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Abstract

Oberlin students had lost interest in the prohibition and temperance cause by the time they became popular in the rest of America, particularly during the 1910’s and 1920’s when the Prohibition movement outside Oberlin was the fiercest. Meanwhile, the students’ indifference toward alcohol was replaced by activism of another sort; the tobacco ban, which was enforced since the founding days of the town and college, was lifted and modified in the winter of 1918, two years before national Prohibition of alcohol.

From the theoretical framework of constructionist model of social problems, this paper examines how the rise of individualism and humanitarianism constructed alcohol as a public problem and deconstructed tobacco as one. I argue that alcohol was problematized by framing the saloon as a social and external evil that could not be resolved by individual self-control but only through collective social restrictions. On the other hand, the deconstruction of tobacco as a problem occurred because cigarette was framed as a harmless, individual preference that did not require institutional and political power to address it until the 1990’s. By examining and interpreting real social phenomena with the theories of social problems, this paper adds to the knowledge by recognizing that those theories are applicable and valid, and thus can be used to interpret and understand why some social problems arise and fall.
Introduction

Oberlin College is widely renowned as the heartland of the prohibition movement. The Anti-Saloon League of America, the only successful “dry” organization to pass national constitutional prohibition to the United States, was founded in Oberlin in 1893 by Oberlin alumni, Howard Hyde Russell. The 1880’s signified the beginning and fiercest decade of the temperance movement in Oberlin. In the summer of 1881, a series of events called “student sit-ins” struck the Oberlin community and gave a rise to an organized temperance movement (New York Times, 1881). Although it was illegal to sell liquor in Oberlin, the news spread that the newly opened drugstore sold alcohol “on the order of a physician” (ibid). Two students from the divinity department sat on the stools in the drugstore, watching vigilantly whether there were any illegal exchanges taking places. This resulted in physical conflict with the young town residents who “smoked” tobacco fumes at the two students and eventually got into a brawl (ibid). Later, the town council reconfirmed the ban on selling any liquor in Oberlin to keep extra vigilance over drugstores attempting to sell liquors under “medicinal purposes” (ibid).

Over the years, however, student interests in the temperance cause started to diminish. Although alcohol’s status as a social evil was not seriously challenged, students were rather indifferent to alcohol politics from the late 1890’s onwards (Barnard, 1969, p. 101). On the other hand, tobacco lost its problem status. Despite the faculty’s endeavors to mark tobacco as a social evil, this was starting to be contested by the students who perceived the tobacco ban as “absolutely foolish” (Blodgett, 2006, p. 120). In 1918, student discontent reached its peak and the faculty could not help but lift the ban on tobacco for male students. In the first decades of the 20th century as people outside fought for freedom from alcohol, students in Oberlin fought for freedom to smoke. These contrasting trends raise interesting questions in regards to why tobacco
was no longer considered as a social problem while alcohol in status as a social evil was not contested, especially when both drugs had been considered as similar vices of the society, according to temperance arguments of the mid 19th century (Barnard, 1969, p. 321).

The sociology of social problems suggests that they are framed as problem, rather than that existing conditions are “objectively” problematic (Hilgartner and Bosk, 1988, p. 53). Different interest groups compete for “celebrity” in public spheres that can only have limited number of social problems at the same time (ibid, p. 57). Then, the rise of alcohol and the fall of tobacco as social problems in America, particularly in Oberlin, can be analyzed and assessed as to why framing was successful in the alcohol case and failed for the tobacco case.

This paper presents the results of a historical and comparative analysis of alcohol and tobacco in Oberlin and the United States. In particular, I addressed similarities and differences between how the Oberlin community reacted compared to national sentiment in regarding problems of alcohol and tobacco. In the following section, this paper discusses the early history of Oberlin, particularly of the temperance cause. Especially noteworthy is Oberlin’s justification for its actions: to preserve its reputation and values as one of the first co-educational and mixed-race institutions in America.

Section two describes the history of tobacco in both Oberlin and in America generally, and how arguments against tobacco are similar in its effects yet different in rhetoric. Both in Oberlin and outside Oberlin, they utilized moral and religious sentiments. However, while outside Oberlin arguments for tobacco emphasized the chicness and cleanness of cigarettes, Oberlin students denounced the tobacco ban as a violation of individual humanitarian rights, namely the freedom to smoke.

Section three reveals how Oberlin students became indifferent to the prohibitionist cause
from the 1900’s to 1920’s while outside Oberlin, prohibition movement gained a huge consensus. Oberlin students became more individualistic and justified alcohol Prohibition with empirical data rather than an appeal to moral and religious sentiments.

Finally, section four discusses the factors that might explain the rise of alcohol and the fall of tobacco as social problems, using the theoretical tools of Benford and Snow (2000): empirical credibility, framing consistency, and credibility of the claimsmakers. The differences in physical and chemical responses to the drugs, in leadership and organization, and the rise of individualism, particularly as evidenced by political power of women, all help explain why alcohol frame was successful in creating collective identity and political opportunities while it was not the same for the tobacco case until much later. I also discuss the contemporary debates on alcohol and tobacco in Oberlin; tobacco is increasingly becoming a social hazard like alcohol once was in the 1920’s while alcohol has become less of an issue.

Methods

Data were collected from Oberlin College Archives and Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library, the official archive of the Anti-Saloon League (ASL). Primary sources include letters (correspondence), microfilms, student scrapbooks, student class notes, journals, newspapers, fliers and pamphlets related to alcohol and tobacco from 1878 to 1999. Newspapers and magazines, local or national, such as Oberlin News or the American Patriot - a national magazine published by the ASL - were valuable primary sources because these showed the language and logic behind the “dry” arguments.

To reconstruct how alcohol and tobacco were viewed, I used keyword searches of electronic full-text databases of local newspapers. Here the key terms that I have used are: saloon,
tavern, prohibition, temperance, liquor, alcohol, local option, whiskey, beer, drunk, drinking, smoking, tobacco, expel, and suspend. Here I abridged some of the words together, such as alcohol and prohibition with the use almost obsolete words like saloon and tavern - bars or pubs nowadays - to reconstruct the ASL’s arguments against alcohol. This method, sometimes called “tracking discourse” (Altheide 2002), was first employed by linguist Fred Shapiro. While the use of full-text database is constrained by the breadth of documents, the sheer volume of specialized archives available provide a fairly complete representation of formally published periodicals and a robust presentation of materials relevant to my project.


**Prohibition and Individualism**

*Temperance in the founding days of Oberlin: “Deny ourselves!”*

Similar to other colleges found in the early nineteenth century, Oberlin focused on “cultivation on piety and character” (Barnard, 1969, p. 3). However, what distinguished Oberlin from other colleges were its support for “moral and social-reform causes,” and its “adherences to a mild form of Christian perfectionism” (ibid). The first presidents of Oberlin were Charles Finney and James Fairchild; Finney was a nationally renowned ministers and Christian theorist of his time. They believed that education in Oberlin should serve Evangelical purposes; during the early years of Oberlin, the college was strongly committed to maintain Christian ways of life.

Although the terms, temperance and prohibition, are often used together, they are technically different from each other and can be used in different contexts. While temperance focused on religiosity and maintaining purity by abstaining from alcohol and tobacco, and
anything unhealthy in general, prohibition was recognition of a substance as socially harmful and of the need to prohibit the substance from society by using political means.

Temperance, in this sense, was part of the Christian ethics that Oberlin cherished. From its beginnings, Oberlin as town and college had an extensive regulations, including some against alcohol and tobacco. *The Covenant of Oberlin Colony* (1833), written when the college and the town were founded, states in its Fifth article:

“we will eat only plain and wholesome food, renouncing all bad habits, and especially the smoking, chewing, and snuffing of tobacco, unless it be necessary as a medicine, and deny ourselves all strong and unnecessary drinks, even tea and coffee, as far as practicable, and everything expensive, that is simply calculated to gratify the palate.”

From an ascetic perspective, the newly found town of Oberlin denied anything that might disturb its Christian goals of resisting temptation and maintaining purity. Alcohol and tobacco were considered “bad habits” explicitly in the Covenant. The founding fathers of Oberlin College - Asa Mahan, and Charles Finney - had similar understandings of alcohol and tobacco (Fletcher, 1943, p. 336). They also wanted students to live according to Christian codes of action, applying them to “all human situations and institutions (Barnard, 1969, p. 6).

According to Fletcher (1943), Sylvester Graham heavily influenced the early faculty of Oberlin. Graham’s argument started from the theological assumption that harming one’s own body is a sin. Liquor was condemned as the exemplary harmful and sinful substance: “if it was sinful to drink liquors harmful to the physical body… it was sinful to eat harmful foods, take poisonous drugs, wear tight or inadequate clothing, or neglect exercise, bathing or ventilation” (p. 336). Graham called for health reforms in everyday life. Among them, diet was considered especially important to stay healthy and sinless. Fletcher’s summary of Graham’s teachings
illustrates how important the diet, including the drinks, was to Grahmists: “4. Wine, cider, beer, tobacco, tea, coffee, and all other stimulants were prohibited” (ibid, p. 321). In this sense, alcohol and tobacco were considered bad habits and harmful and sinful substances insofar as they tempt the Christian to be of the world, rather than focusing on the next world.

In the early decades of Oberlin, faculties, students and town residents agreed on the prohibition of tobacco and alcohol. From time to time, rare instances of alcohol related crimes raised concerns in the village, but intemperance never became a huge issue since the general consensus remained that the intoxicants should be prohibited. Moreover, as slavery became the most important cause of the century, the cause for temperance was set aside and interest in it dwindled over time (Fletcher, 1943, p. 340).

After the Civil War, however, prohibitionists imbued temperance with the rhetoric and activism of abolition in order to establish alcohol and tobacco as the new slavery evils to fight against.

In the 1890’s, Oberlin’s rules on student conduct remained conservative compared to other colleges in the US (ibid). Only after 1898 was the ban on playing cards lifted, but the tobacco ban was not modified until 1918. The complete lift of tobacco ban was not until 1966, even then the college attempted to limit the usage of alcohol by allowing only “light” drinks such as beer (The Student Regulations, 1898-1966).

One explanation for maintenance of strict rules is that Oberlin was an experimental college; “coeducation” and “mixed race” made Oberlin different from any other institutions in America (Barnard, 1969, p. 22). When Oberlin banned alcohol and tobacco, it was not only the Christian practices that the school was trying to protect, but also the coeducational and multi-racial causes Oberlin stood for. Oberlin believed that if there were any mischievous “accidents”
to occur in Oberlin, outsiders would blame the coeducation and mixed-race educational setting of Oberlin for misconduct. To protect these two values that the school and the town cherished, Oberlin had to be extra vigilant and strict, even covering up such accidents when they happened.

Mary Edmonia Lewis, the famous African - and Native American sculptor, allegedly “poisoned” two young white girls with “hot spiced wine” in 1862 (Blodgett, p. 63, 2006). When the two white girls went out on a date with two other young men, Lewis offered to share the hot spiced wine. During the date two young white girls became sick and went to one of the girls’ home to put to rest. Lewis was “instantly accused of foul play” (ibid, p.64). The town people became furious and even more so when the college did not take any actions.

According to Geoffrey Blodgett, an Oberlin historian, Oberlin initially did not “suppress” the news, but was so shocked and appalled that they remained mute and hesitant to take any action against this specific case that had begun to “smear those values the college most proudly stand for - the virtue of coeducation, of racial harmony, of straight-laced temperance among its people, of moral probity in the conduct of life” (ibid, p. 65). Eventually, the enraged and impatient town people took it to their own hands when the hesitant college did not take any actions; they beat Lewis on the streets when she stepped out of her dormitory. The college eventually put Lewis on a trial but she was acquitted for lack of evidence.

Although evidence of how the poisoning initially started exists, Blodgett describes “only fragment of evidence” that survive that address what happened to Lewis after she was accused of poisoning (ibid, p. 64). Blodgett’s analysis of Lorain County News, which was full of the “mundane preoccupation of its readers,” revealed that the newspaper remained reticent about how the case had developed. He is baffled by the lack of evidence and suggests that “the community had entered into a covenant of silence to shroud the facts...for its good name” (ibid, p.
74). The purpose of the college and the values it cherished were to be protected, even if it meant hiding the facts about shameful scandals.

However, such regulations were imposed on not just the students, but every member of the community. The purpose of the college was not just about keeping regulations, but creating a Christian moral atmosphere, a community that positively endorsed the values of its founders - temperance, co-education, and mixed-race education. Official records tell the importance of the abstinence of alcohol at least until 1896, when the college was hiring a new professor, it specifically had checked and evaluated the candidates based on their alcohol and tobacco records (Barnard, 1969, p. 101).

**Cigarettes: White Slaver or the Symbol of Emancipation? (Appendix II, Table 1)**

Although tobacco products were heavily consumed in the US, public opinion towards tobacco was generally negative until the 1900’s. Courtright D.T. (2001), in his *Forces of Habit*, explains reasons for disapproving towards tobacco and alcohol: health, increase of criminal activities, religious disapproval, association with deviant group and endangerment of the future generation. The arguments constructed against tobacco falls under some of those categories. They were constructed early on from the 1880’s and continued to build upon the same rhetoric until tobacco was no longer seen as a serious social problem. Along with alcohol, tobacco products were viewed negatively in religious circles, mainly through arguments that intemperance was a sin of worldliness and as Christians they should abstain.

From the 1890’s, smokers were associated with deviant groups, often immigrants, such as the Chinese railroad constructors, but also with the “dudes and college misfits” (Kluger, 1996, p. 62). However, most often targeted group was the Spaniards, with whom the United States was at
a conflict over Philippines:

“The decadence of Spain began when the Spaniards adopted cigarettes and if this
pernicious practice obtains among adult Americans the ruin of the Republic is close at hand.”
(Goodman, p. 118)

The arguments that certain substances “degenerates” the nation – in this case, the Spanish and the
American - were repeating themes in the rhetoric of prohibition parties, including the tobacco
prohibitionists. One of the leading figures of anti-tobacco movement was Lucy Page Gaston,
who founded the Anti-Cigarette League (ACL) in 1899. Her supporters included Henry Ford,
Thomas Edison, and John Sullivan, a famous boxer. In 1916, Ford issued *The Case Against the
Little White Slaver*. In his book, Ford quoted Hudson Maxim, a renowned inventor of high
explosives, who believed “that the slavers were as dangerous to mankind as his own products”
and cigarette is “a maker of invalids, criminals and fools -- not men” (Burns, 2007, p. 147). Here,
cigarettes were considered as defilers that degenerate the nation and people. The slavery rhetoric
was often used to instill a new cause after abolition, by arguing that intemperance enslaves
mankind and thus was the next social evil to fight against as the victorious North - once did in its
battles for abolition.

Among other images associated with tobacco, gender deviance was also emphasized.
Smoking was considered to be: substance use, virility, poor, effeminate, effete, affected. The
idea was that male smokers were considered effeminate and degenerate. However, on the other
hand, female smokers were considered “unladylike and exhibitionistic” (ibid). The denunciation
of smokers did not just impose female – effete and degenerate - identity on males, but by making
females “unladylike,” it was more about gender deviance overall, defining smoking as
problematic.
Another set of arguments condemned tobacco as unhealthy. Smoking tobacco or even chewing often resulted in unpleasant smells on the behalf of the smokers, even staining their clothes with brownish tobacco substance. This lead to the general belief that tobacco is unhealthy because it looked unclean when consumed. For instance, *Tobacco & Human Efficiency*, written by Frederick J. Pack – a member of ACL - in 1918, was a consolidation of anti-cigarette argument, claiming that cigarettes are unhealthy. Frederick, based on no substantial evidence, argued ‘scientifically’ that cigarette fumes were more poisonous than other types of tobacco products (Kluger, 1996, p. 67).

With the introduction of mass production of cigarettes and intense advertisement strategies by James Buchanan Duke in the mid 1880’s, these imageries were actively contested by cigarette prohibitionists and the tobacco firms over the years (Goodman, 1993, p. 102). Before then, cigarettes were one of the most expensive tobacco products; only people of high prestige such as Napoleon smoked cigarettes (Courtright, 2002, p. 141). From the mid 1880’s, cigarettes quickly became popular and by the 1910’s they were preferred over other tobacco products such as pipe, cigar and chew (Kluger, 1996, p. 64).

The rise of popularity in cigarettes can be explained by various factors. First, cigarettes did not stink and stain like other tobacco products; smoking cigarettes took far less time and had less offensive odor. The rapid, inexpensive availability of an aristocratic product made it especially desirable. In other words, cigarettes were considered modern: less obtrusive, milder, and less hazardous overall, contradicting the health and hygiene accusations (ibid. pp. 62-63).

Secondly, WWI negated the effeminate image of cigarettes and replaced it with the positive image of soothing pains for suffering soldiers (p. 63). Statistics of US WWI tobacco consumption reveals how might the image of tobacco changed greatly during WWI. Alcohol and
tobacco consumption rates generally go down during wartime since the economy suffers greatly from supporting necessary goods such as rations and weapons. The business has fewer incentives to produce the luxury goods such as alcohol and tobacco. However, during WWI, US tobacco consumption went up, spurred by the legitimization of tobacco as the necessary product for soothing soldiers from the physical and mental distress (Courtwright, 2002, p. 143).

Thirdly, the rise of women as the new political force in the 1910’s also helped to paint cigarettes in positive light. During the political battles for suffrage, cigarettes were a medium of exhibiting and declaring the “first citizenship” and the independence of women – women started to consider themselves no longer as “secondary” compared to men, they became and acquired the “first” citizenship. Atlantic Monthly declared that the cigarette be seen as women’s “symbol of emancipation, the temporary substitute for the ballot” (Kluger, 1996, p. 65) Although women smoking in public were contesting social norms for feminine behavior, it was considered less obtrusive than smoking inside buildings.

Although tobacco was eventually no longer considered as a serious social problem after WWI, before then, overall efforts to maintain the stigma against tobacco were briefly successful to some states. Between 1895 and 1909, nine states made the sales of cigarettes illegal: Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Indiana, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin (Burns, 2007, p. 149).

However, after Gaston’s death in 1924, the anti-tobacco movement quickly faded and was aggravated by continuous advertisement from tobacco companies (Kluger, 1996, p. 68). States which had prohibited cigarettes began levying heavy taxes on them; Kansas was the last one to drop its prohibition on cigarette sales in 1927 (Kluger, 1996, p. 69).

Tobacco was no longer considered as a vice, and in the new scientific paradigm,
arguments criticizing tobacco for its unhealthy effects and moral hazards started to lose their persuasive powers. Previous moral arguments against tobacco lost its ground as people started believed that they were not empirical (Goodman, 1993, p. 120). Some doctors smoked themselves, and believed in “soothing” power of cigarettes, considering them healthy. Tobacco was no longer considered as a serious health hazard; there was “no place for tobacco in the disease paradigm” because people started to take moral arguments less seriously and previous anti-tobacco activists were moralists, not scientists (ibid, p. 121). In the early two decades of 20th century, cancer was not diagnosed, and its symptoms were associated with other types of diseases (ibid, p. 122). Goodman’s table (ibid, p. 124, also see Appendix II, table 3) shows that in the 1900’s there were significantly fewer of reported cancer deaths than in the 1940’s. Only 48 cases of cancer deaths were reported in 1900, while in 1940, 158 cases were reported. Only after the diagnosis of cancer beginning in the 1940’s and further development of research about lung cancer were tobacco products were condemned as health hazards.

*Individual Rights vs. Health Concerns (Appendix II, Table 1)*

The tobacco ban at Oberlin enjoyed wide support until the 1900’s. I found no evidence of racist or xenophobic rhetoric, yet Oberlin anti-tobacco arguments were similar to the ACL’s and Frederick Pack’s that tobacco was both a moral and health hazard. In December of 1877, President Fairchild addressed a speech that denounced tobacco as “costly, harmful, and socially undesirable,” calling for strong solidarity of the campus against tobacco. He further lamented that smoking in the presence of ladies was socially unacceptable, but was happening among the students at the moment. Ironically, he warned that violators or those who refuse to be part of a non-smoking campus would receive punishment. This framed smokers as non-Oberlin and
alienated them from “solidarity.”

One incident in 1879 propelled Oberlin to more active participation in anti-tobacco campaigns in the 1880’s. A student named Ed. Lymau from the town Grammar School went to class with clothes stinking of tobacco (Oberlin Weekly News, 1879, December 5th). Although he initially got expelled, he was re-admitted after he wrote an apology that promised he would never smoke again (Oberlin Weekly News, December 12th, 1879). Vigilance against tobacco was strengthened and his suspension might have stirred the already tobacco-cautious Oberlin community and gave a rise to more pronounced anti-tobacco sentiments.

The 1880’s still exhibited the Oberlin tradition of physiological reforms based on Christian ethics: both alcohol and tobacco are social evils because they bring physical, mental and social harms. One of the members participating in the 1880’s fierce anti-tobacco movement was town residents. Oberlin town residents also viewed tobacco as harmful to financial, moral and religious, and physical health. In January 9th of 1880, an Oberlin Weekly News article reported that an anti-tobacco meeting was called by “gentleman interested in the suppression of vice and immorality” to discuss banning the sales of tobacco in Oberlin. Town residents perceived tobacco as unhygienic and unhealthy: “the workmen in tobacco are generally thin, asthmatic, and of a pale or yellowish complexion. Use of tobacco becomes mischievous by its influence upon the digestive and nervous apparatus” (Oberlin Weekly News, January 23rd).

Moreover, in January 30th of 1880, another article from Oberlin Weekly News reported upon family values and moral issues, begging the reader:

“are there not some who though they may have no sons of their own to save, are nevertheless willing to give up the use of tobacco, to save the street boys who may have no father to lend them a helping hand in the battle of life?”
The writer of the article urged the reader to think smoking as a social issue, a call to expand and sympathize with the care for one’s own children. In other words, tobacco was framed as a social evil, rather than a poor individual choice. Oberlin, according to them, had attractive tobacco stores that tempted and provided access to the young people. It was expensive and offensive, demoralizing and harmful, and also a violation of social obligations to the college and the community. Moreover, anti-tobacco activists in town thought that tobacco sales impoverished the community without contributing to its welfare but fostered “idleness, personal extravagance, rowdyism and tends towards dissipation” (ibid). In other words, tobacco stores had the nature of a saloon, a continual temptation to the young.

Still, the general consensus on smoking was negative but not demanding social response until the 1900’s. There were a few people thought alcohol was more hazardous and morally condemnable than tobacco:

“Many things are evil and proper for discussion which have no connection with temperance. The tobacco question is important, and the use of tobacco an evil, but not to be compared with intemperance. To tell a young man who uses a little tobacco that he is as bad as a drunkard, he considered an injury to the temperance cause” (Oberlin Weekly News, 1878)

Even within the same temperance movement, the above quote illustrates the tendency to emphasize alcohol and take less notice of tobacco.

With the mass production and the rise of popularity of cigarettes, several documents suggest that Oberlin students became more tolerant towards tobacco after the 1900’s. A student who attended Oberlin from 1906 to 1910, Curtis Baxter, was a pipe smoker (Appendix I, Image 1). Curtis’ scrapbook helps understand what kind of person falls under John Sullivan’s category
of “dudes and college misfits.” The first page of his personal scrapbook has a picture of a pipe advertisement. He also was a member of “the Seldom Inn Knights” (Appendix I, Image 2). In a unique Oberlin “mixed” boarding system – co-education, mixed in terms of gender - it was important for these “knights” to protect their privatized gender space. This organization was formulated to protect “Seldom Inn,” previously a men’s quarter. To protest and prevent the Inn from becoming a woman’s quarter, these “knights” put on women’s clothes in front of the building. Eventually, they got fined by the town court for disrupting the town; Curtis’ scrapbook proudly saved the billed fine and the receipt. Pictures in the scrapbook show Curtis holding a pipe by himself or with his friends in Seldom Inn, all of them with the pipes (Appendix I, Image 3).

Baxter’s scrapbook also included flyers from the classes of 1909 and 1910. In condescending and violent language, the sophomores of 1909 criticized the freshmen of 1910 (Appendix I, Image 4). Sophomores legitimized their position by claiming that they were older and intellectually superior. “Advice” included: “under no circumstances shall ye allow your idiotic infantile ideas to lead you to clean your pipes in Freshmen Bible [class]. Nor shall the aforesaid despised instrument be used on the campus or library steps or in the presence of the most honorable Sophomores.” Considering that Curtis was a sophomore and a smoker, this is ironic. The language employed suggests that it was considered “rude” to smoke in front of your “elders,” but not to ever smoke. This reframed smoking from an absolute evil to a contextual faux pas. Moreover, smoking, hidden from the faculty, seemed to be so common among the new college students that they seemed to be in need of reminding from the second-year “experts.”

A survey, conducted among college students in 1907 and taken by the college, further shows that tobacco tolerance was increasing. The results indicated that 148 students agreed to
retain the smoking ban, 33 of them wanted the lift of the ban, and 99 students wanted to modify the ban, allowing designated smoking places. Considering that less than three decades ago - in the 1880’s - most students agreed that temperance was a key value that Oberlin should uphold and students campaigned for tobacco-free town, it is significant that about two-thirds of the students in 1907 wanted either total lift or at least modification of the ban.

Although smoking was officially prohibited in campus, furtive smoking had increased over the years. In a response to increased smoking, President King repeatedly addressed the issue in speeches in 1915 and 1916. His pamphlet, *What I am Opposed to: Compulsory Smoking at Oberlin* (1915) mentioned peer-pressure as one of the negative effects of tobacco. Since the smokers can smoke while non-smokers cannot, this gives the smokers the power to choose the membership of their peers. Non-smokers might suddenly become isolated because one cannot be accepted into a smoking circle. King worried that small cliques of smokers then would force the non-smokers: either smoke or be socially isolated.

Moreover, although previous Oberlin anti-tobacco arguments strongly condemned tobacco as a religious and moral hazard, King seemed to recognize the negative effects of extreme denunciations. As the first faculty member to publicly accept Darwinian evolution theory in Oberlin, King approached the tobacco problem with more emphasis on scientific hygiene than moral condemnation:

“I have not the slightest feeling that the tobacco habit is the sin of sins, and I have no desire to settle the question for mature men...I have too many valued and highly honored friends among smokers...to make smoking a test of judgment concerning men. I think, too that moralists and reformers are often very prone to lay a quite irrational and unchristian emphasis on negative abstinences. I do not, therefore want to indulge in any violent
exaggerations or denunciations on the subject. Nevertheless, I would urge the value of a sweet and reasonable bodily and mental hygiene” (King, 1915).

By arguing that even moralists are prone to “irrational and unchristian emphasis,” King recognized the unattractiveness of previous moral arguments, and thereby also emphasized “sweet and reasonable,” the rationality of scientific and health hygiene.

Under President King, the Oberlin administration even under the rise of popularity of cigarettes maintained King’s own arguments against tobacco, not swayed by outside anti-cigarette arguments. Correspondence with Lucy Gaston show that King was hardly influenced by Gaston’s Anti-Cigarette movement; Gaston continuously asked for King’s guidance and King consistently declined to help. While outside Oberlin, anti-tobacco arguments included and put more emphasis on moral dangers of tobacco often utilizing racialized arguments, King’s arguments, with less emphasis on morality, were more in league with Oberlin’s old temperance arguments of physiological Grahamist purity and his own predilections for empiricism and science; however unsupported, his pleas to rationality and to be “sweet and reasonable” made his arguments sound more “scientific.”

Emphasis on moral and ethical arguments no longer sufficed to persuade the young college students, but empirical facts were. Nevertheless, King did emphasize the moral hazards of tobacco in the same speech: however hazardous tobacco be for physical health, smoking is inherently unethical. Although students are aware that tobacco is bad for them, they still smoke. He argued that neglecting self-respect is detrimental to college men. Although he did recognize tobacco as “sin of sins”, King’s speech signified that the changing world needs new paradigm: from religiosity to empiricism.

Then, WWI played a huge role in negating the degenerate and effeminate images of
cigarettes; it might also have instilled the fight for humanitarian causes in Oberlin students. In Alma J. Frey’s records, a flyer shows that WWI was a “War for Human Rights” (Appendix I, Image 5). Cigarettes seemed to have been associated with the images of freedom and humanitarian rights. In the midst of such events, despite active disencouragement from the administration, student support for cigarettes grew. A second college-authorized survey in 1917 about student opinion on the smoking ban suggests that Oberlin students were against tobacco ban mostly because the ban suppressed students’ individual rights. The survey reported that 200 students out of 216 were against smoking, but only 78 students supported the current ban. The rest either wanted total lift or modification of the ban. Out of those 103 who were both against the ban and smoking, 56 students opposed the ban because they believed such regulations inhibited students’ “natural humanitarian rights.” The significance of the second survey, different from the first one, is that although nearly nine out of ten students opposed smoking, a quarter of students rejected the ban because they recognized tobacco ban as inhibition of fundamental human rights.

However, the school and the students still contested the tobacco ban. An Oberlin News article in June 6th, 1917 introduced arguments from both sides. The article serves as evidence of how tobacco was starting to be considered an individual decision. Moreover, students argued that the tobacco ban was not respected altogether and that disregarding one rule would result in disregarding all rules. In order to keep the integrity of other rules, students called for the lift of the tobacco ban. Moreover, they argued abolishing the ban would not result in the “increase of tobacco consumption.”

The year 1918 signified a shift of Oberlin’s official policy on tobacco. The tobacco ban was finally modified in the end of 1918 by student senate under the supervision of the college
faculty. The modification allowed only men to smoke in designated areas. President King delivered exactly the same reasons that students used to explain his motives behind his permission for the modification. He said that respect for the regulation would falter if the school did not change the tobacco ban, since many students were neglecting it already. He further emphasized that the times had changed and it is “unwise to attempt to control the matter by direct regulation,” when students can control themselves with the “self-determination” (Recent Changes in Concerning Regulations Governing Students in Oberlin College, 1919).

The term “self-determination,” used by President Woodrow Wilson in his legitimization of US participation in WWI, also points to the possibility that WWI had imbued Oberlin students and faculty of the languages of humanitarian causes. In the literature about humanitarianism, WWI is viewed as “a way station between humanitarianism’s past and future,” or in other words, after WWI, people had begun to recognize the current main principles of humanitarianism: “impartiality, neutrality, and the independence” (Barnett and Weiss, 2011, p. 41). In Oberlin, especially considering its history of abolition, such arguments might have been more popular. Individualism rooted on the humanitarianism rapidly developed after WWI; it helped Oberlin students - some of whom participated in the WWI – to think that prohibition of tobacco is an inhibition of individual rights. In the same pamphlet of King - Recent Changes in Concerning Regulations Governing Students in Oberlin College -, he said he believed in “the conscience and judgment of the individual and minimum external negative regulation” which would help develop such facilities of the students.

However, the modification of the ban did not change anything but aggravated inequality between genders. The pretext for allowing only men to smoke was to “prevent the growth of smoking as a compulsory social habit and would [to] aid in the solution of the problem arising
from our mixed boarding house system” (Oberlin News, May 7th, 1919). The quote reflected how Oberlin was dedicated to protect its reputation as a co-educational institution. When enforcing tobacco ban was already out of hands, it seemed reasonable, to the faculty at least, to allow only one gender to smoke, since men smoking with women was such a serious social taboo and would create more problems for the institution. To uphold Oberlin’s reputation and its core values, the college modified the tobacco ban by letting only men to smoke amongst themselves:

“Students are required to abstain from the use of tobacco in all college buildings, except dormitories and the dormitory portion of the Men’s Building, and on all college grounds, including the athletic fields” (The Oberlin College Regulation Handbook, 1918).

The Oberlin College Regulation Handbook illustrates such changing tendencies. In the early years of Oberlin, the college strongly prohibited alcohol and tobacco, and emphasized gender divisions in public or private meetings. Men and women were not allowed to engage in any physical contacts and private meetings were forbidden. After 1900, gender divisions were even more pronounced by dedicating more than ten pages of codes of conduct for men and women when they were in presence of each other.

In 1918, when the tobacco ban was finally lifted, permission for college students to dance among different genders was also granted because there were “wide discontent” among the students, and school decided to offer mixed-gender dance as a part of recreation. This in turn, created stricter rules on gender divisions outside dance parties. By granting them the right to dance, students were more strictly regulated in other settings. Smoking also was regulated more strictly; legitimization of smoking in only a few specific spaces such as the individual dorm room or the smoking room, furtive smoking outside these spaces were strictly prohibited.

After suffrage in 1920, rules on women started to ease as well. In 1925, the student
regulation handbook shows fewer regulations on the division of gender than it had just a few years ago when ten pages of the book were dedicated to conduct between men and women. On a college-authorized survey taken in 1928, 20% of women smoked in Oberlin and 30% women had experiences of smoking outside Oberlin. Yet, the survey also revealed that women still favored the ban on women smoking in campus. Although nearly up to one-third of women had smoking experiences, the result, rather dubious, was that the majority of the women supported the tobacco ban on women.

Two student papers explored the issue of tobacco and women, challenging they survey and suggesting smoking was rather a contentious issue. Stenger and Jones (1928), in their Oberlin College Women and Smoking, conducted interviews with every single female student on campus. The conclusion that they drew was that the previous school survey was biased and wrong and thus should not be used as the justification of tobacco ban for women. According to their own census, Oberlin women students actually approved of smoking and if the school is using its own biased survey to justify the tobacco ban, the college should consider their “correct” survey and let women smoke. Stenger and Jones article is an example of female student endeavors to legitimize female smoking in campus.

Another student paper by Sibley Mildred (1928), titled Scholarship, Athletic Ability and Smoking: Their Association Among Girls in the College Classes in Oberlin College concluded that smoking does not disrupt athletic performance but does disrupt academic performance. This paper concluded that tobacco was not a health hazard to female athletes, and women should be allowed to smoke. These student papers illustrate that smoking was a contentious issue for the female students at the time.

Finally, in 1931 Oberlin College allowed women to smoke based on the same reason that
the ban was first modified: smoking was “no longer so rejected by society in general that it can fairly be considered a matter for arbitrary prohibition. It appears to be generally regarded now as a matter of individual preference” (Oberlin News Tribune, May 14, 1931). The quote reveals that tobacco had finally ceased to be a social problem, but became an “individual preference.”

The process leading to the lift of the tobacco ban in Oberlin provides us an insight of how social framing of problems rise and fall. First, tobacco was framed as a symbol of immorality and unsanitary hazards. With the rise of empiricism, many people, including President King, realized that previous criticism on tobacco as a moral vice was not enough to persuade the students. Many others also felt that previous claims on tobacco as physically harmful are “empirically” unfounded. In turn, with the rise of individualism and humanitarianism, tobacco had grown outside the turf of temperance and became a symbol of personal rights and liberation. The “use of non-use of tobacco is no longer regarded as a moral issue but as a personal choice” (King, 1919).

The Rise and Fall of Alcohol: Temperance, the ASL, and Prohibition (Appendix II, table 2)

As the founding place of the Anti-Saloon League, Oberlin has long been known as a fierce defender of prohibition. During the early founding years of Oberlin, the founding principles had the character of temperance movement; they were against tobacco and alcohol altogether and were not contested in any social spheres (Bigglestone, 1983, p. 81-82). Faculty, students, and most town people agreed on the issues of tobacco and alcohol. The biggest issue of the time was anti-slavery (Fletcher, 1943, p. 340).

However, after the abolition of slavery, intemperance quickly became the next slavery against which Oberlin must fight. Arguments against saloons rather than alcohol generally
started to be constructed around the 1870’s after the repeal of the Reconstruction. When previous radical prohibition movement failed to legislate an effective hindrance to alcohol, moderate prohibitionists “displayed a more pragmatic approach to the liquor question than that of the radicals” by targeting saloons instead of suggesting total abstinence of alcohol (Szymanski, p. 51). This was effective because it framed a social institution as a problem, rather than blaming the whole vice on each individual for the cause of the alcohol problem; people were no longer offended as much as they did when previous prohibitionists outright condemned each individual for not abstaining. In Oberlin Weekly News article of 1875, it was argued that the saloons should be banned because the financial burdens that they impose on the community could not be ignored. The money spent on buying alcohol was a waste and the tax used to remedy the deadly social effects of drunkards also was a waste. The writer of the article likened drunkards to “lunatics in the asylums, prisons, and idiot asylums.” Moreover, the article proposed that the town depended on the college: when the institution, the college, “languishes,” the town will languish as well because it is dependent upon the well-being of the college (ibid). Any saloons in the county would be detrimental to the reputation of the institution that was critical to its values of co-education and mixed-race education. The article asserted that town residents should abstain from alcohol and ban saloon altogether for their own good.

In September 6th of 1878, another article in the Oberlin Weekly News summarized a temperance meeting that was held in the town. The meeting discussed banning of billiards saloon and croquet because the saloons will bring whiskey and beer into town. One of the members of the meeting argued that croquet would provide “temptation to lie and cheat and become excited” (ibid). This was in a league with the temperance tradition of Oberlin, disregarding anything that might interfere with ascetic and Christian practices and aims. Anything that might lead to
cheating, much less drinking, might be regulated for individual and community well-being.

Although the temperance movement in Oberlin was fiercest in the 1880s, little evidence suggests that Oberlin student participation was as active as the faculties’ and town residents’ were. The following above mentioned examples of “student sit-ins,” the founding of the Anti-Saloon League (ASL), Oberlin Review articles suggests wide support for temperance causes, and active participation by students. However, in Russell’s - Oberlin alumni, founder of the ASL - speech, “A Hasty Sketch Appreciative of Wayne B. Wheeler,” he revealed that student participation in the initial phase of the ASL was hardly seen:

“I was very much needed an earnest young college-bred man to help in the pioneer organization work. Two men only had thus far enlisted with me.

The fact that only two students volunteered to participate in the ASL indicates that prohibition movement in Oberlin did not have wide support and may have alienated students. Students might have agreed on temperance and prohibitionist causes, but they were not actively participating in the movement. The ASL, initially, was mainly consisted of fourteen members: professors, town residents, alumni, church officials, and only two might had been students.

In the 1890’s, student interest in the prohibition movement dwindled further (Barnard, 1969, p. 101). Although some support from alumni, faculty and students still existed, most students and some faculty members showed “indifference” towards anti-liquor causes based on Christian, religious and moral arguments (ibid.). Rather, the argument shifted:

“Intemperance, it was argued, often went hand in hand with other wasteful and immoral practices of the poor, but more and more it was thought to be a symptom rather than the cause of personal and social ills…the prohibition movement had been relegated to a minor place in the hierarchy of reform.” (p. 101)
The quote reveals that most Oberlin students started to disregard the prohibitionist arguments and to prioritize other social problems. This indicates that alcohol frame was losing its celebrity as a social problem, but other issues gained the attention of the students.

The rise of dissent even among professors further strengthens that even the faculties started to see alcohol as less important social problems. In Professor Lyman’s - Associate Professor of Wind Instruments - journals and correspondence from 1890’s and 1910’s, he mentioned several times that President King complained that faculty members refused to vote for or speak in favor of the prohibition of alcohol. President King also had a correspondence with Amos Root. Root was an influential figure, known as the founder of A.I Root Company, and the only published witness to the Wright brothers’ first flight; he was also a parent of an Oberlin college student, and financial and moral supporter of the college. In his correspondence with Root, King also mentioned the existence of “wet” professors in Oberlin. Root replied “God grant that Oberlin may fight for temperance as they fought in years past against slavery” (1915). Temperance was no longer an important issue even among some member of the faculties.

Moreover, Russell himself recognized general discouragement in the reform during these decades:

“Fifteen years ago (1893) citizens of this college center prayerfully and audaciously launched a new temperance movement. It was a time of general discouragement in this reform; of widespread apathy and acquiescing indifference; a time of discord and division. But the Oberlin spirit prevailed over all difficulties. The moral forces of Ohio rallied to the new standard” (Russell, 1908).

This above quote admitted that there was widespread student apathy during that period, raising the question of what students actually supported if not the prohibition of alcohol.
The number of student activities and voices on the issue diminished as well, as indicated by Russell’s 1908 speech. The speech of 1908 itself also had a preaching character, telling what college men should do. He furthermore acknowledged that he wanted to recruit some college men into the serving the great cause: “As I come appealing for re-enforcements from college ranks for the regular army and for the volunteer service.” (ibid). This indicates that Russell felt the need to instill some prohibitionist values to apathetic college students.

Although “citizens,” used in the above 1908 speech, meant students as well, my analysis of other records during this period indicate rampant apathy. After 1905, there were no county or town news stories that mentioned student support for the prohibition movement. While previous articles in the 1880’s emphasized some student support for the temperance and prohibition movement, from the 1890’s and onwards there were more articles on alcohol politics but far less mentioned student devotion to the cause; the articles rather emphasized the legacy of Oberlin as the founding place of the ASL but mentioned no contemporary student participation.

A few characteristics of the ASL might explain why there seemed to be such a little student support from the heartland of prohibition. The ASL, first of all, was very selective on recruiting its members. Working for the league meant “a lifetime of sacrifices for both the worker and his family,” and it require strong devotion and willingness to work for the League no matter what:

“a thoroughly consecrated Christian...fighter with his fighting instincts under control. He must know how to reserve his fire until he can see the whites of his enemies’ eyes...He must...know how to be knocked down, kicked about, thoroughly broken, yet come back to the battle with a smile on his face and a spirit as sweet as Heaven” (Dohn, 1959) The sacrificing may have restricted the pool of students willing to engage.
In addition to these qualities, financial independence or “the ability to obtain contributions” was important as well: “If he does not know how, or cannot learn how to present the work in such a way as to secure a hearty response financially, he may as well hand in his resignation” (ibid.) For students, acquiring financial support from other than their own parents for prohibitionist cause may have been extremely difficult.

Moreover, the expansionist policies of the ASL might also help explain the decreased Oberlin student support for the prohibitionist cause. The primary goal of the ASL was the eventual national prohibition. Although the movement started grassroots, from ward to counties, from counties to cities, the ASL attempted to enlarge its movement to statewide and then to nationwide one. The papers of Irving W. Metcalf, an active Oberlin prohibitionist, illustrate ASL’s intention to nationalize prohibition by politicizing it locally. Metcalf himself, before the ASL was founded, contacted Republican and Democrat candidates to persuade them to support the ‘dry’ cause. His contact with politicians became more frequent and organized after Russell founded ASL. After 1893, Russell himself contacted the politicians and asked advice from Metcalf.

The movement within Ohio gained considerable standing within few years. During 1897 and 1899, Russell’s correspondence indicates that he was focusing on nationalizing the ASL, talking about progress made in other states. As the ASL had enlarged, Russell spoke of the increased need for “agitation” and propaganda and as a result, for more financial support. Correspondence asking for donations to figures such as Rockefeller and other famous sponsors can be found in Metcalf files.

As the ASL quickly nationalized itself, the prohibitionist cause was no longer easily accessible for students since they had no activities they could do on campus. Although visiting
speakers of the ASL might have thanked the legacy of Oberlin, active student support was missing. The students might agree with the cause, but they were indifferent toward its work. When the Prohibition was finally enacted in 1920, the increased number of students caught drinking in the 1920’s - two in 1925 and ten in 1926 - further indicates that once the movement was nationalized, it was hard for the students to participate in the movement, and thus lost the cause (Local Oberlin Newspapers).

Furthermore, Russell’s activism during his Oberlin years might have triggered an interest in the prohibition causes of the students of that generation, but his departure to Westerville may have deprived the campus of the charismatic leader who inspired his peers. An article written in 1903 in the Oberlin News suggests that Russell was quite a character and different from other students, inspiring even the professors:

“Mr. Russell was then a student in Oberlin Theological Seminary, but in view of their interest in the cause it was understood that the faculty would treat with leniency any shortcomings in his examinations, and he engaged in the work with great zeal” (Oberlin News, 1903).

Letters from many members of the ASL approved Russell’s leadership as extraordinary and satisfactory, and wished Russell to continue leading the organization. Moreover, many letters in the Westerville Archives revealed that Russell himself organized alumni meetings in the 1900’s, founded a Julia Davis Scholarship in 1900, and represented Oberlin; these all indicate that his presence in Oberlin community was quite influential.

However, the prohibition movement was not without criticism. An Oberlin Weekly News article of August 18th of 1888, argued that national prohibition was unnecessary. Using the example of Kansas as the successful state that had managed to pass statewide prohibition, the
article argued that temperance arguments were too religious for the civic government to pursue and government functioned best when it was not connected to religious causes. Secondly, national legislation would mean giving up local governing powers. Moreover, the article criticized the analogy that prohibitionists made between “the sins of slavery and intemperance” and that they were not related in any way (ibid).

Furthermore, in a 1908 Oberlin News article titled “Anti-League Sham,” the writer claimed that the ASL had become a profit-seeking organization by raising money and giving salaries to its leader. The critics also denounced preachers in the ASL, who have “fallen” to such monetary interests, as disturbing and dangerously mixing public politics and the church as well (ibid). Another Oberlin News article in 1910 addressed the ASL of being too political in recruiting ministers to support its cause. Such continued criticisms in the Oberlin community show that Oberlin’s own interests had not only dwindled in the prohibition cause after 1890’s, but were actively anti-institutionalist.

In 1902, the local option law in Ohio was enacted, written and sponsored by the ASL. This allowed county residents to vote for prohibition where previously only statewide bans were available. In 1908, the ASL pushed for the ward local option bill, which permitted inhabitants of any ward in a city where a prohibitory law could not be secured for the whole county, to keep saloons out of that ward if enacted. Although it did not pass in 1908, it led to a series of activism among Ohio residents and other states, step-by-step procedures of prohibiting the local county, ward, state, and eventually the nation. After long struggles, the Eighteenth Amendment was finally enacted in 1919 and took effect in 1920. However, by that time, Oberlin had long lost its zeal for prohibition.

Many of the arguments used against alcohol were the same for both Oberlin and outside
Oberlin since Howard Russell had also been the “agitator” in charge of the ASL propaganda. The Metcalf papers include collections of the ASL advertisements. The arguments condemned alcohol was a religious hazard but also a financial burden. Fliers mostly used parables or short stories to illustrate their points. One flier compared the drunkards to helpless fish and alcohol to the devil as fishermen:

“Another fisherman uses cigarettes, tobacco or beer for his bait, and many a sucker sucks them in, thinking he will let go when they pull the wrong way; but after indulging a while, when he wants to go right he finds himself so hooked and held by the habit instead of going right he goes to the - DEVIL.”

Religious arguments were used in this flier: losing to temptations of alcohol and tobacco becomes a problem because smoking and drinking are “habits” of the devil (Appendix I, Image 15).

Financial arguments attacked alcohol as causing poverty. A flier warned young men against drinking because if they ever caught the habit of drinking, the amount of money they would lose would be enormous by the time they grow old. Eventually, the flier argued, young drunkards would become poor while those who are devoted to the temperance cause will save their money and become rich. The flier stated that drinking habit decides economic class, and it forced the reader to choose whether they want to become rich or poor: to drink or not to drink (Appendix I, Image 6, 7, 8, 16).

Moral arguments asserted that alcohol endangered the family and future generations; saloons tempted young men to debauchery and decadence (Appendix I, Image 7, 9, 10).

A study by Royal Melendy (1900), published in the American Journal of Sociology, suggested that saloon are “not all directly evil places, but the temptation is tremendous. How can
a child, brought up in such a locality [saloons with prostitutes and nude photographs, positing women as the amusement amongst men], forced to receive from the saloon even the common necessities and conveniences of life, grow up into noble and beautiful womanhood?” (American Journal of Sociology, 1900, 6:3, p. 300). Although Melendy maintained and refuted others scholars who saw saloons as the sources of prime evil, he nonetheless admitted that saloon can be “a rendezvous for criminals,” and affect the future generations (ibid). These activities in saloons allegedly hindered the education of young men, thereby hindered the future generation of the whole nation.

Other propaganda materials took it to more emotional level, suggesting that alcohol violated the sacred realm of a family. In a flier titled *Charged with Murder*, a convict charged with the murders of his wife and children defended himself that the saloons were behind the killings. He was tempted to visit a saloon just once, and he became a drunkard soon afterwards. He went home, wreaking havoc upon his family, beating his wife and children to death. He acknowledged that he committed the murders, but it was not entirely his fault; any man under the influence of deadly saloons and its alcohol would give in to such murderous influences (Appendix I, Image 17, 18).

Other arguments for prohibition were based on WASP supremacy and rampant xenophobic racism which are seemingly at odds with the ASL’s origins at the anti-slavery Oberlin College. Richmond P. Hobson, a politician and close associate to the ASL, in his speech in the House of Representatives at Alabama, accused the city and the immigrants as the center of “city liquor problem”:

“The activities of the liquor traffic are centered in the cities of the Nation...together with the well-known fact that the vices of the Nation center in our cities, thus adding
complications to complications, make the great moral and social problems of the city virtually unsolvable so far as the city alone is concerned.”

Richmond accused the city of immorality, and he further argued that immigration, “especially from the countries of Southern Europe, presents a condition in this connection which tends to make the city liquor problems even more complex.” In contrast, while he posed city as the immoral center of immigrants, he juxtaposed rural areas as pure of immigrants, tradition and justice and called for rural help:

“it is not only proper and right that the rural States of a Republic like ours should have a voice in the Nation-wide problems which venter in the cities, but from the standpoint of the welfare of the cities themselves, such a course is imperative”

The quote seems to imply that rural states have moral supremacy over the cities, giving them the “white man’s burden” of civilizing immigrants. In another speech of his at Washington, he revealed the sources of racial supremacy:

“The right of petition is a right that is part of the heritage of Anglo-Saxon people, a right that was part of the Magna Charta and part of the Bill of Rights….No intent on the part of this resolution to invade either the individual right or inherent liberties of citizen, or to climb over the wall over the wall that civilization, particularly the Anglo-Saxon civilization, has built around the home.”

Richmond explicitly mentioned “Anglo-Saxon” civilization as of “particular” importance. Such racial supremacy might seem self-contradictory especially when the same people called for against slavery to join the prohibitionist causes.

However, Russell’s own remarks on race and the saloon problem help us understand how such contradictory constituencies might get along with each other. In one of his speeches to
“advertise” the ASL, he explained why abolition and prohibition are necessary in the rhetoric of Anglo-Saxon chauvinism:

“We are sweeping up toward the zenith of our power as a nation and a race...Is the Anglo-Saxon race to live and grow and wisely rule and usher in the triumphs of the Kingdom of the God, or will its vices weaken and overwhelm it as they have the nations of the past?...My classmate, George B. Waldron, in Mcclure’s Magazine, December 1898, has shown in a most interesting and lucid way how the Anglo-Saxon race starting the weakest and smallest in both land and people, has outstripped in the last two hundred years in both territory and population the Germans, the Slavs, and the Latin races of the world...In view of the final struggle for supremacy,...in view of the future fact that this nation’s vice is drunkenness, it becomes a strategic necessity that the people of God in this nation fight out their war with the organized liquor trade....then our proud race, the grandest that God has yet produced, will, like Assyria and Babylon and Greece and Rome, be silent at the Millennial roll call of the nations.” (Russell, 1899).

In this frame of thought, slavery and saloon were defined as an institutional “vice” that might result in moral failing of Anglo-Saxon civilization. For American society, to reign supreme, it had to get rid of those social vices, and moral failings.

Above mentioned prohibitionist arguments were based on several assumptions. First, drinking is a habitual practice. Once a person starts to drink, he cannot resist his urge to drink the next time. Second, since individual will have a little effect on stopping the consumption of alcohol, saloons are the external social evils that must be eliminated. The existence of a saloon itself tempted people to fall to debauchery where they cannot control themselves. Alcohol, then, was framed as an institutional problem of the society that can only be fixed by political means: to
ban saloons altogether (Appendix I Image 11).

Among many factors that might explain the differences between Oberlin and national campaigns, one big difference was Oberlin’s early adoption of the humanitarian and individual rights (Barnard, 1969). Since 1890’s, the changes in philosophies and institutions of Oberlin education brought the shift of thought from its early evangelical, Christian paradigm to a more individualistic one. The waning interest in prohibitionist cause might be explained by the individualistic tendencies of students. Prohibitionist arguments condemned the existence of saloons as external evils rather than on the responsibilities of individuals; intemperance was no longer considered “the cause of personal and social ills” but rather as a symptom of broader moral failings, like slavery (p. 101). Moreover, student exposures to open gender and multi-racial education might have led to the development of individual and humanitarian values, respecting others regardless of race and gender.

In sum, contrary to the wide spread belief that Oberlin students supported the prohibition of alcohol, they were apathetic to prohibition. The nationalization of the ASL and departure of Russell might have decreased the social realm for the students to participate in and thus might have reduced the interests in the cause. Arguments utilized by the ASL utilized moral, religious, financial, and racist arguments often linked together with abolition. Saloon was the core of these evils the ASL proposed; they further argued that individuals cannot resist the evil temptations of the saloon, and needed institutional and political agenda to ban saloons altogether.

*What / Who makes the Difference in the Rise and Fall of Social Problems?*

According to Hilgartner and Bosk (2006), the public arenas can only handle limited
number of social problems at the same time; various interest groups have to compete for attention to identify or define phenomena as social problems that demand social actions. Since the political and social agenda for social problems are limited, “the ascendance of one social problem will tend to be accompanied by the decline of one or more others” (ibid, p. 61).

Moreover, if the same rhetoric were used repetitively to frame a social problem, such rhetoric will “saturate” the public arena and thereby “undergo a decline because of its diminished dramatic value” (ibid, p. 62). Alcohol and tobacco competed within the same social arena of prohibition, both using similar rhetoric and symbols. Competition for prohibition eventually led to the ascendance of alcohol as a social problem, and decline of tobacco and the saturation of the same temperance arguments diminished the dramatic value for the tobacco case. However, then the new questions arise. Why did alcohol and tobacco receive such different responses? Furthermore, why was alcohol first framed as a substance that needs more collective and social work while tobacco became an individual choice?

Benford and Snow (2000) define social problems as “resonating” if a particular framing is more effective than its competitors (Benford and Snow, 2000, p. 619). Among the factors of resonance are: “frame consistency, empirical credibility, and credibility of the frame articulators or claimsmakers” (ibid). Frame consistency means “congruency between an SMO’s [social movement organization] articulated beliefs, claims and actions” (ibid, p. 620). In other words, an SMO with higher frame consistency does not self-contradict its beliefs or actions and thus has a better chance to “resonate.” Empirical credibility means “apparent fit between the framing and the events of the world” (ibid). Whether the evidence supporting the frame is factual and valid does not influence empirical credibility; rather, when the evidence appears as if it is empirical and real, it increases empirical credibility of the framing. Finally, credibility of the frame
articulators also account for the resonance of a particular framing. Using this theoretical framework, this paper will examine and interpret the differences between the resonance factors of alcohol and tobacco.

The foremost factor to be considered might be the empirical credibility - rise of empiricism in regards to interpreting different physical responses to alcohol and tobacco – and its connection to individualism and self-control. According to Weberian logic, development of “scientific knowledge [empiricism]…enhances man’s rational control over social and natural processes” (Brubaker, 1984, p. 3). Yet, not only did it expand upon people’s control over the nature, but it also resulted in an “inner reorganization and rationalization of the personality” (ibid, p. 27). In other words, the increase of empirical knowledge made individuals to rationalize themselves and their own system, disciplining themselves with “worldly asceticism” (ibid, p. 25). In this manner, scientific knowledge is bestowed “an importance above and beyond its universal significance as a basis for individual rational action” (ibid, p. 30). Then, for an individual, who suddenly possessed the capacity and inner logic to pursue and maintain self-control and discipline, maintaining rational mind defined him as the modern individual and thus it was important to remain in control. Unable to control oneself was seen as a loss of individualism. Pertti Alasuutari (1992), in his *Desire and Craving: A Cultural Theory of Alcoholism*, explains how the value of self-control is strongly tied to individualism: “The emphasis on the value of self-control also justified the individualist behavioral code by stressing the strong willpower it takes to be able to resist the temptations of individual drives and needs” (Alasuutari, p. 16). Asserting self-control by abstinence was an important factor of what makes an individual.

Then, from this theoretical framework, scientific knowledge of alcohol and tobacco in the early 1900’s America differed greatly from each other. While using tobacco products might stink,
it never was conceived as having the effects of impairing judgment and actions - hindering individuals’ ability to self-control oneself - as it does when alcohol is consumed. In other words, alcohol inhibits individual freedom to think clearly while tobacco does not “empirically” inhibit mental self-control and rationalization process. Although Oberlin students lost interest in the prohibitionist cause due to the rise of individualism based on humanitarianism, alcohol maintained its a problematized status because of its obvious inhibition of individual rationality, while tobacco became de-problematized since it did not inhibit any individual expression. Those who drink excessively -namely alcoholics - “are those whose willpower is too weak to say no to the next drink,” and cannot exercise self-control over their desires (Valverde, p.33). In this sense, strongly visible symptoms of alcohol overdose were visual evidence that empirically support the harmfulness of alcohol while, the less visible outcomes of tobacco were shunned as unfounded. The above mentioned quote indicates the seriousness of alcohol compared to tobacco:

“The tobacco question is important, and the use of tobacco an evil, but not to be compared with intemperance. To tell a young man who uses a little tobacco that he is as bad as a drunkard, he considered an injury to the temperance cause” (Oberlin Weekly News, 1878)

This might also explain why the slavery argument for alcohol received wide recognition while it did not happen for the cigarette case: alcohol enslaves and takes freedom away from the drunkards while people did not completely grasp how the same argument would work for tobacco. Although the opposite seems to be gaining “celebrity” today, in the early 1900’s, alcohol framing had more empirical credibility than tobacco had.

Moreover, I argue that the different styles of leadership and integrity of organization of Anti-Saloon League and Anti-Cigarette League might have resulted in differences in creating
political opportunities and thus, differences in frame consistency and credibility of the claimsmakers. Framing and political opportunity are often linked together. Benford and Snow argues that “the extent to which they [political opportunities] constrain or facilitate collective actions is partly contingent on how they are framed by movement actors as well as others (2000, p. 631). In this sense, alcohol frame had higher frame consistency and credibility of the claimsmakers than those of the tobacco frame.

Russell was of an extraordinary character. Yet, what distinguished him from others were his knowledge of institutional and organizational strengths, and his ability to influence those surrounding him and use his intellect to turn the ASL into an “organizational weapon” (Selznick, 1960). For instance, Russell knew the powers of propaganda and political action. He had given himself the title of “the anti-saloon agitator,” and the leader of the “Department of Agitation.” The purpose of this department was described in the founding laws of ASL:

“The subject of personal abstinence and saloon closing shall be presented and urged everywhere, and a strong and growing anti-liquor sentiment promoted by means of union anti-liquor meetings and the use of the printing press.”

His agitation usually involved the church since temperance causes had deep ties to religious ones. However, his reasons were more practical. In a letter to the important members of ASL, Russell argued “he who speaks to a clergymen of ten is to speak to a thousand people. To speak to 60,000 clergymen is to speak to a nation. Directions for the work: how to spread and agitate the church” (Metcalf Papers). In another letter to Metcalf, he said “while we are not working for public approval, yet, in order to be effective in the future, we must demonstrate ability to do something.” It seems that Russell thought previous prohibition attempts failed due to lack of organizations and set political agenda. His emphasis on organization was clear cut: “agitation
must be crystallized into organization” (1899).

Moreover, he knew creating a new party would not be successful. He knew well why previous attempts of the Prohibition Party and the WCTU had failed; he realized that people would not abandon their own party, Republican or Democrat, just for prohibitionist causes, so he called for a coalition, a league of grassroots, nonpartisan movement that started from each church, town, county, and ward. He also thought outright moral condemnation and dissension to drinkers would not result in popular support. Instead of denunciations, he organized the ASL to persuade that saloons are institutional vices, by making an analogy to the rhetoric of slavery, that saloons are national and institutional moral failings, not individual. He also tried to systematically approach the reluctant churches and influential individuals (Dohn, 1959). Such tendencies help explain criticisms that ASL received from the Oberlin local newspaper for being too “political.” Furthermore, as mentioned, he tried to be very selective in recruiting its own members, only appointing people of firm dedication. In sum, Russell was not only a charismatic figure, but was able to create many political opportunities by using the organization powers of the ASL. The abilities of Russell thus granted him high credibility as the spokesman of the ASL. Moreover, his actions strictly and consistently followed the ASL doctrines - he made the doctrines himself.

In contrast, Gaston, the leader of Anti-Cigarette League of America (ACL), lacked the same kind of leadership and did not strictly adhere to her own doctrines, eventually cost her loss of credibility as the spokesman as well as the consistency of the ACL’s actions. She seemed to have understood little of political use of organization; the ACL was not united under the same cause. Some of its supporters advocated the movement because of their individual interests rather than the common ‘moral’ cause to secure the society. They were interested in banning “cigarettes,” instead of tobacco products altogether. Some of them, including Thomas Edison
and John Sullivan, themselves used other tobacco products. By banning only the cigarettes, they believed that they might have better chance of removing negative images imposed on pipes, cigars and chew (Burns, 2007, p. 148). Following Benford and Snow’s framework, this can be seen as an instance of inconsistency of framing resulting in losing credibility of the claimsmakers.

Moreover, Gaston’s letters to Oberlin President King illustrate how unskillful she was in persuading others to join her cause. Instead of setting up an organization to agitate as Russell targeted the church, Gaston continuously implored only help and monetary support from influential individuals without a clear explanation of why the ACL needed King’s specific guidance, or what the ACL was going to do with such donations. Although Russell and Gaston were similar in their usage of warlike and missionary words such as “recruit,” and “war meetings,” Gaston lacked the understanding of the power of organization. She kept reminding herself and others that what she was doing was important without explaining why: “aid me in the great and difficult task I have undertaken” (King’s correspondence). In other words, Gaston made herself look less credible and thereby lost the power to “resonate” in the competition for social problems.

Rather, it was the tobacco firms that understood the power of politics and propaganda very well. Huge investments on advertisements portraying cigarettes as liberators of women, and painkillers for soldiers turned the tide against the Gaston’s arguments on cigarettes (Kluger, 1996).

Furthermore, the ASL, the alcohol framers, was successful in fostering Anglo-Saxon chauvinism while the ACL, the tobacco framers, failed to do so. Another factor that can be considered important in influencing the resonance of alcohol and tobacco framing is how the rhetoric of prohibitionists -alcohol or tobacco- help consolidate or create a certain collective
identity. According to Benford and Snow, framing is connected with collective identity: "not only do framing processes link individuals and groups ideologically but they proffer, buttress, and embellish identities that range from collaborative to conflictual (p. 632). Both alcohol and tobacco framers tried to create WASP identity, but only alcohol framers were successful.

The ASL successfully designated and consolidated Anglo-Saxon identity and alienated the others. Wayne Wheeler, Oberlin alumni hand-recruited by Russell and who later became a spokesman for the ASL, spoke in a manner that “demonizing [ed] the immigrant”: “most of the offenders against the liquor and narcotics laws are aliens” (Okrent, 2010, p. 237). The saloon culture, in the minds of the dominant Anglo-Saxons, was an ethos of lesser European immigrants, defining bootleggers to be “from the slums of Europe” and “the very lowest layer of European society” who included, Polish Jews, Slavs, Austria-Hungary, Italians and Russian Jews (ibid. p.236). Anglo-Saxon chauvinism of the ASL posed the WASP as an important collective identity while juxtaposing the immigrant groups as the dominated; the cultures and norms of the dominant were to be respected throughout the American society and the rest to be ignored and subdued. This helped the dry arguments resonate within WASP circle by bolstering preexisting racism and collective identity (Appendix I, Images 13).

As for the tobacco case, cigarettes did not become successful in its use of rhetoric, aimed at linking racism, and individualism and rationalization. The “empirical” or the visible effects of cigarettes never were as serious as the alcohol’s effects. The racist accusations of smokers as the Chinese and the Spaniards were not enough to problematize the matter; rather, lack of evidence that tobacco products are uncontrollable resulted in the opposite direction that tobacco prohibitionists wanted it to be. The rise of humanitarianism also defined cigarettes as liberators of female independence and thereby defined cigarette prohibiting efforts as inhibition to
individual freedom. The dominant and the dominated, in this case, were switched compared to the alcohol case. The collective identity in the tobacco frame did not form around the Anglo-Saxon chauvinism or existing racism. Instead, with the support from the cigarette companies, humanitarian individualism became the new ideology that people could collectively identify with and thereby might have resulted in the fall of tobacco as a social problem.

Moreover, the rising power of women added to political opportunities that alcohol justified women’s access to the vote while cigarette celebrated their access to public life. Women in the public sphere played a huge role in shaping the perceptions of tobacco and alcohol (Bigglestone, 1983, p. 79). The suffrage movement was borne out of the temperance movement: “to have a voice in selecting those to office who will put down intemperance, licentiousness and other vices” (Burns, 2007, p. 79). Temperance was particularly linked to the abolition of slavery because it gave voice to women in the public sphere (p. 78).

After the abolition of slavery, temperance provided another opportunity for women to voice their opinions in the public sphere. The ASL’s ties to women’s suffrage were clear in a letter Russell received from Susan B. Anthony in Dec, 27, 1899.

Since the failure to solve the saloon problem has not been the want of right sentiment but the lack of votes, it must be evident to every logical mind that what is needed is an additional balance of power in the body politics, which would be sure to throw itself into the scale against the saloon...What I desire is the influence of the league for the enfranchisement of women.

Although Russell himself was personally opposed to women’s enfranchisement, he endorsed her help and started to work with the suffrage movement as well (Dohn, 1959).

The aim of ASL’s propaganda was linking slavery and saloon problem altogether.
Although it did have xenophobic and racial supremacy at the base of their arguments, linking them together gave pretext for women to participate more in prohibitionist causes. As mothers of nation and caring housewives, women who once stopped slavery now could justify themselves to also stop saloons which posed a great threat as to enslaving every household (Appendix I, Image 13).

Around 1888, arguments connecting slavery and temperance started to appear. In an Oberlin Weekly News article, the writer argued that:

“temperance with a few verbal changes may well be substituted for slavery. Indeed, this subject [temperance] came within the broad scope of Garrison’s [one of the founders of anti-slavery movement] philanthropy, but was kept in a subordinate position by the crying demands of the monster evil [slavery] of that day. Now that is no longer necessary, what hinders the adoption of those powerful methods in the reform of the public use of intoxicants?”

The article asserted that the first founders of anti-slavery movement also emphasized philanthropy and temperance. According to the author, abolition and temperance had the same roots and since slavery was abolished, people should also try to solve the intemperance issue. Tying slavery and alcohol together was a powerful rhetoric in Oberlin because Oberlin was one of the vanguards of the abolitionists and fiercely fought for the North.

In another article written in 1891, the writer said that “the saloon will yet strain this republic as slavery never did if it is not stopped.” These articles addressed saloons as the next big issue to be fought against, as exemplified in the above mentioned quote of Amos Root: “God grant that Oberlin may fight for temperance as they fought in years past against slavery.”

On the other hand, tobacco, as mentioned, became framed as the symbol of emancipation
of women. Realizing that the rise of women was a political force to be reckoned with, tobacco companies, investing huge sums of money into advertising and propaganda, solidified the positive image of cigarettes and used such powers against the other tobacco products - chew, snuff, cigar - that were considered “equal” before.

Code: Tobacco Ban, 2014

In 2014, the status of alcohol and tobacco as social problems seems to be switched; students are interested in banning cigarettes while being apathetic to alcohol.

Since the 1980’s, Oberlin has become lenient towards alcohol sales and consumption. In 1984, beer sales were permitted in Oberlin. The town issued the first liquor license in 1993 and the second one in 1997, to the Feve. Starting in 2010, Oberlin has permitted additional liquor licenses in its restaurants such as Tooo Chinoise, Black River, and Weia Tei.

Meanwhile, tobacco products are newly problematized. In 1919, smoking was only allowed inside buildings. Since 1993, the tobacco policy limits “smoking by its faculty, staff, students, and visitors to outdoor areas on campus that are 30 feet away from building entrances, exits, and vents. Smoking is banned at all times in all campus buildings and college-owned vehicles.” (Office of Student Wellness, 2014). Although Spring Referendum of 2010, tobacco surveys revealed that majority of the students and the Student Senate was intrinsically against tobacco and did not smoke, they did not support the ban and remained “indifferent” (ibid). However, active student participation in 2013 and 2014 resulted in a successful prohibition of smoking in front of the main Mudd Library; recently, students voted to make the campus tobacco-free (Appendix I, Image 14).

Moreover, second-hand smoking currently is receiving the same recognition once the
saloons had during the prohibition years: it is an external evil that “innocent” individuals cannot escape. The matter has become a social problem, while alcohol is losing its ground as one. Alcohol might be a problem in some cases, but it has become a “normal trouble,” a concept designed by Sherri Cavan. “Normal troubles” are “improper activities that are frequent enough to be simply shrugged off or ignored…[it] is often treated as though it were the same as any other feature of the standing behavior patterns, as in a sense it is, insofar as it may be a taken-for-granted aspect of the public drinking place” (Cavan, 1966, p. 18). Drinking lightly has become “frequent enough” and thus often “ignored” unless it becomes serious hazards, like binge drinking.

This might be attributed to the fact that in the age of empiricism, the effects “proven” by science matters the most. Tobacco has gained a reputation as the most deadly carcinogens of the lung. It victimizes not only the individual himself who smokes, though unwillingly by the addictive chemical nicotine, but also the others surrounding him. In other words, the rise in tobacco use in the early 20th century was interpreted as a marker of individual self-assertion, while the consumption of alcohol was seen as relinquishing one’s self-control and thus making one dangerous to self and others. Nowadays, tobacco relinquishes not only one’s self-control but also others’ self-controls though the means of second-hand smoking; it is considered both individually and socially harmful.

However, the tobacco argument in Oberlin seems to be developing into a battle of social justice and morality, about who is morally supreme and right. Using widely known negative impacts of tobacco on human body as the basis for empirical credibility, non-smokers, headed by the Student Senate and many faculty members - giving “credibility” to the spokesmen -, create a collective identity of non-smokers against the smokers. The tone of the argument used in framing
even resembles that of Richmond’s speech in House of Representatives; non-smokers - rural states - have the responsibility as a part of the greater community to take care of smokers - cities and immigrants. An article from Fearless and Loathing, a student organized newspaper, reveals such paternalistic side of student involvement in tobacco politics:

“This tobacco ban is about more than just a change in attitude. It’s about our health as a community and really caring for each other. No one wants to stand by and watch his or her peers struggle with addiction. I can promise you, after years of having a smoker for a parent, worrying and wondering what might befall them, I would never wish that on anyone. That’s why this ban is important. As a community, we need to support each other when we need it most. We need to care about each other, especially when it comes to our health. That’s why we should be tobacco-free by the Fall of 2016” (Freeman-Lifschutz, 2013).

The writer, based on her own experience, designated smoking as a vice that people need to quit for the greater good of community, and non-smokers should “help” smokers quit. Her other words reveal her paternalistic and moral supremacy in a better way: “Do you know how hard it is to quit smoking?” There are no mentions of smoking as an enjoyable pastime or unwillingness of some smokers to quit at all. In Oberlin, smoking is becoming a politicized evil that needs to be dealt with: “This is a social justice issue” (Doll, 2013). Richmond’s speech indeed resembles a great deal with Freeman-Lifschutz speech:

“it is not only proper and right that the rural States of a Republic like ours [as a community supporting each other] should have a voice in the Nation-wide [Oberlin-wide] problems which venter in the cities, but from the standpoint of the welfare of the cities themselves, such a course is imperative”
Indeed, Oberlin’s new focus on tobacco is moving similarly into what possessed the minds of the ASL prohibitionists; the rhetorical bases for creating collective identity have changed from racist remarks to moral supremacy.

The findings of this paper lead to more thoughts on the contemporary dynamics of alcohol and tobacco. Since this paper puts more emphasis on the early 20th century, in-depth data analysis of ongoing process of framing tobacco and deconstructing alcohol as social problems in the 21st century would help further the understanding of the process of problematization, how social problems arise and fall.
Appendix I: Images

Image 1 Pipe Advertising (1909)


Image from Oberlin College Archives.
Baxter posing (left), Baxter and his friends in a Seldom Inn with pipes. Curtis Baxter.

Student Scrapbook. Image from Oberlin College Archives
Image 5 “Our War for Human Rights”

Image 6 Who Pays the Taxes?

Cartoons such as these carried a powerful anti-liquor message. MHC. Image from Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library.
Vote Against the Saloons

A temperance poster. (above). A pragmatic argument for temperance based on alcohol’s medical and moral effects. MHC. Image from Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library.
**Image 8 Moderate Drinking Reduces the Worker’s Efficiency**

A dataset showing how alcohol causes inefficiency. Image from Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library.
A graph showing how alcohol causes immorality in British women. Image from Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library.
Image 10 Alcoholism and Degeneration

A dataset of how alcohol causes degeneration in children. Image from Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library.
Posters urging to vote “dry.” MHC. Image from Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library.
A cartoon with racist remarks; German immigrants as the brewers. Image from Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library.
Prohibitionists believed that women were their natural allies (above). Posters warning the vice of saloon (bottom). MHC. Image from Anti-Saloon League Museum in Westerville Public Library.
Images 14 We are Oberlin. Intolerant (2013)

Poster making a parody of Oberlin’s motto: “We are Oberlin, Fearless.” Oberlin College Republicans.
Image 15 The Experience of a Sucker.

An old sucker lived with other fishes at the bottom of a pond. She was observant, cautious and wise. A pickerel and a bass made sad havoc with her descendants, for each often took one of them for his dinner; so the old sucker was not sad when the pickerel was gone. His going, as seen by the sucker, happened in this wise:

A large angleworm fell on the surface of the water, and sank toward the bottom; but when part way down it stopped, for something prevented its sinking further. As she watched it she saw the old pickerel dart from his hiding place and catch it, as often before he had caught one of her babies.

Then something very strange,—the old pickerel lost his self-control; he seemed to want to go back to his safe hiding place, but he did the other way. Something seemed to be pulling him the wrong way, and it pulled and pulled until he was gone, and he never came back.

Not long after, the bass, after a similar experience, was gone, and he never came back.

When the old sucker saw another worm come in the same way, she wanted to understand it, but thought it better to learn by the experience of the pickerel and bass than to have such experience herself, so she left the worm alone; but one of her grandchildren, who was younger and thought himself wiser than she, said: "I will find out about this, grandma." The old sucker replied: "You had better leave it alone, or it may pull you away as it did the others;" but the young one said: "I have often sucked angleworms in my mouth. They tasted good, and did me no harm." The old one said: "I advise you to keep away from it." The young one thought to himself, "Oh, she's an old granny! I will just suck it a little, and if I feel it pull I will let go." So he sucked it in his mouth and thought it was nice; but when he started to go back to his grandmother it pulled him the other way. He wanted to let go, but he did not; for he was hooked, and in spite of his wishes he went to the—fisherman.

Another fisherman uses cigarettes, tobacco or beer for his bait, and many a sucker sucks them in, thinking he will let go when they pull the wrong way; but after indulging a while, when he wants to go right he finds himself so hooked and held by the habit that instead of going right he goes to the—devil.

Religious argument against liquor. Oberlin College Archives.
A Way to Make Money and a Better Way

A gallon of whisky contains about 65 drinks, a quarter of a barrel of beer about 725 drinks. You can buy either for $2. You pay in a saloon 10 cents a drink or $8.50 a gallon for whisky, and 5 cents or $6.25 a quarter for beer. Some writer has said:

Now, if you must drink whisky, buy a gallon and make your wife the housekeeper; then, when you are dry, give her ten cents for a drink. When the whisky is gone, she will have, after paying for it, $4.50 left, and every gallon thereafter will yield the same profit. This money she should put away in the Savings Bank, so that if you become a drunkard, unable to support yourself, your wife may have money enough to keep you until your time comes.

A BETTER WAY.

Don’t drink. If you don’t drink, you save the whole $8.50, and save yourself from the danger of becoming a drunkard. Of men starting when twenty years old, with equal chances, some are rich and some are poor at fifty. Why?

Financial argument against liquor. Oberlin College Archives.
A short story of a drunkard killing his wife and children. Oberlin College Archives.
Image 18 Charged With Murder

workman, a tender father and a loving husband. But to-day my home is destroyed, my wife murdered, my little children—God bless and care for them—cast out on the mercy of the world, while I am to be hung by the strong arm of the State.

"God knows, I tried to reform, but as long as the open saloon was in my pathway, my weak, diseased will-power was no match against the fearful, consuming, agonizing appetite for liquor.

"For one year our town was without a saloon. For one year I was a sober man. For one year my wife and children were happy, and our little home was a paradise.

"I was one of those who signed remonstrances against re-opening the saloons of our town. One-half of this jury, the prosecuting attorney on this case, and the Judge who sits on this bench, all voted for the saloons. By their votes and influence saloons were re-opened, and they have made me what I am."

The impassioned words of the prisoner fell like coals of fire upon the hearts of those present, and many of the spectators and some of the lawyers were moved to tears. The Judge made a motion as if to stop further speech, when the speaker hastily said:

"Not! Not your honor, do not close my lips; I am nearly through.

"I began my downward career at a saloon BAR—legalized and protected by the voters of this town. After the saloons you allowed have made me a drunkard and a murderer, I am taken before another BAR—the bar of Justice, and now the Law-power will conduct me to the place of execution and hasten my soul into eternity. I shall appear before another bar—the JUDGMENT BAR OF GOD, and there you, who have legalized the traffic, will have to appear with me. Thank you that the Great Judge will hold me—the poor weak, helpless victim of your traffic—alone responsible for the murder of my wife? Nay, I in my drunken, frenzied, irresponsible condition have murdered ONE—but you have deliberately voted for the saloons which have murdered thousands, and they are in full operation to-day with your consent.

"All of you know in your hearts that these words of mine are not the ravings of an unsound mind, but God Almighty's truth.

"You legalized the saloons that made me a drunkard and a murderer, and you are guilty with me before God and man for the murder of my wife.

"Your honor, I am done. I am now ready to receive my sentence and be led forth to the place of execution. You will close by asking the Lord to have mercy on my soul. I will close by solemnly asking God to open your blind eyes to your own individual responsibility, so that you will cease to give your support to this dreadful traffic."

Published by the Ohio Anti-Saloon League, Columbus, O.
Price 90 cents per thousand.
Appendix II.

Table 1.

Changes in the status of tobacco as a social problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Tobacco in Oberlin</th>
<th>Tobacco outside Oberlin</th>
<th>Anti-tobacco arguments in Oberlin</th>
<th>Anti-tobacco arguments outside Oberlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833-1880</td>
<td>Uncontested</td>
<td>Uncontested</td>
<td>Temperance//Abstinence</td>
<td>Temperance//Abstinence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moral//Empirical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vs. Individual//Humanitarian Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual//Humanitarian Rights</td>
<td>Liberty//New Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.
Changes in the status of alcohol as a social problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Alcohol in Oberlin</th>
<th>Alcohol outside Oberlin</th>
<th>Anti-alcohol arguments in Oberlin</th>
<th>Anti-alcohol arguments in Oberlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833-1880</td>
<td>Uncontested</td>
<td>Uncontested</td>
<td>Temperance//Abstinence Moral</td>
<td>Temperance//Abstinence Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1909</td>
<td>Contested in favor of “dry” Student/Faculty indifference</td>
<td>Contested in favor of “dry”</td>
<td>Religious//Moral //Financial //Degenerate</td>
<td>Religious//Moral //Financial//Degenerate //Xenophobic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.
Cancer deaths, United States 1900-40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Numbers (000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Patterson 1987: 32, 80, 88, 95, 159, 235, 301
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