

THE SURVEY

M I D M O N T H L Y

February 15
1927



Volume LVII
No. 10

Does Prohibition Work?

By HAVEN EMERSON, M. D.

DOES prohibition work? All the world wants to know, and don't we owe our neighbors an answer? Have we an answer yet? Of course not. But here are fragments, the best so far discovered, purely of urban excavations. This study of the settlements now in press has escaped from the fatal appearance of finality, born of a trust in figures; and it is neither backyard gossip, nor yet a sociological seminar in print. It is the unweighted, bilateral record of the opinions and observations, the memories, reports, tragedies and comings of a great number of city neighborhoods, related by social workers, both those settled in residence and living as a part of the families they make their friends, and often, in the smaller cities, the lonely representative of civic affairs.

The National Federation of Settlements created a committee, the vocation or hobby of all native-born Americans. The committee undertook to collect authoritative information upon family life since the operation of the Eighteenth Amendment came to disturb the complacency of our voluntary and commercially exploited self-narcotization. The author, Martha Bensley Bruère, and her collaborators, Mary Parton and Marion P. S. Kellogg, play the part of introducers of the evidence. They canned their prejudices and used only their critical judgment in selecting material—not proof, nor argument, nor propaganda nor popular education, but stories of real people by real people, and well told.

This racing, tumultuous story of instant experience touches no part of rural America, bears no direct testimony upon the reaction to prohibition among the crisp and sodden top and bottom crusts of our national pie, but for the substance of urban United States we have a serial film, clear, brief, picked out with the sensitiveness of the artist and bound together by a firm grasp of continental geography and international race travelogues.

"Getting down to some sort of a real reply to the question requires retrospect, explanation and particularly an understanding of the setting of the problem, a setting composed of geology and anthropology, history and industry, politics and psychology, and also a determination of the exact point in the process of civilization where we happen to be. For the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment through Congress was a small thing compared with its passage through our times."

These United States are not yet homogeneous in any respect of thought, tradition, emotion, race, history or wealth and yet from the four corners of the compass, from Cavalier and Puritan, pioneer and farmer, plain and mountain, forest and orchard there has been developed out of common experience and through a strong bond of family ambition an ideal of freedom from commerce in liquor such as has never gripped another country or people.

AT least seven of the national groups from which have evolved the three, five, seven-generation peoples of this continent who call themselves Americans, have come to wish for prohibition because of the way of life of their newly created fatherland. This desire was not an importation, with them or since their coming, from trans-Atlantic sources. But, and there is always the exception, these same national and race groups in the greater ocean ports and in the industrial cities, have, shall we say, reverted to so-called cosmopolitan European standards or advanced to some higher aim of individual liberalism.

As for the newest comers, "the reports show that practically every foreign group, and their first generation born in this country, is drinking now and is making its own beverages. So far as our social workers can see, prohibition is not working among them any better than it would have worked in the thirteen colonies."

Will they change as their predecessors have? Can we arrive at a common law and usual practice in social customs by the highways of education, of prosperity, of freedom from the grosser forms of misery and the vulgarities of undigested wealth? What do the social workers, the people's observant neighbors, see in the background—the factors of conflict in custom and opinion?

"What stands out most conspicuously in the returns is the fact that we are so rich. We have time and intent for pleasure. The Puritan idea has so far melted in the warmth of a pretty widely distributed surplus as to break down a whole series of ancestral taboos. We have become able to see a wide range of not unattractive grays between the white of the total abstainer and the black of the gutter. Prohibition has slid off the moral plane and become a social and economic issue."

We are found by these social scientists to have obtained "the civilization of a surplus" and by use of this excess wealth we have found ways never before so wide open to a people, to "escape from our crimes and failures and pursue our pleasures and excesses." By freedom from attachment to the soil and to localities, we are found to be "less bound to face the consequences of our own acts than any earlier peoples." And again, as part of the very freshly painted foreground of our picture, there is the new citizen status: "Free women are less inclined to stand for drunken husbands in whatever class of society they live and especially so when they happen to have children." "The contentious fluid irks them as a home companion" and yet in her escape from old laws, statutory and of the drawing-room, woman found that not prohibition but the times have been her ally in drinking, if she chooses, and has the price, often of her own earning.

Other partial patterns in the picture are the so-called intellectuals' antipathy to Puritanism, and the cheap and ready-to-serve excuse of "post war psychology."

If in this new stage of civilization, we are continuing to drink, and many of us are, why are we doing it?

Not because life is hard for us certainly. The need to drown our sorrows in the flowing bowl is not nearly so poignant as it was. We are, take it by and large, pretty comfortable, thank you, and growing better day by day. . . .

From coast to coast, from Canada to the Mexican border, the social workers tell of automobiles and homes, of silk stockings and insurance, of high school for the children and hospital care for the sick, of mounting savings and visits to the country; of the things the poor have dreamed of, being actually in their hands. There is no need in this coun-

try for any "misery drinking." We have food and clothes and shelter to spare. But the habit of drinking to mitigate present ills may continue long after the ills themselves are done away.

There crops up everywhere among the laborers who still buffet the earth and meet the vicissitudes of weather the belief that alcohol is an aid to work or a reward for it and an incitement to pleasure, though there begins to dawn, first among the skilled workers and now and again in the society of youth, the idea that the work is quicker and better done, pleasure the keener and more of it, without than with the liquor.

Mimicry still holds many of the mature-bodied infants in its fascinating grip. Imitation of the conspicuous, of the well-to-do, of the popular, dramatic, or reckless, is one of the roles of "adult infantilism." A very constant part of youth is its joy in doing the don'ts. But the youthful gesture of revolt is not, in the opinion of these observers, the foundation of a habit.

The social workers point out with apt reference that we were all aliens once. Those of us who got here first have a special job to help the followers to join us in changing their ways with their country of residence, that is their ways of handicap, not their ways of self-expression. Whatever we do or say, at least remember that the newcomers, the foreigners as we call them, are not the cause of our major present dilemma. To be sure they know how to make wines and spirits in their homes but if left to themselves their product would not leave their own dining-room or kitchen.

It is class lawlessness, the latest and most unlovely expression of the power of wealth and social and political position, which is making the demand the home stills are supplying. It is the limousine trade from the "best districts" that makes blind tigers out of first-floor flats in our industrial cities.

Never did wealth and distinction play a more pitiful role. It is the power to buy, the skill in evasion of the law by the people of means, which seems to the social workers the chief danger to the lives and families of the "unprivileged class." "It is not for home consumption that children tend stills in the tenements. No rum-runner operates to supply the thirst of the man who earns four dollars a day."


To have put the liquor trade without the law, to have cut the saloons out of the telephone directories, to have made it inconvenient and hazardous to find and buy and drink liquor is of itself an evidence that prohibition is working. The saloon has gone.

COMING SOON WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN WAITING FOR

THE STERLING AMERICAN DRAMA.

TEN NIGHTS IN A BARROOM

DRAMATIZED FROM T. S. ARTHUR'S CELEBRATED WORK.



"FRANK BLADE YOU HAVE KILLED YOUR OWN FATHER."

THE STANDARD DRAMA THAT HAS STOOD THE TEST OF YEARS.

ENDORSED BY THE CLERGY AND PRESS

All Classes of People have witnessed this GREAT MORAL TEMPERANCE DRAMA and have Pronounced it the Best ever Presented.

A PLAY THAT WILL INSTRUCT AS WELL AS AMUSE YOU

A Play for Young and Old. It will teach you a Lesson that you will never forget.

From a dodger used in the '70s and '80s and current again this winter in New York at a revival of Ten Nights in a Barroom by the Triangle Players Club

All the lawbreaking being admitted, what are the social conditions that may be attributed to prohibition? In our blanket of prosperity, there is throughout, the warp and woof of non-alcoholic habits. The pre-prohibition drink bill seems in many places almost balanced by today's increase in annual savings. Says one witness: "Whatever prohibition may have done for the idle rich, it certainly has done well for the laboring poor." Better health, less drunkenness, more schooling, less interruption of weekly employment, more trade in clothing, food, furniture and automobiles—these appear to be incompatible with drink. The less the liquor budget the more the family has of comforts, convenience, security.

To the physician trained to accept the cruelty as well as the encouragement of the symptoms and history of the individual case of sickness, there is the same delight in obvious accuracy, the same sense of satisfaction in the revealing though disturbing diagnostic points which these social engineers have developed in viewing the natural history of our folk.

Come with me for a swing around the circle—while waiting to read the whole story—first, feverishly, that of your own home town or state, and then with glee that of your neighbors. Here you will see an exhibition of state and racial and municipal complexes. Forget the prophetic remarks of health officers, the precise predictions of actuaries and vital statisticians, even the solid discoveries of physiologists, if you will, and think of the communities, passing through them, as human families, and you a neighbor at the cross-roads, taking toll of seasoned stories from your friends, men and women and children.

We join our author in the United States of Minnesota, where the people are blonde, blue-eyed and bony, climbing into a good organization of business and social order as any 75 per cent native-born white group will. Here they talk and vote dry and drink wet, and resent interference with personal and folk customs. Here the youth drink more than before prohibition. No evidence of need of drink "to deaden nerves to the prick of hardship." They drink from tradition and inheritance, as they did in Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Lithuania, and Rumania. They will make and use liquor at home, and their national habits are strong upon them. They have convictions and political tenacity. Drinking is bringing no satisfaction to the wage-earner, and is apparently an importation with no certainty of successful transplantation.

Sioux Falls, Caspar, Butte—over crowding of schools was the first notable effect of prohibition in Sioux Falls; 4 per cent of the entire population is attending high school and the grade classes are proportionately filled. The red-light district and its houses have passed out of existence; the "necessity seemed to pass with closing of the saloons." Here the native American and Scandinavian juries convict in liquor cases when the Irish will not. Even though they drink alcohol, the majority of the people are in favor of enforcement and approve the activity of sheriff and police chief in clearing out bootleggers and stills. "Not enough illicit liquor consumed to give profit to the harassed bootlegger. The bootlegger has no political pull in South Dakota and observance is on the whole good."

Butte "is not dry alcoholically speaking, but drier than it was, and in spite of the raw foreign labor coming into



From a contemporary print

AS THE WET NINETIES SAW THEMSELVES

the mines there are fewer accidents due to drink and general law and order is improved."

Now over the mountains to Idaho and the Inland Empire from which the finest physical type of man was contributed to our citizen army. There are 425,668 persons in Idaho, only 40,747 of them foreign-born, and these of the Nordic stocks, all familiar with the English language. Even diphtheria isolation placards need be printed in only our own tongue. When the forty-four saloons closed in Boise City they took it hard, these native Americans. They fairly erupted with religious emotions. But business came as twin sister of evangelism, and our social worker says from a home-steading outpost at the edge of the city that "Fords appeared in front of isolated ranch houses. Mail-order houses sent better clothes into town. The whole family drove to church in the new Ford and the church grew and became a social center. . . . The honking auto-horn has taken the place of the cracking of pistols in this western town."

Across the mountains the Denver social worker tells of more saving among the poorer families, less excuses for crime on the basis of intoxication, decrease in the number of homeless men. And for Colorado Springs, little change in crime and disorder "in this distinctly American town, where public conviction is wholly on the side of law enforcement."

Sectional, racial, class controversy throughout the state; labor feeling the law is unequally applied and to its disadvantage. They see the financially powerful safe against raids to which their own homes must submit. Here is a transfer of antagonism of labor towards the interests they have fought for years. Capital votes dry and lives wet. Labor is against prohibition in the mining camps, but the bootlegger is out of luck in his conflict with mountain ranges as well as with enforcement officers, backed by strong native-born sentiment for prohibition.

Nevada, a failing state, is wet. Unemployment, shrink-

ing population, not as many residents as when admitted to statehood, an excess male population, 11,840 votes against, to 3,350 for prohibition, and rarely a good word said for the law or its observance. Colorado votes it a success and, by reversing the ratios, Nevada says failure.

And now for Seattle, Tacoma, Portland and New America. Seattle cashed in on its convictions in 1915 without waiting for national prohibition and is visibly satisfied. All kinds of industrial accidents have decreased. Homes are better, living on a better standard. Less drugs used and peddled. Courts and police more critical and severe with a grade of drunkenness which formerly would have had scant notice. Reduced street soliciting and closing of disorderly houses. Youth attending to its own problems; the accusation of pocket-flask dancers exaggerated or wholly unfounded. Drinking an individual not a social problem. Seattle is set for dry.

IN Tacoma, hospital and other medical opinion bears out our social workers' evidence, for the doctors are of one mind that such poverty as there is from illicit liquor drinking is not more than a small fraction of that formerly chargeable to the saloon. Householders spend more for furnishings and the improvement in standards and credit seems to be permanent. The percentage of bad accounts has fallen since prohibition. Strikes have been weathered without violence, an unheard-of pre-prohibition experience. Prosperity greatly due to prohibition. Sickness rather than drink the commoner reason for a man's being in debt. Such is the evidence of judge, business man, attorney and physician.

And prohibition works in Portland, too, and for good and sufficient reasons.

The dry tradition of the region has held. As a territory it was dry in 1841. In 1883, when it had become a state, a law passed both branches of the legislature which prohibited manufacture and limited importation. In 1914 Oregon state went "bone" dry by 36,000 and confirmed it later by a majority 20,000 greater. Obviously these apple-growers and lumbermen, these salmon-fishers and traders want Oregon to be as dry as the Hudson Bay Company did in 1834.

The author gives us one of her sharp vignettes of a great empire—the Northwest:

In the American Belt, the Eighteenth Amendment was nothing new—they solved their problem themselves, these English, Irish and Swedes, the Americans of today. This group has experimented with the liquor problem by local option, and state control, by fines and blacklists, has come from dry to wet and back again, and by the long, slow, costly method of trial and error found what is right in the sight of their own eyes—prohibition. With them alcohol has ceased to be a social problem.

On to the south, to the long coast state with a double state of mind—two states in very truth, as conflicting in certain points of view as if of different tongues and breeds. San Francisco is wet in spirit and in fact. The only focus of disturbance in the public peace, a truce between bootlegger and police, is that the little man, the poor householder, is less protected and hence more often raided and fined than the big fellow whose money buys him immunity as it buys his drinks.

Los Angeles—the terminal moraine of an avalanche of chilled and lonely people from the great dry middle-western United States and colder Canada. Sun-seekers who took with them dry convictions, and wanted play and rest and ease of circumstance. A transportation of ideas followed the trail of the gasoline gypsies.

Our settlement people's children now grown, are much better off financially and socially, owing, we feel in great part, to their escape from the constant domination of the saloon which was one of the chief causes that held their parents back. In those days, saloons were not allowed in "residential" districts, but thousands of the poor had to "reside" in districts not honored by the high-sounding phrase, so their children had to have thrust upon them what the better off would not allow in their neighborhoods.

In Arizona the traders, wet ten years ago, find that the Mexicans spend their money now for goods and not for drink. And the children have shoes in winter. Is the trader dry? Yes—at least for the poor.

And in New Mexico. Hardly 1 per cent of the poverty is now due to drink. Crimes reduced by half. Mines that regularly closed for Monday now can pay men off on any day and be sure of sober labor the next morning. A coal mine superintendent supports the social workers' evidence.

Texas still coquetting with liquor, though El Paso is bone dry. It can be, with Juarez across the bridge. El Paso sells goods to wear and eat and gets the money its saloons raked in before prohibition. One of Dallas' chief social workers sees no good in prohibition. "The only difference between now and before prohibition is that a citizen pays a very high price in an illicit manner for extremely poor whiskey."

In the seaport of New Orleans there is almost universal disregard of the law and scorn for it. Less is spent on liquor than used to go into the saloons and the families of the wage-earners are better off. Unquestionably better conditions than in saloon days in spite of law-breaking.

St. Louis gives the same story. Plenty of home supply, disregard of law, but real social benefit to home and family from the outlawing of the legalized commercial exploitation and sale of liquor in saloons.

Up the Mississippi, Keokuk and Des Moines, La Crosse and Chippewa Falls carry on the journey of experience, a peripatetic confessional for communities. "Most of the drinking among the well-to-do who can support both a flask and a car. Our (the social workers') neighbors usually choose the car. Standards of living have so changed for the better in 'The Bottoms' that it is difficult to compare them with twenty years ago."

In Madison, Wisconsin, evidence of more drinking among youth and a general disregard of law without any significant social economic change.

OF course Kansas is dry—a generation of people raised out of sight or taste of a saloon. The saloon in Kansas never was a people's institution. For some time Kansas has won the distinction of having a people enjoying the greatest expectancy of life of all the states in the Union.

And so Topeka and Emporia, say our eastern questionnaires, have no meaning for them. But Omaha is wet and does not talk for dry Nebraska. "Drinking continues, but without the evils of meeting and treating in the saloons. The working classes have gained where the others have not. . . . The foreign-born are encouraged in the manufacture of liquor by the patronage of the American-born from the other side of town. Sentiment is against the injustice of enforcing the law upon the poor and not upon the rich."

Pittsburgh and Detroit, Cleveland and Buffalo—a great quartette of cities where the law is not enforced and there follows disregard for law and order. The rich debauch the poor. Politicians protect the bootlegger for their own profit. Prosperity and increased production are in part the

result of prohibition. The saloon is abolished and no one wants it back.

The cotton-mill towns of New England testify with clear truth from mill managers and social workers, from bankers and tradespeople.

The stories of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and Virginia, Maryland and Kentucky, each a sketch of race, work, topography and family reaction to the bottle of liquor.

Maine, Danbury, Hartford and back to New York and Philadelphia. Maine talks and votes dry. Violations—yes, but the state is dry and will remain so.

Danbury of the hatters is satisfied in spite of bootlegging. "Our so-called Monday morning problem is now practically non-existent; 80 per cent of the workers report for work. They are better dressed, and seem better fed. No more do women come to the factory to collect their husbands' wages, nor do children wait at the saloon-doors to take home their drunken fathers. Although the population of Danbury has not increased, yet we have had to build a new high school to relieve our over crowded one."

AND then the great seaport cities—a story in themselves, and through it the same refrain. You can't mop all Europe dry; you can't stop rich Americans from debauching their new immigrant guests; you can't find any benefits flowing with bootleg liquor, even if some formerly pauper families are now able to buy both protection and a Rolls Royce; but you do find that the saloon is gone and many a wife and mother among the wage-earners is glad of it.

From New York and its satellite cities we find thirty-three testing points, settlement samplers who give us out of the ripeness and wisdom of their years an amazing mosaic of truth. It is significant that only three of these even mention Americans: "New York of the social workers is a foreign city." In every part of the city the settlements testify that for the first few years the amendment was reasonably observed. "War discipline had trained people to obedience; the machinery for illicit manufacture and distribution had not been developed; and until the repeal of the Mullin-Gage law, state enforcement was expected to back up the federal officials."

But what of the present? The largest racial group is Jewish, with the traditional use of sacramental wine and with the racial habit of sobriety. Seven settlements in Jewish neighborhoods testify "that their old men have not taken to drugs nor their young men to drunkenness; that among them the increasing prosperity and health is due more to high wages, steady employment, health education and public health nursing than to the Eighteenth Amendment." In the Italian neighborhoods there is a story of bootlegging, of families grown rich on illicit manufacture and trade, yet here, apparently, even the illicit business is not what it used to be. "The small saloon even in our business streets but slightly interests the progressive factory-hand or business man. The speak-easies reach unattached men and older men whose addiction to liquor is strong and constitutes one of their remaining pleasures." Yet in another neighborhood the picture will be darker. The evidence for the dries is not, in general, as conclusive in the great cities as these excerpts may indicate. From Philadelphia comes the complaint: "The women say they always knew (before prohibition) where to find their husbands, and that the habitual drunkards hung around the saloon. Now they wander all about the streets and alleys and with the large

Does Prohibition Work?

Dr. Emerson's article draws on an advance copy of the report of a study of the operation of the Eighteenth Amendment made by the Committee on Prohibition of the National Federation of Settlements, of which Lillian D. Wald is chairman and Martha Bensley Bruère director of study. The study will be published shortly as a book under the title, Does Prohibition Work? (Harper and Brothers, \$1.50). Of the 190 local reports on which the Committee's study rests, about half were from family welfare societies and other private social agencies, juvenile courts and other public bodies and officials. The Committee on Prohibition has the following members: Lillian D. Wald, Henry Street Settlement, New York, chairman; John L. Elliott, Hudson Guild, New York, vice-chairman; Charles C. Cooper, Kingsley House, Pittsburgh, treasurer; Bruno Lasker, The Inquiry, New York, secretary; Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago; Edmund T. Anderson, Alta Social Settlement, Cleveland; Anna F. Davies, College Settlement, Philadelphia; Robbins Gilman, North East Neighborhood House, Minneapolis; Paul U. Kellogg, Editor The Survey, New York; Albert J. Kennedy, South End House, Boston; Mary E. McDowell, University of Chicago Settlement, Chicago; William E. McLennan, Welcome Hall, Buffalo; Harriet E. Vittum, Northwestern University Settlement, Chicago; Martha Bensley Bruère, director of study; assistants, Marion P. S. Kellogg, Mary Field Parton.

percentage of bootleggers in this particular district, they are, of course, harder to locate. It was impossible for fifteen- or sixteen-year-old girls and boys to drink as they do now."

Philadelphia is one of the Atlantic strongholds of the Irish—and the racial drink problem of the Irish, Scotch and English-Americanos are much the same the country over in Chicago, New Orleans, Boston or New York.

They took drink in pre-prohibition days as a matter of course. Whatever resulted from it was more or less an act of God. . . . To them alcohol is as personal a possession as a toothbrush; they buy from bootleggers the contentious fluid which sends them mad; they take a chance on anything from synthetic gin to canned heat; and they blame the law when they break it. The other outstanding thing in the Philadelphia reports is the absolutely unusual condemnation of the public officials by whose connivance the law is broken, on the breaking of which they prosper. Not from any other place has this discussion come with no dissenting voice.

And Boston.

(Continued on page 669)

Chicago's Civic Dinner to Jane Addams

By GRAHAM TAYLOR

"A great statesman without a portfolio!"
"A great professor without a university chair!"
"A guiding woman in a man-made world!"

THERE was no immediate occasion for calling Jane Addams any such names and many others, nor for inviting her to dine with all Chicago on January 20, but there was every reason in general for so doing. It was done because so many of her fellow-citizens felt like expressing the affectionate regard they have always cherished for her and the increasing appreciation they have had for her work at Hull House and far afield. So they needed only the suggestion, very appropriately coming from John A. Lapp, representing the National Catholic Welfare Council and president of the National Conference of Social Work, to respond with the best of Chicago's good-will.

She alone sought to shift the center of gravity from personalities to principles. Despite these inhibitions which her inveterate modesty imposed upon the committee and each speaker, all of us agreed with the American Arbitration League's message: "One subject not to be arbitrated—the worth of Jane Addams."

The one hundred representative men and women invited to serve as the Citizens' Committee selected as their chairman Henry P. Chandler, former president of the City Club of Chicago and prominent in city affairs. The twelve hundred who first responded to the dinner announcement were given all the seats available in the banquet hall and adjoining rooms. Payments for as many more reservations were returned and numerous telephone calls for admission had to be denied.

The guests were almost as mixed a multitude as the population of Chicago itself, representative alike of leadership and the ranks in the city's racial, social, political, industrial, commercial, professional, educational and religious interests. Moved as much by the divergent elements thus uniting as by the spoken and telephoned tributes to the guest of honor, the newspapers of the city, in their news and editorial columns, reported the occasion to "exceed all expectations," to be "a tribute to one of its private citizens unique in the annals of Chicago," "a most impressive testimonial to the ideas and causes Miss Addams has stood for, worked for, and at times suffered for since the day on which she dedicated herself to the service of human solidarity and progress." Said one of them, "There was never anything like it in Chicago."

With aptness and wit, Julia C. Lathrop played the part of toastmistress in the absence of Mrs. Joseph T. Bowen, who was detained by illness. What Mrs. Bowen intended to say in her opening remarks was read and included this pen-picture of Miss Addams:

One must live at Hull House to see her becoming a friend of the neighbors, sharing in their joys and sorrows, entering

into the life of the community. She knows not only all the details of the thirteen Hull House buildings but she can tell you what are their furnishings, even to the pictures on the walls. She welcomes with equal cordiality and courtesy a distinguished visitor and the foreign-speaking woman with a shawl over her head and a baby in her arms who has come to ask advice or assistance.

Miss Addams has always been ahead of her times. She is a crusader. She has sponsored new and unpopular courses, fought for civic and national reform, worked for remedial legislation for women and children, founded international organizations, and at all times and in all places her voice has been raised to plead for the oppressed, for justice, for tolerance, for righteousness and for peace. She has sometimes been misquoted, misunderstood, and misjudged, but through it all she has gone her way, outwardly undisturbed, and with a calm serenity and steadfastness of purpose inherited from her Quaker ancestors.

William Allen White of Kansas prefaced his paper on The Mission of the Liberal with these personal references to Miss Addams:

We have met here to pay a tribute of our love to America's most useful citizen. Presidents have come and gone; leaders have waxed strong and vanished, leaving behind only the shell of reality in the coral reef of progress; commercial cycles have appeared and run their courses—and through it all for nearly four decades our dear friend has kept her even, forward way, steadily and beautifully exemplifying the work of the liberal in our life and politics.

Times have changed, issues have changed, men that made the issues have come and gone, while she has steadily met the day's work, faced the issues of the hour and tested the leaders of passing causes with just one challenge: Do you bring into the life of the average man more self-respect than he had before? If so, Miss Addams has given her heart to that movement. If the movement denied that and offered the whole world instead, she withheld her support. Self-respect has been the thing she required in life.

Tonight we are celebrating the life and achievement of one who has dealt with the things of the spirit. She has fulfilled the liberal's mission. Let us gather faith tonight that the vision of self-respect, of a reborn world, the vision of mankind groping toward brotherhood and so finding its divine fatherhood, has come deeply into millions of lives. That vision still lives. That dream shall survive our sleep. Miss Addams has followed this great vision faithfully through the years. We give her the benediction of our faith and hope and love; our faith in her understanding heart, our hope for her vision, our loving gratitude for her life.

As a spokesman for many present who had been born and brought up near Hull House, Judge Hugo Pam of the Superior Court of Cook County and a prominent citizen of Jewish heritage thus stated the point of view of those who had enjoyed Miss Addams' neighborly fellowship:

I am the only one scheduled to speak on this program whose mother and father were immigrants. I was born within two blocks of Hull House. A learned rabbi whose temple I attended advised his young men to "look at Hull House. See what it is doing. You young men back from college should do something like it." We went to Hull House and sat at the feet of Miss Addams. Then a few months thereafter the