drinking men who saw little to be gained by other high-minded feminist campaigns, and whose dependency made them unable to attack their men's behaviour **directly**, found in temperance an **indirect venue for articulation of their grievances**. They could challenge husbandly behaviour under the most respectable aegis with the blessing of clergy and civil establishment. "

Obviously, not all men who drank turned to domestic abuse, but it was common to cite alcohol as a reason for poor or aggressive behavior if brought before court (see Ramsey 2011 for a detailed analysis of domestic abuse cases in the United States and Australia from 1860-1930). Wives were not yet permitted the right to divorce their husbands, nor were they able to claim ownership of property or money in the case

⁶⁴ Athey, Stephany. (2000). Eugenic Feminisms in Late Nineteenth-Century America: Reading Race in Victoria Woodhull, Frances Willard, Anna Julia Cooper and Ida B. Wells. University of Colorado Boulder. Retrieved from: <https://www.colorado.edu/gendersarchive1998-2013/2000/06/01/eugenic-feminisms-late-nineteenth-century-america-reading-race-victoria-woodhull-frances>

⁶⁵ Small (1890), 90.

of their husband's death or abandonment, issues which members of the Prohibition Party identified and utilized to attract women as supporters. Since its inception in 1872, the Party promoted women's suffrage and the right to divorce as Party platforms, drawing in support from women seeking the right to vote, desire to divorce, and prohibition of alcohol while also ensuring that if women were granted the right to vote, their votes would likely back the Prohibition Party's agenda in return (Prohibition Party Platform 1872). The Party promoted the most progressive suffrage agenda of the time:

“the right of suffrage rests on no mere circumstance of **color, race, former social condition, sex or nationality**, but inheres in the nature of man; and when from any cause it has been withheld from citizens of our country who are of suitable age and mentally and morally qualified for the discharge [sic] of its duties, it should be speedily restored by the people in their sovereign capacity.” (1872 emphasis my own)

This perspective on the wide definition of voter-eligible citizens made Prohibition Party attractive for women, but failed to bring immigrants on board, as many were directly involved in the brewing and distilling industries themselves (see previous section). This is reflected in the shift from such an encompassing fight for universal suffrage to the expansion of the right to vote to that of just women by 1880. Not entirely ignoring the immigrant population, the Party shifted its focus to that of inviting in new immigrants rather than focusing on the immigrants and their decedents already residing in the United States. The direct connection between Prohibition and women's suffrage led to both additional support for suffrage from Protestants and an attempt to stifle the suffrage movement from Brewers and their organizations. Those in the alcohol trade, especially brewers in the Midwest, feared that in granting women suffrage their businesses would be voted “out of existence.”⁶⁶ This conflation between suffragettes and Prohibition continued into the early 20th century when the president of the National Retail Liquor Dealers' Association announced in 1912, “Gentlemen, we need fear the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the ballot in the hands if women; therefore, gentlemen, fight woman suffrage!” (as cited in Okrent 2010). This quote highlights the growing influence that the Temperance Movement and the WCTU, in particular, had in a political world even without the right yet to vote.

Leading to the twentieth century was the unification of the Suffrage Movement under Susan B. Anthony and the WCTU under Francis Willard. This coalition led to the direct development of temperance from a general into an explicitly feminist issue: the WCTU altered their goal to align it more closely with acquiring the right to vote in order to enact temperance at a national level while the Suffrage Movement

⁶⁶ Davis, Marni. *Jews and Booze: Becoming American in the Age of Prohibition*. NYU Press, 2012. <http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/j.ctt16gzq64>.

gained a large body of support which was already highly organized behind another issue and active in demanding change. Willard wrote extensively in her journals about the development of the WCTU and other organizations both domestically and internationally. The first instances of a discussion of unity between suffrage being incorporated into the Prohibition Platform are recorded on 1 and 7 January 1888 when Willard writes:

“A day of blessed home life & church fellowship. Love feast & communion in AM. Temperance meeting as usual in Union Hall at 3.30 under auspices of WCTU. **Rev. CH Zimmerman spoke for prohibiton [sic] by law by politics & by woman's ballot.**” (1 Jan. 1888)

Previously, the WCTU had been explicitly mentioned in Prohibition Party platforms, specifically during their 1884 campaign, yet there is no corresponding note of this in Willard’s journals. As the reference to the organization was removed for the 1888 campaign, it seems that the Party had been presumptive in their ability to woo the WCTU, who did not actively seek out suffrage until this time. Within this same week, Willard held another meeting with the Prohibition Party, but made few notes of the interaction aside from an observation on the difference in political stance held by the interacting parties, with no explanation of the comment:

“Had a talk with W.M. [Walter Mills] about suffrage in Prohib. Platform. **He is conservative & I am radical.**” (7 Jan 1888)

While the Party has included suffrage as a party platform for sixteen years – four election cycles – already, this notation indicates that the details of suffrage are to be worked out and the relationship between the Party and WCTU is strengthening. It is interesting to note that the platform of 1884 is much more reflective of the explicit desires of the WCTU than that in 1888: in 1884 the WCTU is explicitly identified while in the following cycle there is no explicit mention of them. This dichotomy between the dated journal and explicitly in the party platform is indicative of deeper ideological shift and the closing sentence highlighting the conservative versus radical stance the two leaders held. What is interesting here is the self-identified radicalism of Willard, as the WCTU was traditionally made up of “conservative, middle- and sometimes upper-class, white, native born, and usually religious in orientation.”⁶⁷

Women, particularly those a member of the WCTU, demonstrated “strength and encouragement which we [the Prohibition Party] gratefully acknowledge and record” for “the purity of purpose and method, the earnestness, zeal, intelligence and devotion” to the cause of Prohibition (Prohibition Party 1884). Not

⁶⁷ McCammon, H. & Campbell K. (2002) Allies On the Road to Victory: Coalition Formation Between The Suffragists and The Woman's Christian Temperance Union. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*: October 2002, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 232.

only were the characteristics of these specific women highlighted in 1884 but the purpose for advocating women's suffrage was identified:

“That, believing in the **civil and the political equality of the sexes**, and that **the ballot in the hands of woman is her right for protection and would prove a powerful ally for the abolition of the liquor traffic**, the execution of the law, the promotion of reform in civil affairs, the removal of corruption in public life, we enunciate the principle and relegate the practical outworking of this reform to the discretion of the Prohibition party in the several States according to the condition of public sentiment in those States.”⁶⁸

From this clause, suffrage is both a tool and a right. By granting women this right, their vote would become a tool both to further the Prohibition agenda and to allow women the opportunity to protect themselves. In highlighting “her protection” from an unidentified harm, immediately before admitting that women's votes would “prove a powerful ally” in Prohibition, it can be assumed that alcohol is contributing to the dangers confronting women, namely the actions of their husbands whilst intoxicated.

The religious affiliation of the organization lead pastors and preachers who were traditionally more conservative to support these women in their pursuit of emancipation from the sin of alcohol. Of prominent religious leaders, Reverend Samuel W. Small was among the most vocal, admiring the women making up the Temperance societies and their goodness in raising the question of Prohibition:

“Temperance societies are increasing in number, influence, and aggressiveness. The **good and Christian women** of the country, with courage and consecration, have taken up the **defence [sic] their homes, their husbands, and their offspring**, and have banded themselves into **efficient organizations** which have had much to do with reviving interest in and augmenting the agitation of this question. Too much credit and honor cannot be given to these **noble mothers, wives, and daughters for the wisdom, skill, and persistence** with which they have pushed this problem and its solution upon the attention of all classes of our people.”⁶⁹

The Reverend further ties together the Christian woman and the Temperance movement with this compelling quotation, illustrating these women as crusaders in defense of the maternal roles they held in

⁶⁸ Prohibition Party Platform, 1884.

⁶⁹ Small (1890), 73.

society. Thus the admiration for these women as promoters of Prohibition can be read as just that – agents of social change in promoting both Christian values and inherent in that abstention from alcohol. The suffragists and WCTU originally disagreed with the methods each group used to promote their agendas, but with Frances Willard in control, the WCTU shifted away from radical and violent “crusades” against liquor people towards a reformatory stance whereby change would come through political action, which needed to derive from the ability to participate in politics. Despite the apparent similarities between the two groups: created by and for women in order to assert women’s right to the public sphere, suffragists explicitly demanded this right via the vote while the WCTU was implicit in their demands, acting independently as women without demanding political recognition⁷⁰. The inherent difference at the beginning of their movements was the belief in the most efficient way to bring about social change. Eventually, the WCTU and suffragists came together, recognizing the strengths each had to offer one another: social capital from the former – including the support of the Prohibition Party – and the later providing a mechanism to enact the sought-after social change in the form of the vote. Frances Willard was responsible for the radical ideology of the WCTU with notion of “home protection ballot,” the idea that temperance women could use the vote to close saloons and ban the production of alcohol in order to protect their families and home life⁷¹.

Labour Lobbyists

Politicians on both sides of the Prohibition debate organized around the issue of labor. Those in favor of outlawing alcohol referred to the detriment alcoholism had on worker’s motivation, focus, and wages, while those against Prohibition cited the jobs created by the alcohol industry, particularly for immigrants. This relationship of immigrant jobs to the liquor and beer industries were utilized as a means of scapegoating immigrants for the issues associated with alcohol. Labor was also tied to women’s issues, as money spent on the drink was therefore not going towards the family and the decreased income led to the need for child labor. These issues were framed as “women’s issues” and emphasized by the Prohibition Party and women’s movements as necessary reasons to both outlaw alcohol and enfranchise women who were better versed in issues of the home than their male partners were.

During this period, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) was collecting taxes from the liquor industry, which provided up to 20% of the Federal budget in any given year. Thus, threatening to eliminate liquor revenue would have a dramatic impact on the national economy. The Prohibition Party opposed the

⁷⁰ Blocker, J. (1985). Separate Paths: Suffragists and the Women's Temperance Crusade. *Signs*, 10(3), 460-476. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/3174261>

⁷¹ McCammon, H. & Campbell K. (2002) Allies On the Road to Victory: Coalition Formation Between The Suffragists and The Woman's Christian Temperance Union. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*: October 2002, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 231-251.

IRS on the grounds that its existence made the Federal Government dependent on “support from our greatest national vice” and called for its abolition in 1888. They continuously discuss the economic impact of alcohol and begin referring to it as “the most serious drain on the wealth and resources of the nation” in 1912. Small confronted this by arguing for a shift from liquor-based income to foodstuff-based income which to tax:

“The American farmer is a man of more than mediocre intelligence, but he has yet to comprehend the plain truth that the liquor traffic is his enemy, not his friend; that every bushel of grain sold to the distillery stops the sale of three other bushels to the breadmakers... Liquor traffic has argued the idea of the necessity for its toleration...It makes many lines of trade believe that the ruin of the liquor business means much loss of custom and profit; and thus, like a poison vine, it has attached itself to the sturdy oaks of our prosperity.”⁷²

Highlighting that it is not the farmer’s intelligence which is in question, but rather the power of the liquor influence in clouding the reality of their situation, Small goes on to explain the assumed prosperity of collusion with the liquor industry is not a necessity but the result of propaganda. Instead of selling their grains to brewers and distillers, instead bread could be made and sold, by his estimates in threefold quantity. Small also brings back the claim that the liquor people were corrupting American society, this time by making their interaction in the market seemingly irreplaceable to farmers who depended on the income from selling crops to the industry rather than based on corrupt politicians.

Marni Davis argues that workers and those with limited power saw temperance as a source of economic and social uplift as alcohol “impoverished workers and their families, endangered public health, and, by impeding immigrant acculturation, endangered national security as well.”⁷³ This seemed to occur more in Southern states which tended to have a less prevalent liquor industry within them. Alcohol again was demonized by the working class as something which hurt both the workers and their families, thus bringing in the female protector trope. It was blamed for the lack of acculturation of immigrant populations, as they remained within their local community drinking spots, thus limiting their exposure to English language and others outside of their cultural enclaves. By drinking, it was argued, these immigrant communities remained stratified from white, English speaking, Americans, thus creating a sense of insecurity around their existence as outsiders.

⁷² Small. *Pleas for Prohibition*. 38-39.

⁷³ Davis, Marni. *Jews and Booze*, 2012.

The Prohibition Party also used labor rights to appeal to women including in their 1892 platform that “equal labor should receive equal wages, without regard to sex.” The party also attempted to attract women who were not as keen on emerging from the traditional home sphere by position Prohibition as a means of ending child labor, something which would protect the home “sphere” which women occupied⁷⁴. A popular mechanism for bridging the gap between women’s groups, Reverend Small also attempted to appeal to women using the same rationale:

“It is at the bottom of nine tenths of the child labor, which is already a social and industrial problem with us. It drags young men and women from their desks when they are eager in study, harnesses them to menial tasks of the machinery of trade and production destroys their nobler aspirations, and makes millions of them serfs who should have been sovereigns of their own independent fortunes.”⁷⁵

Small blames alcohol for the need of child labor, for the children who stop going to school, again giving it agency rather than putting responsibility on those who chose to drink. Members of the liquor industry worked to shift blame for intemperance and excess drinking on the consumer rather than the seller or producer. Henry Clausen, president of National Brewer’s Association argued:

“Instead of condemning and prosecuting the saloon keeper, punish the drunkards; refuse to recognize them as gentlemen, debar them from all society, disfranchise them at the polls, condemn them to sweep the streets of your city with chain and ball fastened to their feet. Make drunkards criminals, but not the honest producers and purveyors of a necessary life.”⁷⁶

This conflict in responsibility drove further divisions within society as women tended to view this statement as a statement on their failure to raise good children and marry good men, thus an attack on their morality. If their husbands were arrested for their drinking, then the primary source of income in many households would be lost, so women preferred to advocate against the producers and distributor of alcohol.

⁷⁴ McCammon, H. & Campbell K. (2002) Allies On the Road to Victory: Coalition Formation Between The Suffragists and The Woman's Christian Temperance Union. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*: October 2002, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 231-251.

⁷⁵ Small. *Pleas for Prohibition*. 118.

⁷⁶ Blocker, J. (1985). Separate Paths: Suffragists and the Women's Temperance Crusade. *Signs*, 10(3), 464. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/3174261>

The liquor stance is reflective of the Jewish argument that it is the consumer not the substance which causes societal issues. One group gave agency to a substance while the other gave agency to the people consuming it. This dichotomy is interesting due to the political agency denied to women at this time, which suffragists were fighting to achieve. Women could simultaneously be blamed for the alcoholism of their male family members but not being “womanly” enough to prevent their distraction but were not responsible enough to be granted political agency.

The Prohibition Party tapped into the sentiment felt by members of the labor movement who suffered from alcoholism in their party platforms by highlighting key issues which intemperance affected and proposing solutions for them:

“That the **importation, manufacture, supply and sale of alcoholic beverages**, created and maintained by the laws of the National and State Governments during the entire history of such laws, are everywhere shown **to be the promoting cause of intemperance**, with resulting **crime and pauperism**, making large demands upon public and private charity; **imposing large and unjust taxation** for the support of penal and sheltering institutions, upon thrift, industry, manufactures and commerce; **endangering the public peace, desecrating the Sabbath; corrupting our politics**, legislation and administration of the laws; **shortening lives, impairing health and diminishing productive industry, causing education to be neglected and despised, nullifying the teachings of the Bible, the church and the school, the standards and guides of our fathers and their children in the founding and growth of our widely-extended country**; and which, imperilling the perpetuity of our civil and religious liberties, are baleful fruits by which we know that these laws are contrary to God's laws and contravene our happiness.”⁷⁷

The Party discussed the entirety of liquor traffic, from importation to domestic sale, as a cause of intemperance. The mere existence of alcohol led to impoverishment and crime, thus corrupting the morality of American citizens. This corruption is then blamed for the taxes needed to maintain prisons to hold the troublesome alcoholics who presented a danger to the surrounding area and threatened the sanctity of Sabbath. The emphasis on God and this religious day highlighted the Party's belief that in religious texts being a base for law and morality. The party highlights the corruption discussed earlier, as well as the health

⁷⁷ Prohibition Party Platform 1884.

detriments of drink. Crucial to labourers is the “diminishing productive industry” and neglect of education. This brief excerpt highlights key intersections in the Party interest: labour, women, family, and religion. They later go into detail, directly calling on members of the labour industry to pay attention to their plans:

“We earnestly call the attention of **the mechanic, the miner and manufacturer** to the investigation of the baneful effects upon labor and industry of the needless liquor business. It will be found **the robber who lessens wages and profits, foments discontent and strikes, and the destroyer of family welfare**. Labor and all legitimate industries demand deliverance from the taxation and loss which this traffic imposes; **and no tariff or other legislation can so healthily stimulate production, or increase the demand for capital and labor, or insure so much of comfort and content to the laborer, mechanic, and capitalist as would the suppression of this traffic.**”⁷⁸

The major labour parties sought after were the mechanics, miners, and manufacturers. Alcohol is presented to them as a “robber” to appeal to the workers themselves as well as to the owners of the industries. It lessens profit by making workers less productive and it steals wages by costing money with no long-term gain. The owners are appealed to with the claim that alcohol instigates the strikes by fostering discontent. The Party also appeals to women by claiming that alcohol destroys the welfare of the family. This careful framing allows the Party to attract a broad base of support from a variety of actors – alcohol becomes the enemy to American values, thus insinuating that if you are a patriotic American you would support the Prohibition Party as their platform identified one issue which once eliminated would theoretically solve other societal issues.

THE VOLESTEAD ACT

The result of the lobbying presented by the groups above were the passages of the Eighteenth Amendment, prohibiting the “manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors” within the United States, and of the Nineteenth Amendment which granted women the right to vote.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ The Constitution of the United States, Amendment 18.

CONCLUSION

Coalitions are more successful when unifying behind one issue, framing their own agendas in terms of this singular issue. At the turn of the nineteenth to twentieth centuries, the issue able to unify a diverse set of actors was the liquor question. Suffragists and The Prohibition Party unified in order to advance both of their goals. The WCTU compromised on their traditional perspective on women's roles, conceding that their desire for temperance was more effective if political power was placed behind it, thus were willing to take up public political space outside of the home. The liquor industry, while financially powerful, was unsuccessful in activating political support to prevent Prohibition as their rejection of women's suffrage and base in the immigrant community left them with little political base. The Prohibition party took advantage of the opportunity to offer enfranchisement to the disenfranchised women and alter immigration regulations in order to make voting a tangible reality for immigrant communities which helped to promote the Prohibition agenda. The formation of coalitions within the Temperance Movement of the United States allowed for the eventual passage of both the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Amendment to the United State's Constitution. While the relationship between the suffragists and WCTU has previously been examined due to the woman led base of each movement, and individual relationships between alcohol and lobbyists have been examined during the Prohibition Era, this research provides insight into the compromises made when these coalitions formed, thus allowing the evolution of each movement to be examined leading up to the Prohibition Era.

Modern Prohibition

After the official end of Prohibition, the US government shifted their focus to other substances, including marijuana, implementing taxes to reduce use on this beginning in 1937. The Temperance Movement which helped to support the implementation of Prohibition, also played a crucial role in the demonization of other substances. By broadening their platform from just alcohol to include other substances, this group has managed to remain intact today. This rhetoric conflating migrants with illicit substances can also be seen when examining the official era of the War on Drugs, begun under Richard Nixon as well as in the primary speeches of current US President, Donald Trump. While a larger paper would be necessary to trace the repeating patterns of anti-immigrant-anti-substance political rhetoric, it is important to keep in mind the continuation of this negation of domestic responsibility for substance usage within the United States. While the focus of this paper will be an analysis of the rhetoric used to discuss immigrants and wine in particular during the prohibition era, it is interesting to look at these patterns from a broader perspective.

Reference List

- Act of October 28, 1919 [Volstead Act]. Sixty Sixth Congress to the United States Government.
- Amenta, E., & Young, M. (1999). Democratic States and Social Movements: Theoretical Arguments and Hypotheses. *Social Problems*, 46(2), 153-168. doi:10.2307/3097250
- Amenta, E., Caren, N., Chiarello, E., & Su, Y. (2010). The Political Consequences of Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 287-307. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/25735079>
- Andrews, K., & Seguin, C. (2015). Group Threat and Policy Change: The Spatial Dynamics of Prohibition Politics, 1890–1919. *American Journal of Sociology*, 121(2), 475-510. doi:10.1086/682134
- Appleby, J. (1997). The Personal Roots of the First American Temperance Movement. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 141(2), 141-159. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/987298>
- Athey, Stephany. (2000). *Eugenic Feminisms in Late Nineteenth-Century America: Reading Race in Victoria Woodhull, Frances Willard, Anna Julia Cooper and Ida B. Wells*. University of Colorado Boulder. Retrieved from: <https://www.colorado.edu/gendersarchive1998-2013/2000/06/01/eugenic-feminisms-late-nineteenth-century-america-reading-race-victoria-woodhull-frances>
- Augst, T. (2007). Temperance, Mass Culture, and the Romance of Experience. *American Literary History*, 19(2), 297-323. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/4496982>
- Bengtsson, H. (1938). The Temperance Movement and Temperance Legislation in Sweden. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 197, 134-153. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/1020867>
- Blocker, J. (1985). Separate Paths: Suffragists and the Women's Temperance Crusade. *Signs*, 10(3), 460-476. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/3174261>
- Breitenbach, W. (1983). Sons of the Fathers: Temperance Reformers and the Legacy of the American Revolution. *Journal of the Early Republic*, 3(1), 69-82. doi:10.2307/3122752
- Brown, L. (1916). Suffrage and Prohibition. *The North American Review*, 203(722), 93-100. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/25108710>
- Carroll, L. (1976). The Temperance Movement in India: Politics and Social Reform. *Modern Asian Studies*, 10(3), 417-447. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/311914>
- Clemens, E. (1999). Securing Political Returns to Social Capital: Women's Associations in the United States, 1880s-1920s. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 29(4), 613-638. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/206976>
- Dannenbaum, J. (1981). The Origins of Temperance Activism and Militancy among American Women. *Journal of Social History*, 15(2), 235-252. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/3787109>
- Davis, Marni. *Jews and Booze: Becoming American in the Age of Prohibition*. NYU Press, 2012. <http://www.jstor.org.eur.idm.oclc.org/stable/j.ctt16gzq64>.
- Digital Journals of Frances Willard, 1875-1889, Journals 75-89. Retrieved from <http://www.franceswillardjournals.org/about.php>
- Digital Journals of Frances Willard, 1881, Journal 45. Retrieved from <http://www.franceswillardjournals.org/about.php>
- Digital Journals of Frances Willard, 1883, Journal 46. Retrieved from <http://www.franceswillardjournals.org/about.php>
- Digital Journals of Frances Willard, 1888, Journal 47. Retrieved from <http://www.franceswillardjournals.org/about.php>

Digital Journals of Frances Willard, 1893, Journal 48. Retrieved from <http://www.franceswillardjournals.org/about.php>

Digital Journals of Frances Willard, 1896, Journal 49. Retrieved from <http://www.franceswillardjournals.org/about.php>

DuBois, E. (1987). Working Women, Class Relations, and Suffrage Militance: Harriot Stanton Blatch and the New York Woman Suffrage Movement, 1894-1909. *The Journal of American History*, 74(1), 34-58. doi:10.2307/1908504

Goldberg, M. (1994). Non-Partisan and All-Partisan: Rethinking Woman Suffrage and Party Politics in Gilded Age Kansas. *The Western Historical Quarterly*, 25(1), 21-44. doi:10.2307/971068

Goodstein, A. (1998). A Rare Alliance: African American and White Women in the Tennessee Elections of 1919 and 1920. *The Journal of Southern History*, 64(2), 219-246. doi:10.2307/2587945

Greve, H., & Rao, H. (2012). Echoes of the Past: Organizational Foundings as Sources of an Institutional Legacy of Mutualism. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(3), 635-675. doi:10.1086/667721

Harrison, B. (1967). Religion and Recreation in Nineteenth-Century England. *Past & Present*, (38), 98-125. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/649750>

Holly McCammon and Karen Campbell (2002) Allies On the Road to Victory: Coalition Formation Between The Suffragists and The Woman's Christian Temperance Union. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*: October 2002, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 231-251.

Kerr, K. (1980). Organizing for Reform: The Anti-Saloon League and Innovation in Politics. *American Quarterly*, 32(1), 37-53. doi:10.2307/2712495

McAdam, D., & McCarthy, J. (1996). *COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES ON SOCIAL MOVEMENTS*.

McCammon, H. (2001). Stirring up Suffrage Sentiment: The Formation of the State Woman Suffrage Organizations, 1866-1914. *Social Forces*, 80(2), 449-480. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/2675586>

McCammon, H. (2003). "Out of the Parlors and into the Streets": The Changing Tactical Repertoire of the U.S. Women's Suffrage Movements. *Social Forces*, 81(3), 787-818. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/3598176>

McCammon, H., Campbell, K., Granberg, E., & Mowery, C. (2001). How Movements Win: Gendered Opportunity Structures and U.S. Women's Suffrage Movements, 1866 to 1919. *American Sociological Review*, 66(1), 49-70. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/2657393>

McCammon, H., Lyndi Hewitt, & Sandy Smith. (2004). "No Weapon Save Argument": Strategic Frame Amplification in the U.S. Woman Suffrage Movements. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 45(3), 529-556. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/4120862>

McGerr, M. (1990). Political Style and Women's Power, 1830-1930. *The Journal of American History*, 77(3), 864-885. doi:10.2307/2078989

Miller, J. (2015). Never A Fight of Woman Against Man: What Textbooks Don't Say about Women's Suffrage. *The History Teacher*, 48(3), 437-482. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/24810524>

Mills, W. (1980). The Roots of African Nationalism in the Cape Colony: Temperance, 1866-1898. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 13(2), 197-213. doi:10.2307/218873

Nelson, Robert. (2016). Prohibition and Eugenics: Implicit Religions That Failed. *Implicit Religion*. 19. 307-335. 10.1558/imre.v19i3.30841.

Nicholson, S. (1908). The Local-Option Movement. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 32, 1-5. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/1010546>

Polletta, F. (2008). Culture and Movements. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 619, 78-96. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/40375796>

Prohibition Party Platforms 1872-1920.

Rappaport, E. (2013). Sacred and Useful Pleasures: The Temperance Tea Party and the Creation of a Sober Consumer Culture in Early Industrial Britain. *Journal of British Studies*, 52(4), 990-1016. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/24700889>

Samuel W. Small, *Pleas for Prohibition* (Atlanta, GA: Printed for the author, 1890), 19. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/cu31924031432051/page/n5>

Snow, David A., Sarah Anne Soule, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Holly J. McCammon. *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Second ed. 2019. Wiley-Blackwell Companions to Sociology. Web.

Strom, S. (1975). Leadership and Tactics in the American Woman Suffrage Movement: A New Perspective from Massachusetts. *The Journal of American History*, 62(2), 296-315. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/1903256>

Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics* (Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511813245

Tetrault, L. (2010). The Incorporation of American Feminism: Suffragists and the Postbellum Lyceum. *The Journal of American History*, 96(4), 1027-1056. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/40661824>

The Constitution of the United States, Amendment 18.

The Constitution of the United States, Amendment 19.

Uluğ, Ö., & Acar, Y. (2015). 'We are more than Alliances between Groups': A Social Psychological Perspective on the Gezi Park Protesters and Negotiating Levels of Identity. In David I. & Toktamış K. (Eds.), *Everywhere Taksim: Sowing the Seeds for a New Turkey at Gezi* (pp. 121-136). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/j.ctt18z4hfn.12>

Van Dyke, Nella, and Bryan Amos. "Social Movement Coalitions: Formation, Longevity, and Success." *Sociology Compass* 11.7 (2017): *Sociology Compass*, Jul 2017, Vol.11(7). Web.

Wasserman, I. (1990). Status Politics and Economic Class Interests: The 1918 Prohibition Referendum in California. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 31(3), 475-484. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl:2048/stable/4120974>

Welskopp, Thomas. 2011. "Prohibition". *Immigrant Entrepreneurship*. <https://www.immigrantentrepreneurship.org/entry.php?rec=87>.

Yacovone, D. (1988). The Transformation of the Black Temperance Movement, 1827-1854: An Interpretation. *Journal of the Early Republic*, 8(3), 281-297. doi:10.2307/3123691