



HV/D 456

WOMEN'S  
TRUE TEMPERANCE  
COMMITTEE

---

STUDY CIRCLE PAPERS

---

*Price - Fourpence*

1927

DONINGTON HOUSE,  
NORFOLK STREET,  
STRAND, W.C.2.

*I*N the Spring of 1927 the Women's True Temperance Committee formed a Circle to study the temperance question, and lectures were given by qualified speakers on each aspect.

*This pamphlet is the almost verbatim course of lectures given to the Study Circle.*

HV5020.

Temperance.

## Contents.

	PAGE
THE ETHICAL VIEW, by the Rev. Arthur Day, s.J.	5
THE LEGAL VIEW, by Ernest E. Williams, Barrister-at-Law.	9
THE CIVIC AND SOCIAL VIEW, by Mrs. Herbert Dalton, F.R.G.S.	18
THE MEDICAL VIEW No. 1, by E. B. Turner, F.R.C.S.	24
THE MEDICAL VIEW No. 2, by A. Beresford Kingsford, M.D.	26

## The Ethical View.

By REV. ARTHUR DAY, S.J.

**E**THICS must be connected with religion—with a belief in God. Morals which are not rooted in religion are as fickle as fashion. We have some clues to God's plans which enable us to form a shrewd view as to the lines on which to run the world. All things come from God and are therefore good. But all things are not equally good for everyone at all times. Sometimes a person does well to enjoy a thing and sometimes he does better to refrain from it. Reasonable beings can judge which is best. We must cultivate the art of discrimination. Some created things have the appearance of some special affinity with evil. That anybody will make any serious misuse of milk, which God provided for us gratis in our infancy, is unlikely; it can therefore safely be left on people's door steps. It is in itself excellent and not likely to be abused. Beer, for which God is not so directly responsible, could not be left lying about. It presents more temptation to excess. Another example of two things not equally good are cabbage and tobacco. The fact is, the problem of evil is such a difficult one and is so much brought under our notice, that there is danger of the heresy which tries to make out that God is not responsible for the material side of this world. This Manichean heresy came from Persia and from the Balkans invaded Europe about the year A.D. 1000. It caused great havoc during a couple of centuries and broke out again in a milder form in Puritanism. It is a heresy that is always liable to recur.

We require a moral quality to steer a course between excess and defect and to preside over our selections. This quality is called Temperance. It is the most comprehensive of all moral virtues because it presides over all the others. Nor is it a Christian virtue only. The Roman philosophers taught it. Plato and Aristotle and Cicero wrote of the sovereign self-mastery we should have. The Greeks developed a high sense of proportion in all æsthetic matters. They tried to make life

a fine art. There are three chief forms of temperance. In eating and drinking it is called usually abstinence; in "sex" it is called chastity, and in other matters (in less violent appetites) it is called modesty—the checking of any bumptiousness or disorderliness in outward manners. Temperance is the fourth cardinal virtue and in the order of dignity the others take precedence. Yet in spite of this the religion of some people resolves itself into temperance only and narrows this down to teetotalism in drink! There are, of course, other domains in which temperance is needed; in speech (to know when to speak and when to keep silence), in expenditure (to know when to spend without being extravagant and when not to spend without being mean), in recreation (to know how to take enough amusement to keep in good condition, but not to take so much that we dissipate our moral strength). Temperance is necessary for steering between the Scylla and Charybdis of indulgence and defect. Undisciplined human nature is a chaos of vague desires: true education co-ordinates these and attempts to subordinate the lower to the higher. The chief object of ethical training is to help us to acquire a master-purpose in life which is worthy of us. A truly "moral" life tends to become a work of art, from which the ugly and degrading elements are, as far as may be, eliminated.

It is in the use of all manner of commodities that we chiefly show the fruits of this discipline of mind and will. Among these commodities, and holding an honourable place amongst them, must be reckoned beer and wine. In mediæval England the monasteries were the principal breweries and after their suppression a fair number of the homeless inmates were forced to turn this talent to account. Excellent work was also done by "brewsters" (breweresses) and the punishment of ducking was meted out to those who were proved by a rough and ready test to have diluted the ale or beer unduly. History has shown that the moderate and seemly consumption of good beer has played an important part in parochial life, the building of churches, etc. It is then right and ethical that the average human being who has not some good motive for abstinence should possess the art of drinking beer or wine gracefully and in moderation. It is only those who take a low view of human improvability and divine goodness who can suggest Prohibition as the proper means for preventing drunkenness.

We may now pass from the duties of the man to the duties of the State. This is an imperfect world, and imperfect on such strange and freakish lines. Where there are a lot of people living together we must have policemen—but not more than are absolutely necessary. The policeman must not be officious;

he must respect the rights of the individual and not intrude unnecessarily. For similar reasons a surgeon is careful not to do more cutting than necessary. The State must go very gingerly and endeavour not to damage character. People should develop their proper gifts on proper lines and a State which tries to supersede self-control and to force people to be reasonable and good, goes altogether beyond its mandate. Character is even more important than Conduct. It is better to have eccentricities and excrescences than to sacrifice character. Nor is the State called upon to suppress all vices. This is not in its power. It must select the vices which are particularly subversive of social life. The State is not expected to urge all virtues; it fulfils its duty in encouraging the social ones. Moral stamina is not always fostered by removing temptation. The State is not called upon to remove all temptation—this is not God's plan—but only to remove the more glaring and shocking ones. Again laws must be made for the capacity of the average man. If there obtained in any country the horrible condition in which a large number of people were constantly getting drunk and committing crimes, then perhaps Prohibition might be necessary; but even then only for a time. Very strong anti-prohibitionists who will not allow for a minute the possibility of prohibition under any conceivable conditions, damage the cause of True Temperance which we advocate. In the reign of Queen Anne (Brandy Nan as she was called for taking the duty off spirits) people were able to get drunk quite easily on a penny or two. This constituted, especially in London, a deplorable state of affairs. Things were positively loathsome and disgusting. Drastic methods had to be adopted to end this orgy of drink. All stimulants, especially spirits, have their dangerous side and need careful watching. Belloc and Chesterton sometimes wave the flag of good fellowship so cordially that the unwary may almost suspect them of deprecating all abstemiousness applied to alcohol. Such views are far from their minds.

The modern view of the liquor problem is not to work for the greater honour and glory of God, but rather for promoting efficiency—a very misleading ideal. The form of efficiency has first to be defined and its value discussed. It is not necessary to take Selfridge & Co., as setting the true criterion of human excellence.

#### **Note on Industrial Efficiency Argument.**

Viscount Sumner in a debate in the House of Lords (24th May, 1927) related the following incident. Just before Prohibition was introduced in the United States, Lord Sumner

asked a distinguished American: "What do you think about Prohibition?" He answered: "I hate it, because it is an invasion of liberty. But mark my words, if you intend to keep up competition with us you will have to adopt it in three years." This prophecy was evidently too definite—we have survived the critical period! But from the ethical standpoint we should prefer financial ruin to any remedy involving an immoral principle. "The end does *not* justify the means" and, in this case, the end—increased wealth—is only a doubtful advantage: it does not always bring happiness in its train. Happiness is what we really want. And if only education is wisely managed and directed towards temperance in all things, efficiency may be secured as well. A moderate use of stimulating drink may be helpful to both. Of course, the use of liquor needs regulating and it is precisely this that the True Temperance Association is endeavouring to do.

## The Legal View.

By ERNEST E. WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law.

AN Englishman is supposed to know the law. And so, in approaching a question like temperance, with which a good deal of law is bound up, it is just as well to know something of the law affecting it. But the law of licensing is a very complicated affair, and if I were to attempt to unravel all its complexities, this lecture would never finish, and your brains would soon be in a whirl. In the short time at our disposal, therefore, I shall not attempt to do more than give you a very general idea of the system which regulates our places of public refreshment.

But the law has its roots in history. And we shall better understand the public house of to-day if we try shortly to trace its growth in the past.

### History.

Now the public house, in the sense of a place where, for payment, travellers and others can find food and drink and entertainment and lodging, is an ancient institution. Seeing what primary needs it serves, it would be strange if it were otherwise. But the commercial public house is not in this country on any large scale so ancient an institution as might be supposed. And the reasons for that are that in the old days people did not travel about so much; and brewing was a home industry, and drinks were mostly consumed at home; while most of those who did move far from home were pilgrims, and being engaged in that pious occupation they received the hospitality of the monasteries with which the countryside was plentifully sprinkled. Also, apart from the object of his journey, monks held themselves bound in charity to supply the wayfarer with food and lodging.

But it was not always easy to entertain travellers within the ordinary rooms of the monastery. Hence guest houses on the monastic estates, but apart from the main buildings, were set up, and from those guest houses the monks dispensed their hospitality. Then many of the monasteries adopted the view

that the supply of refreshments would be better out of their hands, and they therefore made over the guest-houses to laymen on their estates; and, of course, these original publicans ran their establishments more or less in a commercial fashion.

There were also, even in mediæval days, in the large towns, taverns run by laymen as business concerns, and these sometimes were of a rowdy character, and came under the notice of the authorities, so producing conditions which led later to licensing. But, speaking generally, the place to which the wayfarer in pre-Reformation England resorted for a drink or meal or may be a bed, was the pilgrim's house, owned by a monastery and managed either by the monks or by a lay tenant. And this system may have accounted for the widespread use of religious names for public houses, which persist, though in a corrupted disguise, at the present day, as was well brought out in the True Temperance Clerical Committee's interesting little pamphlet, "The Witness of Old Inns."

But with the Reformation came a great change in public houses, as well as in other departments of life. Pilgrims, with their modest requirements, no longer occupied the roads. Trade grew, and merchants going up and down the country were the principal travellers; and they demanded a much better service than the poor affair provided by the pilgrim's hostels. So began the first agitation for public house improvement. And it appears to have been a successful agitation, and great improvements were said to have been made. And, to skip a couple of centuries, we may note here a second public house improvement agitation, about the middle of the 18th century. It was the time when tea began to be drunk, as well as beer, and a time when the prosperous "cit" liked to travel out a few miles on Sundays and holidays. And so arose the demand for, and the supply of, a new type of public house, to entertain visitors out for a day's amusement and fresh air. The term Tea Gardens came into use, and from this period date houses, like Jack Straw's Castle on Hampstead Heath and the famous Rosher-ville Gardens.

But to return to the 16th Century. The public houses were completely laicized and commercialised, and were more generally used. And out of this new development arose the licensing system. Which brings us to the law.

#### Law.

A tentative beginning had been made at the end of the previous century, for an Act of Parliament of 1496 empowered justices of the peace to stop common ale-selling in towns and places where they should think convenient, and to take sureties

for their good behaviour from the keepers of ale houses. This was not the same as licensing. A man in the ordinary course could start an ale-house if he so wished, but he might be asked by the justices to give sureties for his good behaviour, and the justices might, if they chose, order his premises to be closed.

The real licensing system started in 1552, when an Act was passed ordaining that no one should be allowed to keep an inn, ale-house or tippling house unless the justices first gave him the privilege to do so. This was done either under the hands of two justices or at the ordinary sessions. But in 1753 a regular meeting was ordered to be held annually for the purpose of granting licences. And that system continues to-day.

#### Applying for a Licence.

The legislation on the subject up to date has been brought together in a statute called the Licensing (Consolidation) Act, 1910. And if you are fond of that kind of light reading, you can trace in that Act all the steps that have to be taken before an applicant can get permission to open, or to keep open, premises for the sale of intoxicating liquor. Probably a very short summary of the procedure will give you all that you will want to know at the moment.

The first section tells you that an excise licence under which intoxicating liquor may be sold by retail shall not be granted except to a person who holds a justices' licence. That reminds us of a fundamental point in licensing law: there are two licences in respect of most places where fermented beverages are sold—a licence issued by the Customs and Excise Department and a licence granted by the magistrates. The second comes first. That is to say, the justices' licence has first to be obtained by the applicant. And nowadays it takes some obtaining. Up to about 1869 that was not so. If the applicant were a man of good character and the premises all right, the justices did not pursue the matter farther: they granted their licence. But about this time teetotal agitation against public houses and the prevalence of a good deal of excessive drinking caused the justices to adopt a different policy. Thenceforth they wanted to know if the proposed licence was required, for the needs of the neighbourhood, that is—not merely by the applicant, and if they thought it was not required they exercised their discretionary power, and refused the application. And justices usually think that a new licence is unnecessary, and refusal has become almost customary.

But, assuming that, owing to the growth of a neighbourhood and the sparseness of houses for the sale of alcoholic refreshment, the licensing justices grant a new licence—and

they do sometimes—then the applicant, armed with his magisterial permit, goes to the Excise authorities for his excise licence. That he then gets as a matter of course, for it is only to them a question of hauling in revenue. The Department draws so much annually from the licensee by way of licence duty as consideration for the licence to sell. This sum varies with the annual value of the licensed house. The rates were roughly doubled a few years ago under Mr. Lloyd George's famous Finance Act. They are now equivalent to half the annual value of the licensed premises, if it is a fully licensed public house, and a third of the annual value if it is only a beer house; in the case of "off" licences the duty ranges from £10 to £50 for a spirit licence, with much smaller scales of duty for beer and wine licences.

If anyone sells intoxicating beverages without having obtained these licences, he may be fined £50 or treble the amount of the full duty—a penalty which is not infrequently enforced in the case of bogus clubs, whose proprietors are the main offenders against the law to-day.

Now these licences, as I have said, are granted at an annual licensing meeting, which is its correct title, though you will often hear it referred to as Brewster Sessions. These meetings are held in February, with adjourned meetings a little later. The magistrates who are entitled to attend them are commonly spoken of as licensing justices. In most places the justices and the licensing justices are the same persons, but in boroughs which are not county boroughs, and have ten justices, the licensing justices are for some purposes—new licences and ordinary removals—a committee appointed by the general body of the justices. But though the justices and the licensing justices are for the most part the same, their position is different when they sit at the licensing meeting from what it is when they sit in the ordinary petty sessional court. In the latter case they are a court of justice, enjoying all the privileges of a court. At a licensing meeting they do not form a court at all, and are only acting in an administrative capacity. If, therefore, they make intemperate and injurious statements, they expose themselves to an action for defamation, whereas if they were sitting as a court they could say what they liked.

But though the justices at their licensing meeting are only acting in an administrative capacity, they are endued with a very wide amount of judicial discretion. In regard to the grant of new licences their discretion is absolute, and if they choose to refuse the application there is no appeal from their decision.

On the other hand, if the justices grant a new licence it is of no validity until it is confirmed by a body called the con-

firmer authority. The confirming authority is the general body of justices of the county, called quarter sessions, because of their quarterly meetings to transact judicial and other business. In small boroughs the confirming authority is a joint committee of county and borough justices. Opponents of a new licence therefore have a second string to their bow. They may come before the confirming authority and argue their case over again. It is not, however, usual for the confirming authority to turn down the grant made previously by the licensing justices, but they sometimes insert new conditions in the licence.

### Monopoly Value.

This matter of conditions is a very important one. The licensing justices themselves, as well as the confirming authority, may, in granting a new licence, attach to the licence any conditions "they think proper in the interests of the public." And there is one condition which they must insert—the payment by the licensee of what is called "monopoly value." Monopoly value is defined in the Act (s. 14) as "the difference between the value which the premises will bear, in the opinion of the justices, when licensed, and the value of the same premises if they were not licensed."

This idea of monopoly value was introduced in 1904. It arose out of the policy of restricting the number of public houses. Obviously, if the number is restricted very severely, a monopoly of business is conferred upon those houses which are allowed to exist, which theoretically at any rate can be expressed in terms of £ s. d. — though practically it must always be extremely difficult to calculate. In fact one may go farther and say that it is impossible. And the difficulty of computing the monopoly value is increased by reason of the fact that the success of a public house is governed by other factors besides its freedom from competition. There is successful competition itself. The enterprise of the owners and licensee build up a goodwill. And that is not monopoly value at all—though it is mixed up with it inextricably. But still the law says that in respect of all new *on* licences granted after 1904 the licensee must hand over to the State Exchequer a sum representing the monopoly value of the licence. And it is assumed that every licence has a monopoly value. And so when an application for a new licence is granted one of the most important proceedings at the sessions is a haggling over the amount which is to be paid for the monopoly value—a proceeding in which a representative of the Government takes a leading part. A lump sum is eventually fixed, but it is usually

divided up into annual payments over the period for which the licence is granted; which may be for any time up to seven years.\*

### Forfeiture.

Though a new on licence is thus now granted for a fixed term of several years, it is always liable to be forfeited, if the licensee breaks any of the conditions attached to his licence, or if he is convicted of an offence in connection with the conduct of his business. This is a serious matter for the licensee. It is also a serious matter for the owners of the house, who have put their money into it, and who are not usually nowadays the same as the licensee. That is a point to bear in mind. The licence is granted for the house in question to the man who is going to live on the premises and conduct the business, not to the owners who have built and maintain it, and who are the real applicants for the licence. As a consequence if a licensee does anything which causes him to forfeit his licence, the premises themselves become unlicensed, and the owners may lose their property — unless they can induce the justices to transfer the licence to some other person.

### Old Licences.

Hitherto I have been speaking of *new* licences, but by far the greater number of the public houses in the country are old licences. In their case the procedure at Brewster Sessions is different. An effort was made in the past by those who are opposed to the trade to have it declared that licences should only be regarded as yearly privileges, that each year a new licence should therefore be applied for, with a consequent discretion in the licensing justices to refuse it. These people based their claim on the fact that in terms a licence was only granted for a year at a time. But though this was the form, in substance these licences were really perpetual—until certain anti-trade licensing justices began to act on the yearly theory, and refuse the renewal of licences. The injustice thus introduced into licensing administration was corrected by the Act of 1904, which ordained in effect that in the ordinary course licences would be renewed from year to year, but that if it was desired not to renew a licence because it seemed to the justices to be redundant, then compensation should be paid out of a fund furnished by the owners themselves of licensed premises. So the holder of an old licence, though obliged to apply each year for its renewal, does not have to attend at the annual meeting to make his application unless the justices require him to attend "for some special cause personal to himself." (s.16.)

\* See note at end.

### Off Licences.

What we have just been considering are on licences, *i.e.*, licences for premises where liquor is sold for consumption on the premises. In the case of off licences—*i.e.*, licences for shops where liquor is only sold to be taken away for consumption—different provisions apply. There is no power to close old off licences on the ground of redundancy, and no power to refuse renewal of such licences each year, except on grounds connected with the character of the licensee or his conduct of his shop.

### Redundancy.

To return for a moment to on licences. When the licensing justices think there are more of these under their jurisdiction than are necessary, they fix upon certain which they regard as unnecessary, and instead of renewing them, report them to the compensation authority. The compensation authority is again, like the confirming authority, the larger body of magistrates called the quarter sessions. This compensation authority considers the reports made to it, gives the various interested parties an opportunity of stating their case, and then, if it is of opinion that the licence under consideration is unnecessary (also, usually, if there is enough money in hand in the compensation fund) it refuses renewal of the licence, compensation is paid to the proprietors, and the premises then cease to be licensed. They are not infrequently within a short time afterwards re-opened as a club.

The compensation is, like monopoly value, arrived at by giving what is supposed to be the difference between the value of the premises licensed and unlicensed, plus an allowance for trade fixtures.

The compensation fund is levied on all old on licences, the maximum leviable in one year varying according to the value of the house from £1 to £100. In many places the charge is still levied at the maximum, notwithstanding that since the system began a fifth of the public houses in the country have been closed, and with an increasing population; but in a good many areas now only a part of the maximum is levied, and here and there no levy at all is made.

### Note on Monopoly Value.

It is impossible to calculate the monopoly value of an old licence. Monopoly value is not in truth what the Act says it is—"the difference between the value which the premises will bear . . . when licensed and the value of the same premises if they were not licensed," because the business goodwill



which has been built up in the house by its proprietors would account for some of the difference in value, since, if the licence disappears, the goodwill necessarily disappears with it: the customers go. If (as in the old days) licences could be had for the asking, there could be no monopoly value; the entire difference between the value licensed and the value of the premises unlicensed would be goodwill. The difficulty of getting new licences to-day may be assumed to confer some special value upon a house which has a licence; but it cannot be said that the whole of the difference in value between the premises licensed and the same premises unlicensed consists of real monopoly value: some of it is goodwill; and it is not possible to say how much.

Monopoly value is not, however, extracted from old licences. The bearing of this goodwill argument upon new licences is in reference to the future. There is no goodwill to consider when a new licence is granted; but, as the licence is granted for a few years, during that period goodwill is being built up. At the end of the time a new grant is applied for; a new payment of monopoly value has to be made; and the value of the goodwill built up in the earlier period will then get included in the so-called monopoly value.

Then there is the excise licence duty to be taken into account. That consideration applies to both old and new licences. The licence duty is a sum which the licensee pays for the privilege of selling certain liquors on the premises. That is in the nature of a payment of monopoly value. And it is worth noting that these licence duties have been doubled since the policy of creating monopolies by restricting the number of licences came into practice; so that since monopoly became a real thing the State has extracted in licence duty from the licensee more money in return for the privilege he enjoys. That seems very clearly a payment of monopoly value. Further, the compensation levy which the owner has to pay (though in one point of view it is a system of compulsory insurance) is also an addition to the licence duty, and therefore to the payment of monopoly value.

It comes, then, to this: what is called the payment of monopoly value on new licences is an addition to the monopoly value already paid by way of licence duty and compensation fund levy. It is, furthermore, an arbitrary addition, for it is imposed when the licence is granted, before any trade is done, and therefore before any one can tell what the trade will amount to. It is the State holding a pistol to the trader's head and saying, "Pay me so much, or you shan't have the opportunity to trade." It is the State coming along and

forcing itself as a sleeping partner in the business—but a partner who takes a fixed share of the profits, and none at all of the risk. The capital which the State partner brings into the business is the concession (called a licence) which it is able to give to the working partner.

## The Civic and Social View.

By MRS. HERBERT DALTON, F.R.G.S.

WITHIN the last fifty years the Temperance Question has forced its way to the front among social world-problems. In this country, having regard to the enormous increase of national sobriety, what is known as the Liquor Problem perhaps hardly justifies the amount of consideration bestowed upon it. It has been discussed *ad nauseam* in conferences, debates and summer schools; but the public mind has been and is still confused on the subject. The True Temperance Association, which sets out to develop a sane social opinion and a constructive policy on a matter that touches the life of the people at so many points, has set itself steadily to the task of public house improvement as the main key to the problem. For the public house is a distinctive feature of the national life. Is it necessary or desirable? What purpose does it serve? Is public drinking to be tolerated, or is the existence of public houses a nuisance and a scandal, lowering the moral tone of the nation? Shall they remain in as low and undesirable a condition as possible, the better to arouse public opinion against them with a view to sweeping them away altogether? If so, what should replace them? To destroy the public house system wholesale, or even to change it radically, is probably impossible. Any successful legislation to get rid of it piecemeal (by local option) would probably result in fiasco, as in Scotland, where, since the application of the Scotland Temperance Act, there has been great cry and little wool, much heated feeling and considerable recurrent expense to the ratepayers. To tamper seriously with its liberties would probably be to court trouble in the country; for the public house and the club are the working man's citadels.

It must be admitted, even by its enemies, that the public house serves a purpose beyond and above the supply of refreshment. As a place of coming and going, it to some extent replaces the ancient "forum" or market place, and is probably

the only existing form of social centre that could meet present-day needs, or hold the affections of a very large section of the community. Ought it then not to be of the best possible?

Man all the world over is seeking in a thousand ways, the same elusive treasure. He wants to be happy. Tirelessly he pursues what he regards as happiness, and seizes it in whatever form he can grasp it. It is fundamentally necessary to human existence that there should be an element of joy in life; it is man's birthright. And it is quite as true that if a man is happy he is good, as is the reverse. For, using the word goodness in its broadest sense, happiness and goodness are interchangeable terms. Therefore he needs a variety of interests. Aristotle, speaking of the passions in general, says, "Some men create violent thirsts for themselves, because they have no other things to take pleasure in." For lack of opportunities of healthful enjoyment and harmless pleasures, he too often turns to undesirable amusements or descends to idle and profitless loafing.

Now, as a being both animal and social, man likes to take his happiness largely in the form of a compound mixture. He has hunger and thirst, and he enjoys society. Therefore, social feasting is universal. So, in the public house, he likes to drink and chat together; and it is common knowledge that the more he chats the less he drinks; because nature does not allow of these two things being done at the same moment.

But civilised man is something more than animal, and more than social in the merely gregarious sense of the term. Under the increasing pressure of the struggle for existence, he has acquired in the course of countless generations a highly-developed community instinct, which, if primarily self-protective, is alive too with the sense of social responsibility and mutual social duty. Evolutionary developments have combined to create the sense of "citizenship."

In this inheritance, the man and the citizen, conscious more or less, according to his particular nature and nurture of his own individuality and his personal freedom, is, from childhood to the grave, making choices all the time. Within the set boundaries of his life and work, he chooses his friends, his interests, his pursuits. Gradually and subconsciously he forms his opinions, social, political, religious. This sifting process is permeated and leavened by a mysterious element in his make-up, which is hard to analyse, and harder still to define. To some it is the divine spark; others call it nature, or the social instinct, or, simply, reason. This fundamental sense is the foundation of all law. First it en-

lightens and guides the individual consciousness; then, as the man becomes a member of the family (which is the first social unit), and later, when the community life of family and clan expands and develops into the organism of the State, this sense of law still holds and binds. By it the State is morally bound to study the welfare of the nation primarily in protecting the life, property and personal rights of the individual, so far as these are not injuring the community. Then the State must aim at securing, by equal opportunity for the development of each individual, the greatest common good of all. This common good issues in a real and many-sided liberty, which is the very essence of a "Free State." Under the clumsy necessity of government by the majority this democratic State is bound on the one hand, to have due regard for the just rights of the minority, and on the other, to protect the personal rights of an ignorant, inert, and inarticulate majority, from the tyrannies of an organised and highly vocal minority. The average Britisher gropes and stumbles along with rudimentary confused ideas, having had but a meagre education, and having little time for anything beyond earning bread for himself and his family. But he vaguely realises the truth that in a community as far advanced in self-government as the British nation, there should be less and less of restriction and more and more of construction, less of "thou shalt not" in petty details, and more of improvement and development for the common good.

The public house gives a unique opportunity, through social life and intercourse, for the education of the citizen in a self-governing democracy. It is not easy for one grade of society to thoroughly understand another grade, to see it as it were from inside. And those who have had the wider opportunities of self-development afforded by education, literature, travel and cultured society are often unable to realise either the exceedingly limited opportunities of the worker's life for the widening of outlook or for the kind of recreation that will give him the "joy of life," which he so sorely needs. His often monotonous and wearisome job if he has one, his anxious and fatiguing search if he has not one, his "old woman and the kids" in the narrow space that he calls "home," his evening—very short after he has washed and had his tea—his Saturday afternoon and his Sunday rest—these make up the round of his waking life, year in, year out. And within this circumscribed area he must get, if he is to have it at all, "life"—which means his little bit of happiness.

To him the golden hour of the twenty-four—the bull's eye of the day as he would say—is the evening. How and where shall he spend it? Here comes in the public house.

Not that he doesn't care for his home. The working man's love for his home, however squalid, is amazing. When there's "trouble at home" many a man "sticks it" as faithfully and tenderly as any woman. But in the ordinary way he does not want, and cannot be expected to want to spend all his free time there. It is generally small, stuffy, noisy, and dull. He is tired, head, stomach, legs; "on edge," mind and body; he must get "fit" for next day's work. Often he wants his wife to go with him; and how much better for both. So there must be a decent comfortable place where they can go together. More and more, it is to be hoped, they will go for a bit of supper, where food and drink will be taken together, and she will enjoy the appetising food cooked for her; or he wants his seat in the old familiar corner with his pipe—sweetest of all pipes—and a glass of beer and his pals for company. Or he looks for a quiet hour to read the paper—or play a game—or to listen to music, which, as the law stands, he must not have. The more he has of social life and amusement, especially in his wife's company, the less he will drink for drinking's sake. In the saloon bar many business deals are done—cemented with a glass together. This is not shameful, it is just human nature. In any west-end club are there not the same happenings? "A man's a man for a' that." But if he has no place where he can sit down, no table for his glass, nothing but a stand up bar, he has nothing to do but to drink. Or if some night his favourite haunt is crowded out by earlier closing in a neighbouring area, or if a "wet" train from a "dry" area unloads a crowd of thirsty souls upon him, then indeed he drinks his liquor for all he is worth. No time for the soothing night-cap he is used to—a glass of beer is surely a harmless narcotic—he doesn't like the strange gang around him. He is upset and angry. He doesn't quite know what to do. So he takes another glass, grousing, and perhaps another, and goes home cross, "seeing red." Next day he goes to work less fit than usual. Some trifling incident occurs, and he has a "scrap" with his employer. Perhaps he is fired. Sides are taken, tools downed, a strike is born. Another wire entanglement has been made, a set-back to peace and goodwill in industry. And like a prairie fire the thing spreads.

No one can have been much in contact with the workers in industrial areas without being aware of the irritation that arises from the sense of being controlled "by them as thinks they know what's best for us." "They say it ain't good for us." "The law's agin us." A sense of unrest dogs the footsteps of the poor. All through life he hears the echo

of "move on please." Is he behind with his rent? "move on." Past his job? "move on." Will it be his pub: next, then his club? He hears threatenings. But he is very helpless. "Move on please."

It has been strongly urged of late that if public houses were closed as a step towards prohibition, it would be beneficial to industry. The U.S.A. is held up as the convincing proof that prohibition results in increased output and is a short cut to national prosperity. An enquiry into the complex causes of present-day prosperity in America, or a comparison of the British public house and the American saloon would be beyond the scope of this paper. But it must be observed that neither the public house and saloon, nor the British and American proletariat admit of comparison. The origin and development of the one and the other are fundamentally and widely different; and methods which are alleged to have been successful up to the present with mixed immigrant workers in the U.S.A. might have disastrous results if forced on the sturdy independent British workman.

Set forth on the weekly poster outside a Wesleyan Church in South London\* are these words, "All visionaries dream of a City beautiful. But no man in his right senses would think of putting a pub. in it.—Rosslyn Mitchell, M.P."

Are we of the True Temperance Association all out of our right senses?

Where town planning has developed and a public house of the right type has been opened, we believe the City Beautiful is nearer realisation. Life is brighter, the tone of social intercourse has been raised, a friendly spirit of goodwill has arisen—and there has been no drunkenness nor disorder of any sort. It has proved itself a golden opportunity of social uplift.

It is earnestly to be hoped that this type of licensed house will win through, and that a few years will see it established throughout the country, not as a State changeling, nor under the management of a Board with a scheme of compensation, or rather confiscation, on the system of the cats of Kilkenny, but on the old tried lines brought up-to-date by the experts who have known their job for generations past. The new public house has come to stay because public opinion approves and loudly demands it; a house of comfort, peace, sociability, merriment, a house where man and wife may go for an hour or two of happiness after the day's work. Her life is

\* April, 1927.

drabber and greyer than his, and she needs it as much or more than he does.

It is already proved that a catering department, with food, tea and coffee and soft drinks is often highly remunerative. We look for the time when sane opinion will triumph, and when the inn or public house will be a place properly safeguarded also for the young, who need the protection of family life and parental influence as long as possible.

It is good to see visions and dream dreams, for these are often fruitful in result. "Where there is no vision the people perish," says the Book, and the ideals of one generation bear their fruit in the next. The mills of public opinion grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small. Matured public opinion on moral questions is very sound. It represents the deliberate decision of collective thought; it is the verdict of the nation's conscience; it is based on the sure foundation of that natural law of which St. Augustine says, "There is nothing just and lawful in temporal law unless what men have gathered from the eternal law." Therefore it is certain that it must finally become the full expression of the "perfect law of liberty."

This is not a high-sounding phrase; nor is it only a sublime paradox. It is sober fact that there is such a law; and upon this law, and this only, must a nation be built if it is to escape disaster and final ruin. Therefore it behoves every individual citizen to do his part in the building of the nation upon the rock of true liberty.

# The Medical View.

## No. 1.

By E. B. TURNER, F.R.C.S.

WHEN first I was entrusted with the charge of sick persons alcohol in large doses was considered almost a panacea for all illnesses. Nearly all cases of enteric fever, and many cases of pneumonia, were treated with alcohol as a matter of routine. Sometimes the sufferers from enteric fever were allowed 20 ounces of brandy as well as a bottle of port in the 24 hours, and should that enormous quantity have been consumed, very frequently a further allowance was prescribed during the night. The dose in cases of pneumonia was not quite so liberal, but even in them excessive. Some of them recovered!

I was one of the first to give up treating fevers in this way, and soon began to use other methods of stimulation less harmful to the patient; but in some cases brandy or alcohol in some form is absolutely essential as a medicine. I had a case once of a very conscientious teetotaler to whom it was absolutely necessary to give brandy as a diffusible stimulant. This was resolutely declined by the patient, and death was said to be preferable. But with the consent and collusion of members of the family I gave a prescription of "Spt. Vin. Gall." liberally flavoured with carbonate of ammonia and asafetida. This was taken, had the desired effect, and my patient was pleased at a recovery not assisted by the "evil spirit"!

Very frequently it is possible to tide a sick person over a difficult half-hour by the judicious administration of alcoholic stimulants in moderation, especially if the patient be played out.

In the bad influenza epidemic of 1890-91, after a tremendously hard 12 or 13 hours work, I sometimes came home so

tired that I could not face the idea of dinner, but a glass of champagne, in 10 minutes or so, "bucked me up" and enabled me to eat and carry on my work.

In persons undergoing hard physical exertion the effect of any alcoholic stimulant is as a rule most deleterious. I have seen a man riding in a 24-hour bicycle race injudiciously dosed with champagne, the result being that he ran "amok," passing nearly everybody for two or three miles and then collapsed finally and hopelessly. In any such contest if stimulant is to be given it should be given most judiciously, and as a rule, when the race is so near its finish that there is not time for the stimulant effects to pass off.

Some people digest their food better if moderate quantities of alcohol be taken, but not everybody. Doctors are divided into two classes—fools and physicians. Fools treat the illness, physicians treat the patient. Therefore the advice as to stimulants should be given to suit the individual and not ordered or forbidden indiscriminately to the mass. To overdo alcohol is a tremendous mistake; the under-doing of alcohol is just as much a mistake. The extremists on both sides are wrong. Study the golden mean, neither overdose nor prohibit. Some people are so constituted that they should never touch alcohol. Therefore a doctor should study each person and order or withhold alcohol individually.

It is my opinion that in old days the medical profession was sometimes the innocent cause of excess in taking alcohol in after life by those young persons, generally girls, to whom port and red wine had been ordered in adolescence to make "red blood."

Alcohol in medicine is a very good friend and a very bad enemy, and this is my considered experience based on my practical experience of 50 years, during which time I have taken great interest in the subject. I never order alcohol in cases of sickness unless I consider it absolutely necessary; I never am afraid of ordering it when it is required. In cases requiring a rapid diffusible stimulant I have frequently tried other drugs, but as a rule have found brandy the most easily accessible in an emergency.

## The Medical View.

### No. 2.

By A. BERESFORD KINGSFORD, M.D.

**A**LCOHOL is often called poison by some of our opponents, who thereby excite prejudice against it.

Although we all have a fair idea of what is meant by a poison, to define it is not a very easy matter. In the reign of George III, about 1780, a case was recorded of one, David Waller who suffered from symptoms of violent poisoning every time he ate bread; to him wheat flour in any form was a poison.

Again, when coal miners drink plain water after sweating profusely over their work in a hot atmosphere, they often suffer severely from cramps and other symptoms of poisoning. For plain water does not restore to them the salts they have lost in their sweat.

Apart from legal definitions we may assume that we usually mean by poison something of which the harmless dose is quite small.

In practice poisonous action depends more on the mode of using a thing than on the properties of the thing itself.

It is said that the body hastens to get rid of alcohol as fast as it can.

Well, it is always getting rid of carbonic acid gas with every breath, yet without a certain amount of that gas in the blood respiration itself comes to a standstill, and the gas may have to be administered to save life.

If more albuminous food is taken at any time than the body can use just then, its product is got rid of by the kidneys; it can hardly be stored up any more than alcohol can.

Passing to the action of alcohol on the various functions of the body, we may say that in moderate amounts it has

little or no influence on respiration, though in grossly excessive amounts it may fatally paralyse the respiratory apparatus.

It used to be thought that alcohol is a powerful stimulant to, and support of, the circulation, but this is true only to a very limited extent and *that* in an indirect way.

By easing the mind, alcohol may relieve the heart of some of the inhibitory, depressing, effect of anxiety; for anxiety is but "fright spread out thin," and we all know of the serious, and occasionally fatal, effects of sudden fright.

If alcohol affords no *direct* support to the heart and circulation is it in any sense a food?

Now food must be oxidised (or burnt) in the body to keep up its temperature and to supply it with muscular and nervous energy.

By actual measurement it has been found that an average man lying quiet in bed, but not starved, loses about 1,800 units of heat—calories—in 24 hours.

One caloric is the amount of heat required to raise the temperature of a pound—or 4/5ths pint—of water through an interval of four degrees Fahrenheit, say, from 60° F. to 64° F.

Now food, other than alcohol, is of three main kinds, namely, fats, starches and sugars, and albuminous foods, such as white of egg, curd of milk, meat juice, and gluten, the sticky substance of wheat flour. These latter are called proteins. Food has to make good the wastage of the body as well as supplying heat and energy.

The waste matters are got rid of, partly by the lungs, in the form of carbonic acid gas, and partly by the kidneys, in the form of urea and somewhat similar substances, all which, unlike carbonic acid, contain a good deal of nitrogen.

Only albuminous foods or proteins contain nitrogen, so they alone are capable of making good the wastage of body substance and framework, and are styled body-building foods.

Proteins also afford heat and energy, but are too expensive, and if given in sufficient quantity for this purpose would entail too much work on the kidneys.

Most of the heat and energy required are obtained from fats, and from starches, or rather sugar, into which all starches are converted for use in the body.

Fats and sugars are therefore called "protein sparers." Fat largely supplies heat; Eskimos consume very large quantities

of it, and walrus milk contains 40 per cent. or, bulk for bulk, ten times as much fat as cow's milk does.

Alcohol *can assist* as a "protein sparer," or as a fat or sugar sparer.

It is used as a partial substitute for sugar in diabetes with great benefit, for sugar or starch is poison to the diabetic.

In the body one ounce of alcohol will yield about 196 calories, an equal weight of fat yields about 250 calories, and (of protein or) of sugar 112 calories. Alcohol has thus an intermediate value as a "protein sparer" but, containing no nitrogen, is, of course, no more of a body *builder* than fat or sugar.

This is not to say that alcohol is, in general, a good substitute for any kind of food; it is expensive, and has other actions in the body besides burning as a fuel.

But the fact that it is easily absorbed without any digestion, and that about one-fifth of it is rapidly absorbed from the stomach itself, often give it a very special value in illness; for other foods must be more or less laboriously digested and are not absorbed from the stomach itself.

Unlike saccharine, the whole of which reappears unaltered in the urine, nearly all the alcohol taken, *in moderation*, is oxidized in the body, only about 2-3 per cent. re-appearing in the urine as such. Faint traces may be found in the milk of nursing mothers but in quantities too infinitesimal to affect the infant.

In weak solution alcohol stimulates gastric digestion and more especially the secretion of hydrochloric acid on which its disinfecting power depends. If, however, the proportion of alcohol exceeds 5 per cent. (or so) it will retard the digestive process.

In the case of spirits the retardation is due to the alcohol itself; but if wine be taken the solids thereof, more especially any tannin present, may retard digestion much more than pure alcohol does.

But human digestion is not carried on in a test tube independently of all nervous control. Alcohol may indirectly help digestion very considerably by allaying anxiety and banishing fear, and this especially towards the end of the day when many a man, or woman, is almost too tired and worried to eat.

Much of the evil attributable to alcohol is due to taking it at the wrong time.

It is a bad preparation for work, either mental or muscular, in the earlier hours of the day, and an even worse preparation for exposure to cold whether one is fresh or fatigued. For alcohol dilates the vessels of the skin thereby increasing the loss of body heat, while, paradoxically, the owner feels warmer for a little while on account of his flushed surface.

Thus "Wine is a mocker," and perverts judgment in this and other matters.

When men take even moderate doses *before* work they are apt to think they are working more efficiently than usual.

Two groups of Compositors were taken; one, A, working *with*, the other, B, *without*, alcohol.

The alcoholic liquid given was disguised so that the workers did not know who had alcohol and who had none.

The men of group A all thought they were working very efficiently but they set less type and made more mistakes than the men of group B.

Afterwards the experiment was repeated, but the disguised alcohol was given to the men of group B who, in their turn, proved less efficient though they thought they were working better than usual.

Nevertheless when a stiff piece of work *must* be done by tired or worried men, a ration of alcohol often enables them, *for a limited period*, to make an effort and do better work than they could do—as experimentally tested—(when fatigued) without alcohol.

It is objected sometimes: Ought not a man to try to be always at his best? The answer is No! not when he wants to go to sleep!!

Herein lay the justification for the "tot" of rum at the Front, to allay anxiety and banish care when the day's work was done and exposure to cold had no longer to be feared; to promote sociability and the enjoyment of a hearty meal, and to secure the re-invigoration of mind and body which dreamless sleep alone affords.

The "tot" given in the trenches before "going over the top" was given on purely military grounds; for men did not "go over the top" for the benefit of their health!

Opponents often point to the fact that much less alcohol is given in hospital now than formerly, and argue therefrom that healthy people can always do quite well without it.

But people who are very worried in mind or fatigued in body are often not "healthy" enough, *at the moment*, to reap benefit from their evening meal or opportunity for sleep. To those who serve the Industrial Front the argument from the Fighting Front applies; albeit in minor degree.

In hospitals the need for economy caused the alcohol rations to be very closely scrutinised.

It was then often found that the alcohol ration was being supplied to patients long after they had become convalescent, and the need for alcohol had passed away. So rules were made that the ration could only be supplied for one week without a fresh order signed by the medical officer in charge.

"Hospitals," whether General, Special, Mental, or Poor Law, are now so much more comfortable and *safe* than they were half-a-century (or less) ago, that much of the need for alcohol has passed with the "horrors" once prevalent in so many of those Institutions.



