The South Carolina Dispensary

Within the last two decades, no question has received closer attention from the students of ethical and political problems, than the extent of the liquor traffic and the proposed measures for its regulation and control. Various laws have been passed by different states in the United States, and by European countries, looking either toward the absolute prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages, or to its regulation by the state.

The South Carolina Dispensary law is one which merits our close attention. To arrive...
at a just conclusion in regard to this law, it will be necessary for us to continually bear in mind the temperament of the people of the state, and their purely political and social differences, as well as their differences of opinion on matters of prohibition.

Prior to the civil war, the state was governed by the landed aristocracy, a state of affairs which of course existed all over the South. When South Carolina was readmitted to the Union in 1868, under what is known as the County Constitution, the state government was reorgan-
ijed by the negroes and carpetbaggers, who remained in power until 1876. At that time Wade Hampton was chosen governor of the state by election methods which we will not discuss here. The Republican returning board threw out the votes of several Democratic counties, but they were unable to enforce their decision, owing to the fact that President Hayes had withdrawn the federal troops. The control of affairs naturally fell into the hands of the aristocracy as it had been before. True, the large plantations had been divided up or deserted.
or had passed into other hands, and their former owners had migrated to the towns; but the productive wealth of the state was still in the possession of the old "Bourbons." They still held the social power and were the educated class. The small freeholders and tenant farmers caring more for material independence and home comforts than for political preferment lifted the control of affairs to the old oligarchy. "From their ranks came the new leaders and office holders. The policy of government continued to be shaped by a minority which lived in
the cities and towns, and more especially by those who through the prevailing class distinctions considered themselves the traditional heirs to political preferments. Although the state is predominantly an agricultural community, the will and wishes of the farmers were not consulted. Except in point of number, they lacked the influence that commanded even an unwilling hearing, and they were without organization." The organization afforded by the Farmers' Alliance, however, afforded them strength, and though formulated at first...
is a cooperation of consumers, its political feature soon became the one of supreme importance. The discontent and restlessness of the farmers was encouraged by leaders until it culminated in open hostility to the men in power. These leaders were not farmers in every case, but ambitious young men who had a taste for political honors, and were shrewd enough to see the trend of political affairs. Neither were they "wicked demagogues" — a statement to which their subsequent actions bear witness. Their most effective appeal was to class prejudice. They
brought these charges. First—that the state was not governed by the people but by a class of aristocrats who regarded themselves as privileged. Second—the residents of the towns were accused of reaping undue advantages at the expense of the farmers, and of usurping political power. Third—that the "Low" country dictated to the "Up" country in matters political.

These were powerful mistrustments in the hands of the "Reformers"—the people versus aristocracy, the town versus the country and the "Low" versus the "Up" country. The last
mentioned would seem of least importance, but in fact it is of greatest impor-
tance. No love has ever been lost between the two sections. It is not a difference of mere position but of blood. The "up" counties are inhabited by people of Scotch, Irish, German and English descent, who migrated from Virginia and Pennsylvania. The people of the Coast counties, and of Charleston particularly, are French Huguenots. Each section has preserved the characteristic traits of their ancestors, and cordially hates the other. The conflict was decided in
1890 in favor of the "Reformers."
Each side made charges which were in the main true. The conservatives were guilty of the charge of ring rule. The whole Democratic organization was in their hands. The editor of almost every county newspaper was chairman of his county executive committee, and the "town" politicians managed all nominations. A propos of this one of the "reform" bands sung:

"This county's a wagon
Jim Lane is the host
Tom Davis the driver
And Johnson's the boss;"

On the other hand, many
of the "Pops" were averse to hard work and jealous of the rich. They loafed around railroad stations, post offices, cross roads, stores, and sawmills, to exchange ideas, and to kill time. They were unusually intelligent and well informed on matters political and financial, and could have been clever at any profession, but many of them had hardly sense enough to make a comfortable living. Ordinary party questions were laid aside. The Reformers gained possession of the Democratic State Convention and nominated Mr B.R. Fillmore for governor. Their
opponents put an independent ticket in the field which was defeated. Thus the "Wool hat" and "one gallus boy" triumphed over the "kid glove gentry". Still the latter has exerted a powerful influence against the Disfranchisement law.

The anti-saloon sentiment is and has always been far stronger in southern public life than in northern. This has been due in a large measure to the disfranchisement of the Negro, and the absence of voters of foreign birth.

The growth of this sentiment in South Carolina can be marked by the various liquor laws which have been
Passed from time to time.

The first one was in 1880 to prohibit the sale of drinks outside the incorporated towns. The second to compel each saloon to pay a heavy tax. In 1882, a local option law was passed, which effected prohibition in seven counties and in over sixty towns.

Temperance people, however, could not be satisfied with anything less than "state-wide" prohibition; so the drink evil became a state problem.

When the reformers came into power in 1891, the responsibility of a solution was thrown on them. They
had made no definite promises, but they had, in common with the temperance men, but one source of power. They were dependent on the rural vote. A petition was presented to the Legislature, requesting the passage of a prohibitory law. Such a bill was passed in the lower House, but was killed in the Senate, which was directly under Governor Tillman's control.

It was agreed, however, to take a popular vote on prohibition, by special ballot at the fall elections of 1892, and the legislature was to abide the decision of the ballot in the
prohibition for"
Governor Tillman was personally opposed to a prohibitory law, but he saw clearly that the problem had to be met. So in his message to the legislature in 1892 he stated his views clearly. First, a refusal to license liquor will increase the taxes, which the party stands pledged to reduce. Second, the passage of such a law would divide the party vote at the next election and would bring out the negroes in favor of license, who would otherwise not vote at all. He feared political shipwreck from the enactment of such a law.
Inaction was equally dangerous. He therefore recommended that the legislature consider the dispensary system in operation in Athens, Georgia, which regulated the sale of liquor and at the same time used the profits for municipal purposes.

The House, however, passed a prohibitory bill which was killed by the Senate.

A substitute known as the Dispensary Act, prepared under Governor Fillmore's direction by John G. Evans, was passed by the Senate, and referred to the House, on the last day of its session, for approval. It was rushed through without discussion and became
a law— to go into effect July 1st, 1893. The features of the original law were:
That the manufacture or sale of all spirituous liquors be prohibited, except that the Governor shall, with the approval of a state Board of Control, appoint a commissioner to buy all liquors for sale in the state, and to supply the same to local dispensers. The liquors must be chemically pure and the commissioner must make quarterly reports.
Packages of liquor must be sealed with the commissioner's stamp and contain not less than one half pint, and—
not more than five gallons. The dispenser must not break the seal and the purchaser must not open the package on the premises.

County boards shall be appointed by the State Board.

Manufacturers selling liquor to persons outside the State must ship them under state inspection.

Wine may be made for personal use.

One dispenser is allowed for each county, and County boards may establish others in other towns if necessary.

The applicant for the position of dispenser must present a petition signed by a majority of the freeholders of his town.
or city ward and he must not be a druggist, hotel or restaurant keeper.

The profits are to be shared equally between the county and the municipality.

The dispenser may not serve minors, drunkards or strangers. The purchaser must present a written request signed by himself stating his name, age and residence. If not known to the dispenser he must not identify himself.

The dispenser's books shall be open to inspection at all times.

The payment of a United States special tax or conviction in the federal courts shall be prima facie evidence of liquor
selling.

The governor shall have power
to appoint constables to enforce
the law.

The law has since its
passage been amended in
various ways. The reasons
for this have been different.

One of the purposes has been
to perfect the working of
the system, and make it
more productive of results.

Another has been to strengthen
the dominant party. Another to
avoid intervention by the
federal courts, while still
another has been to make
the profits of the business
a permanent fund for the
aid of public schools.
Through all its changes the purpose of the law has been the same, namely to control the sale of liquors, to diminish drunkenness and disorder and to continue the Reform party in power.

The underlying principle of the system is the same as that of the system in operation in Norway and Sweden, although the details of the South Carolina law, and those of the Gothenburg system are sometimes different.

Its supporters claim that former prohibitory laws have failed because they either left the traffic in the hands of
those who gained by it; or that they pursued an irrational policy of destruction and not of rational reform.

The benefits arising from the Dispensary law are held to be these:

1. It gives us reform and not destruction.
2. Private profits are removed.
3. It removes the traffic from politics.
4. The number of places where whiskey is sold is diminished.
5. A limit on the quantity sold at one time and shorter hours of sale lessen the quantity drunk.
6. A pure article is sold.
7. The system insures better
police regulation. It forbids selling to minors, punch or drunkenards. No dives of any sort can be run in connection with a dispensary. It forbids selling on a credit, and does away with treating.

8. It places the responsibility directly on the Executive of the State.

9. It does not interfere with local option.

10. The absence of ice, lemonade and sugar lessen the temptation to drink.

11. The profits go to the school fund.

12. Law and order are improved. Public sentiment, educated and political purity better established.
Its opponents deny these, and add:

1. That public control is wrong.
   State monopoly is a sanction of drinking and fails to recognize it as an evil.
2. Profits are "blood money."
3. Political corruption has a new field.
4. Inability to enforce the law breeds contempt for the Executive.

I shall not now discuss the validity of these claims. Such a discussion is more fitting when made in the light of results.
Under any circumstance, such a law would have had strong opposition. In this
case it was doubtless strong. The prohibition party claims our first attention. They are opposed to anything not strictly prohibitive, and while they have confined their efforts mainly to creating a sentiment against the system, they have proved quite annoying to the authorities in Columbia. Their arguments are not always logical or fair. They ask questions like these:—Will the schools educate the liquor traffic into or out of the people when her teachers are paid from its proceeds? or on which side would Christ vote "for" or "against" the Dispensary, were He a citizen?—questions which
they nor any one else can answer. In reply to a letter sent to prohibition headquarters, I received the following from the secretary of the executive committee:—

Columbia, SC
March 10, 1898

Dear Sir,—

It will be impossible to answer your questions in detail at present, but generally and briefly I can state first that the Dispensary law was the result of an effort on the part of the political faction led by Governor Tillman on his accession to office in 1892, to defeat prohibitory legislation for which the people had declared, by a majority of more than 100,000 at the same election. Finding
himself in absolute control of the legislature, which had been pledged to abide by the decision of the voters on that occasion; and being personally opposed to prohibition—when the House of Representatives passed the measure by a large majority, he had the dispensary law framed and substituted in the Senate; and when it came into the House at the closing days of the session, with assurance that it was the true step in the direction of prohibition, for which the people were not yet ready; and that he would enforce the excellent restrictive features which had been retained from
the prohibition bill; and that the right of communities to prevent the establishment of dispensaries would be respected if it became a law.

Second, the attitude of the Church toward the liquor traffic at that time may be gathered from the fact, that Governor Tillman, during his first canvass, held up the clergy as the chief agents in bringing about the vote for prohibition—so in truth they were—and abused them as intermediaries in politics, and in his subsequent deliverances after the system went into operation, he has never ceased in the coarsest terms to characterize the clergy as
being in alliance with the saloon keeper and the Devil, to obstruct the operation of the law and bring it into disrepute. That is his testimony of the attitude of the Church toward the Dispensary.

In confirmation of this I can add that after four and a half years, in which he and his successors to this time have had absolute control of its administration, it has so far failed to commend itself to the body of Christian citizens, as a success in diminishing drunkenness and its attendant evils, that during the past year, in view of our present effort, renewed
to secure relief from these evils, I have in my possession letters from more than 600 pastors of churches of all denominations in the state expressing their earnest and hearty cooperation in our effort.

The restrictive features of the law have been utterly disregarded by those charged with its administration from governors to constables, and the avowed purpose is now to sell all the liquor possible, in order to secure the largest revenue from such sales, without regard to the moral effect upon the community. The result has been a steady
increase in drinking, drunkenness and the crimes of violence which result from these, from which the former advocates and promoters of the system are in revolt, and we are hopeful for a change for the better.

The two largest churches assemblies in the state, representing an aggregate membership of 175,000, at their last annual meetings passed unanimously resolutions of condemnation of the existing system and approval of prohibition as the only remedy.

Yours truly,
Thos. J. La Motte.

Some of the statements of the above letter are consistent with
The facts and therefore must be considered in our final judgment, but some of them must be taken with a grain of salt.

That the annual assemblies of these two churches declared against the dispensary cannot be doubted, but that these resolutions represented the opinion of the 175,000 church members must be called in question.

In answer to the cry of "blood money," the friends of the system, quote Mr. Joseph Chamberlain in one of his recent utterances:

"We cannot rid ourselves of responsibility, by clamoring
for a prohibition we cannot compel the towns to adopt, much less enforce if adopted. "We are at present undertaking the responsibility of the control and regulation of the liquor traffic, and the question is whether we will do it effectually or in the perfunctory way it is now carried on? As far as the majority of our towns is concerned, it seems to me the choice lies between leaving the saloons in the control of persons who abuse the privilege in every way and try to sell us much liquor as possible, and placing it in the hands of people bound to do nothing to..."
increase the demand for intoxicants. That by choosing the latter we should become more implicated in the moral and social ruin wrought by the saloon, is impossible to see.

"It is not mere assumption to say that by opposing the system, the prohibitionists only try to defeat their own ends. The system is a rational step towards ultimate prohibition, if you please, but it proceeds on the ground that it is generally worse than idle to legislate in advance of a matured public opinion, and that the reaction from a too sudden and sweeping reform is more to be deprecated than
the evil of such to cure.
As for sharing the "Devils money"
as profits— are we not doing
it now, and how can we
escape it? The difference is that
now we content ourselves with
a small share and let the
rest go into the pockets of
the saloon keepers."

In one of his messages,
Governor Evans wrote, "The law
has had a hard road in this
state. It has had the united
opposition of the advanced
prohibitionists, the press of the
state, the whisky dealers, the
citizens who are accustomed
to buy their drinks on the
fly, the mayors and police
of the towns, the United
States courts, and under it all a "rooted hostility, partly political, partly personal, to the organizers, and chief supporters of the scheme, creating a conviction that nothing good could emanate from the party in power."

When the law first went into effect, outside the city of Charleston there was an almost total cessation of the illicit sale, but as time went on some of the dealers, emboldened by the promises of the daily papers, to shield them from punishment, began to disobey the law. The majority however, left the state for good, and set up elsewhere.
The task of enforcing the law was a hard one. "Blind Tigers" at once appeared. Whiskey came into the state in unexpected ways. The railroads aided the lawbreakers. Moonshiners smuggled whiskey over the line into the northwestern counties. The constables were too few, and not well organized. City authorities did not help enforce the law. Charges were brought against those opening dispensaries. Offenders were arrested and their goods seized, but confiscation was the only punishment that could be inflicted as jurors would not convict on the clearest evidence.
Governor Tillman saw that the law must be amended to make it efficient. So in 1893 several changes were made for the purpose of extending the monopoly, to increase the power of the constables, to reduce the penalties of some offenses so as to bring them under jurisdiction of trial justices, to withhold from towns their share of the profits, for failure to suppress illegal sales. Withholding the profits exasperated the towns, the right of constables to search private houses for contraband goods, exasperated the citizens. Threats to execute these provisions brought matters
to a crisis. Several persons had already been killed in fights with constables, when on March 30, 1894 occurred the memorable Darlington riot. The city had been notified that they must extinguish their share of the dispensary money. Constables were busy and had threatened to search private houses. The citizens rose in arms to resist. How the fight itself began cannot be obtained from the statements of either Governor Tillman or of Mayor Dargan. The following account of a resident of the town seems most reliable. The constables interfered in a fight between two boys. A crowd gathered
and thinking that the constables were the aggressors, attacked them. Five persons were killed and others seriously hurt. The crowd retired to arm themselves, and the constables fled to the woods. The crowd returned, and believing that the constables were on board a certain train, fired into it as it left the station. So further violence was attempted, but the mob did not disperse at once. Governor Tillman declared Darlington under martial law and ordered out the militia, but the companies which were made up chiefly of members of the "old families" refused to march. They were
promptly disbanded, the railroads and telegraph lines were seized, and other companies were organized and sent to preserve order. When they arrived at Darlington all was quiet, due partly to the energy and promptness of the governor and partly to the good sense of the better citizens of the town. Although the actual number of killed and wounded was small, the escape from a state of civil war was a very narrow one. While the social and political opposition to the law is very great, and while otherwise law-abiding citizens countenance and encourage
Smuggling and support "peak evils" in preference to the legal dispensary, the state has gradually extended its control by various enactments. Next to the large power of the constables, and the reward of twenty cents per gallon to informers, the Metropolitan police law, which empowers the governor to remove and appoint all police officers at his discretion, compels the suppression of illicit sales.

If the dispensary party has met with opposition from the law breakers it has suffered still worse at the hands of the courts. On April 19, 1894, the State Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional. The dispensaries were closed at once.
and the constables paid off and discharged. The court further declared "that the state is now under total prohibition."

No attempt was made to restrain liquor sellers, and whiskey ran free as water. This did not continue however. One of the judges retired, and the new court reversed the former decision. The prosecution of offenders was begun again, but this time appeals were made to the federal courts. In February 1895 the United States Circuit Court decided that the seizure of goods in original packages is unconstitutional, and issued an order restraining any further seizures. The State
appealed to the Supreme Court arguing:— (1) That these constables were acting in accordance with State laws. (2) That such action is within the lawful exercise of police power.

The appellants based their claim on that clause of the Wilson act 1870, which declares:—

That all intoxicating liquors carried into any State or remaining therein for use, sale or storage, shall upon arrival in such State, be subject to the operation of the laws of such State, enacted in the exercise of its police powers, as though such liquors had been produced in such State,
and shall not be exempt therefrom by reason of being introduced therein in original packages or otherwise. They further claimed that the purpose of the law was to protect the morals of the state and argued that the law did not discriminate against citizens of other states and therefore did not regulate commerce in any way.

The decision of the lower court was affirmed however, on the ground that the state still considere[d] liquor as a lawful article of consumption and sale. Since intoxicants are not entirely prohibited, they are subject to interstate commerce regulations.
The court held further, that the law as amended up to 1875 did not provide for competent inspection, and therefore, could not be considered as an inspection law. The dissenting opinion of Justice Brown is an able statement of the case. He defines "arrival in," as crossing the boundary, and not arrival at destination. He declares that the Dispersary law is a police measure. It does not discriminate and is not a monopoly except in the sense that the post office is one. He says: "We cannot fail to recognize the sentiment growing in the United States in favor of restrictions on the liquor traffic. Whether license tax,
total prohibition or state assumption, it is a matter of state jurisdiction. The broad principles of state welfare ought to be considered. The manifest dangers to the future of the country which lurk in the inflexibility of the Federal Constitution, can only be averted, by carefully distinguishing between such laws as practically concern the inhabitants of a particular state only, and are intended bona fide for their welfare, and such as are a mere subterfuge for an unlawful discrimination, and cannot be carried into effect without doing palpable injustice to the citizens of other states. It should not
be overlooked in this connection that the complaints in this case emanate from a citizen of South Carolina, who seeks to defy the laws of his own state, and put forward as his excuse, the injustice done the citizens of other states who make no complaint of her action in this particular.

This decision affected matters somewhat but not for long. Governor Evans and the Legislature soon amended the law by inserting an inspection clause, which made all drinks imported for personal use subject to analysis by the state chemists, and seizures went merrily on until Judge Simonton again
declared that there was not sufficient inspection provided for in the law as amended. The last case was that of the Vandecook Wine Company versus state constables. Under injunction by Judge Simonton the constables refrained from seizing small consignments, but when the Vandecook Company began shipping wines in car load lots to their agents, who took orders and delivered the goods to customers, they again went to work. Further orders from the court restrained them from this and they became unwilling to arrest any offenders at all for fear of being jailed for contempt. In consequence
Governor Ellerbee has dismissed the force and has left the enforcement of the law in the hands of the local authorities.

The following from his message of January 11th, 1878, shows the animus of the administration toward the matter:

"We have then to face the following condition of affairs:
Under the protection of a Circuit Judge, liquor is being sold throughout the State, in the country as well as in the towns, and in defiance of the laws of the State. The right of a State to police and regulate the liquor traffic in its own way is nullified..."
and trampled under foot. The Act of Congress of July 1890, has been, so far as South Carolina is concerned, repealed, and we are told that the enactment of prohibition alone gives a state the right to exclude "original package" dealers, unless the profit feature of the dispensary is destroyed. The language of the Court in the Vandercook case is as follows: "If all alcoholic liquors, by whomsoever held, are declared contraband they cease to belong to commerce, and are within the jurisdiction of the police power. But so long as their manufacture, purchase or sale, or their use as a beverage
in any form or by any person
are recognized, they belong to
commerce, and are without
the domain of the police power.
The power to license the sale of
liquor, to the exclusion of these
interstate commerce dealers in
"original packages", has therefore
been destroyed by this decision,
unless it should be reversed
by the Supreme Court. The Attorney
General of the State has appealed
but the appeal will not be heard
until too late for you to know
what the decision will be, in
accordance therewith."

In the meantime the original
package dealers have full
possession and the Executive
is helpless. The decision of the Supreme Court which was to have been given on March 7, 1898 has unfortunately been postponed as the following letter shows:

The News & Courier
Charleston S.C.

April 28, 1898

My Dear Sir,

Your note of April 18th has been received. The Dispensary case has not been decided by the United States Supreme Court. Possibly a decision will be reached Monday next. We have been expecting it for several weeks, but the court has not yet acted.

Yours very truly,

J.C. Hempfling.
Whether the ruling of the lower court will be affirmed or not is hard to decide. Meanwhile, it is interesting to note the attitude of the two leading papers of the state.

The Dispensary Law has had a fair trial at the hands of the people and as conducted has proved more hurtful than many ways, and has not reduced drunkenness in proportion to the riot and disorder attendant on the enforcement of the law. If Judge Brountons decision abolsihed the system, it will be mourned for the unimproved possibilities for good that go with it, but not for
other reasons. That which the state should do in the emergency which confronts it should be discussed temperately, and carefully, and there will be plenty of time to do that when Judge Simonton's ruling has been thoroughly digested. Until then let us go slow. If it comes to a choice between prohibition and liccence, let us make the choice rationally and deliberately, leaving nothing to be regretted in the future. For one thing at least we have cause to be thankful. The old barroom carousals can never again, so long as the present constitution is in force, blight and blast the state with the disgrace and ruin of other days. This
is a comfort that should not be overlooked by those who are the staunchest supporters of the Dispensary Law."

— Columbia Register.

"We do not think that this necessarily kills the Dispensary. It merely deprives it of its unlawful monopoly. Its power as a police regulator of the quantities in which the liquor may be sold and in the prevention of drinking on the premises where sold, in short, all its capabilities for good are unimpaired. No loss of revenue need be feared if the managers act with common sense and seek honestly to meet competition instead of shutting it off. The
hostility to the institution will be greatly mitigated when the people feel that to patronize the Dispensary is a matter of choice and not of compulsion. There is no reason why the State should not, by the quality and price of its liquors, run out all its competitors in the business, and at the same time minimize the evils of the liquor traffic—Charleston News-Courier.

If the Supreme Court reverse Judge Simonton's decision, the Governor will again undertake the execution of state laws. If not, he has three alternatives: either to pass a total prohibition law, or await the will of Congress, or do away with the profit feature of the Dispensary.
1. Total prohibition is probably not desired by a majority of the people.
2. A bill has been passed by the United States Senate which gives the States complete control of intoxicants within their own boundaries. They hope to have it passed in the House.
3. The third is Governor Albright's choice. He says:—
   "We can, however, get relief by doing away with the profit feature, as the following quotation from the Vanderwerp decision shows: The decision of the Supreme Court must control all Circuit Courts. By this decision it is clear that so long as the State herself engages in the business of importing and selling alcoholic liquors for the
purposes of profit; so long as she recognizes that the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage is lawful and can be encouraged; so long as she sees a monopoly in supplying these liquors for that use, and in this way looks to an increase in her revenue, she cannot under her constitutional obligations to the other states of the Union, control, hinder and burden commerce in such articles between their citizens and her own." Here is the law and we must obey it until Judge Sisson is overruled by the Supreme Court or by Congress. Let us, therefore, do what is left us, and wait for action at Washington. We can certainly get
rid of the "original package" dealers and their demoralizing traffic by continuing the Dispensary, shorn of all profits and administered only as a police regulation to control and reduce the liquor evil. The Federal Judge will have neither occasion nor excuse for his ever ready injunctions, if that system shall be inaugurated unless he shall again reverse his own previous decision. This then, appears to me the best and almost the only thing left us to do. We might try this policy for a year, and next winter, after Congress shall have acted or failed to act, and after the Supreme court shall have decided what is to become of the States
power to control liquor under
the Wilson act of 1890, we shall
be in a position to take final action.

A statement of the success of the system since it went
into effect will naturally be
incomplete on account of a lack
of accurate information. The
Dispensary has not had a fair
and impartial trial. Whatever
of success the Governor, backed
up by a majority of the voters,
may have had, has been
wrested by force from an
unwilling and very active minority.

As a revenue measure it
has been fairly successful although
it has not been as profitable as
was at first expected. The
benefits which the promoters of
The measure claimed would follow its enforcement can be best ascertained by a comparison of the subjoined table, with the answers to a series of letters sent out by the Outlook early in 1897. The table was compiled by Governor Evans in February 1896 from answers to letters written to the mayors of all the towns and to all the county Boards of Control. The Outlook sent letters to its subscribers in all the towns asking them to answer: 1st Is the Dispensary law enforced? 2nd. Is public sentiment in its favor? To the first question, answers from some places reported entire success. Everywhere sati-
factory enforcement, or at least
better observance than formerly was reported.

The greatest difficulties of enforcement were encountered in the counties bordering North Carolina due to the activity of the moonshiners, and in the city of Charleston.

The answers to the second question were conflicting, but the consensus of opinion shows that opposition is lessening, and that the system is increasing in public favor.

The facts of Governor Evans' Chart are entirely reliable, since they were obtained from men both hostile and friendly to the dispensary law. It shows an average decrease in consumption of liquor of 33 1/3%, it has indeed
increased in counties which were formerly under local option. This is due to the establishment of dispensaries in towns, where there were before no licensed saloons. The increase, however, is more actual than actual, because formerly no account could be taken of the liquors sold on the sly. The table shows a decrease of drunkenness of 63 1/4 per cent. The combined opinion of the Outlook subscribers, and of the boards of control is that the law has had a good effect on the law courts and public order generally. It has prevented brawls and rows on election days, circuses or county fairs, by closing the
dispensaries—a thing which could not have been done to saloons. Two enureses traveled the state in 1896, and only two arrests were made for drunkenness during the entire trip.
The claim that state control sanctions drinking is in a sense true. "The fundamental conception of the dispensary law is opposed to the theory that liquor selling—not liquor drinking—is a sin; a theory we would be inclined to limit before agreeing to. But on analysis the objection is purely sentimental."
"When people realize—as they are beginning to do—that it is not the states reem to make
money and drive out competition, but to limit drinking, to eliminate attendant evils and consequently to decrease liquor consumption to a minimum, they have no longer any ground for contempt for such a state. The end is worthy and the means as free from objection as any plan of such large objects could be.

It cannot be denied that the system has built up or at least strengthened the political machine. The charge of political unsoundness is well founded; but the power of the saloon keeper is forever killed. The exchange of the saloon papers for one dispenser and one constable is a profitable one.
treatment of such offices as spoils can be remedied if necessary by civil service rules, and by pure business methods in carrying on state affairs.

The objection that failure to enforce the law creates a contempt for the Executive, if true, is a strong one. But the law has been enforced almost everywhere, and will continue to be outside of Charleston. Here there are serious doubts although a marked change for the better can be seen. The chief difficulties have been the methods adopted by the Executive for the enforcement of the law, and the prejudice against the originators and leaders of the
movement.
Whether the "Bourbons" can so far overcome their antipathy for the "Reformers" as to obey a law of their making, remains to be seen.
Whatever the future of the Reformer—very may be, the past is certain. Enacted in a compromise between good and bad faith; enforced as far as it could have been under the circumstances, for a variety of reasons, including honest belief in the law, party machinery and personal spite; and opposed for the same reasons; it has commanded itself in a greater or less degree to the majority of thinking men in the State and in the United States.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTIES</th>
<th>-has drunkenness and crime increased or decreased in your town and county, and by what per cent.?</th>
<th>Has the number of cases of drunkenness tried before the mayor increased or decreased since August 1, 1864, and by what per cent.?</th>
<th>Has the consumption of whiskey increased or decreased since the establishment of the dispensary law, and by what per cent.?</th>
<th>What has been the effect of the dispensary law upon the general good order and peace of your town and county?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbeville</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good order promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiken</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Peace and good order promoted greatly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good as compared with saloons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnwell</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Very salutary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Wonderfully good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Wonderfully good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Morals improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgefield</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Morals wonderfully bettered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good, and good only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good order promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good effects very marked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Great improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kershaw</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Peace and quiet improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurens</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good order greatly promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Great improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>Very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oconee</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeburg</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickens</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>Improvement; much less crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>No report.</td>
<td>No report.</td>
<td>No report.</td>
<td>Pleased with the effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumter</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Effects better than saloons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartanburg</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Improved peace and order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Excellent effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for State</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Decrease: 70, Increase: 70</td>
<td>Good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography

The Liquor Problem — Wines and Beer.

Arena, Vols. 9 and 12.


Public Opinion, Vol. 22.


Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 79.

North American Review, 158 and 159.

Outlook, 53 and 56.

United States Reports — 1896.


Nation, 58-61.

Forum, 17.

Reports of the State Board of Control
1896 and 1897.


Governors' messages 1896, 6, 7, and 8.

The Dispensary act of 1897.

Letters from, Senator Tillman, Attorney General Barber, Mr. J.C. Humphreys, Editor.
of the Charleston News-Herald, Mr. Lewis Travis, Editor of the Gooseville Enterprise, Rev. Jas. H. Carlisle, President of Wofford College, Spartanburg S.C., and Mr. Thomas J. La Motte, Secretary of the State Prohibition Committee, Miss Amanda Haeger, for an account of the Darlington Riot.