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The history of temperance and prohibition has long been constructed as either a rural backlash against modernity or a defining feature of middle-class culture. Early scholarship inaccurately denounced prohibition as a consequence of rural discontent in an increasingly urban immigrant America. More recent scholarship has relocated temperance in middle-class culture and politics, often to the neglect of the agrarian sector. Using an exploration of the production of space, this dissertation reexamines the place of temperance in the transition of the North American colonies from a largely subsistence-oriented society to a modern market-centric nation-state. I contend that as a middle-class movement, temperance emerged out of the enclosure and improvement movements and trace the movement’s history as a cultural arm of enclosure through to the passage of national prohibition. As shown herein, dry crusaders of the early republic were antagonistic to the subsistence farmers who were viewed as a threat to the national project. This antagonism was extended to new stock immigrant farmers who arrived in waves through much of the 1800s. In an attempt to redefine American farms and fields,
across the nineteenth and early twentieth century, temperance advocates pushed farm commercialization and the transformation of farming and food systems to meet the needs of an industrial society. But because temperance ideology failed to address the very real economic concerns of farmers in their struggles with the transition to commercial production, agrarian America remained ambivalent to temperance up to and following the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment.
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Introduction

To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven; a time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up…What profit hath he that worketh in that wherein he laboureth? I have seen the travail, which God hath given to the sons of men to be exercised therein. He hath made everything beautiful in his time: also he hath set eternity in their heart, yet so that man cannot find out the work that God hath done from the beginning even to the end. I know that there is nothing better for them, than to rejoice, and to do good so long as they live. And also that every man should eat and drink, and enjoy good in all his labor; it is the gift of God.

--Ecclesiastes 3:1-13

As of 1913, Jack London, a man in his thirties, had achieved four things modern Americans covet most: wealth, fame, power, and land ownership. Yet happiness eluded the author. He was aging, and prematurely at that. A lifetime of courting adventure--his involvement in the Klondike Gold Rush, excursions in the South Pacific, and escapades as an oyster pirate and seal hunter—every thrill-seeking journey, the substance of which he channel into his famous novels, all of it had taken its toll. Various diseases—some tropical and two “isms” (rheumatism and alcoholism) racked his frame. As he put it, he was “going” bit by bit. Bouts of scurvy were taking his teeth, old fights had made off with his dexterity, and his skeleton “strained and snapped” under his weight. All of this made London painfully aware of life’s tragic perishability or, as he put it, “the cosmic sadness that has always been the heritage of man.”

In reality, a modern angst plagued the author as evident in his autobiographical work, John Barleycorn (1913). An “enlightened” man, London dreaded mortality as a cruel function of a “cosmic sport of chemistry.” Every little thing he encountered


reminded him that his days were numbered. What did he have to look forward to? --only the “black abyss,” states London, “the merciless and infinite waste of natural section.”

Even his beautiful ranch—its dust, its twilight hours, and the name of its location, the Valley of the Moon—reminded him that life was a mirage, or as he surmised, a “perpetual lie-telling process.” Riding horseback over the valley, he contemplated the grapes in their autumn glory and the unattainable moon overhead whose phases, in the darkness of night, marked the relentless passage of time. Thus he states,

Life is a mad dance in the domain of flux, wherein appearances in mighty tides ebb and flow, chained to the wheels of moons beyond our ken… Life is apparitional, and passes. You are an apparition. Through all the apparitions that proceeded [sic] you and that compose the parts of you, you rose gibbering from the evolutionary mire, and gibbering you will pass on, interfusing, permeating the procession of apparitions that will succeed you.

London’s lamentations included a fierce desire to control and own both his fate and the land under his feet. But in the face of life’s “mad” and terminal dance, the possession of anything seemed elusive. The author mourns that he was simply the latest of a wave of settlers struggling to control the dust, never really capable of owning the stubborn and imperishable land. Notes London, no deed, no mortgage, no order of sale could subdue the earth for long. The indigenous gave way to the Mexicans, the Mexicans to the Anglos, and the Anglos to the immigrants, including famous names like Kohler and Frohling with their legendary wineries. “Prince or peasant,” it mattered little--all were

---

“dreamers and ghosts” who’s striving seemed a lie. The body was but a “flesh-machine” in the “continual process of becoming but never being.”

Yet ironically, London did not blame Darwin, or modernity and its priorities, or his habit of living fast and large. After all, modernity implied “knowledge” and “health”: two vague terms London embraced as death’s counterweight. No, London blamed alcohol, aka “John Barleycorn,” which he associated with death and disease, the “pseudo-civilization” of the past, the lingering remnants of an old agrarian culture, and the habits of foreigners. Ubiquitous alcohol represented a fundamental antagonism between past and future. For London, the world of the past was a world of cycles—day and night, birth and death; whereas the future promised nature’s subjugation to human will and priorities. This manner of human salvation, however, demanded the purging of the old.

According to London, his slow deterioration began at age five when out of curiosity he snuck a few gulps from his father’s beer pail on the family farm. Thus “poisoned,” little Jack became quite ill. The event was followed by other youthful misadventures. He drank to socialize and to prove his muster. But most of all, drink was part of his attraction to epic escapism. Frontiers captured his imagination, as did California’s communities of “swarthy and wild-looking” immigrants, a veritable breed of “old country peasants.” But as of 1913, the author scoffed at the Italian immigrants, the

---

7 London, John Barleycorn, 321, 326.
8 London, John Barleycorn, 328.
9 London, John Barleycorn, quote on 310; the influence of “wild” and “primitive” California and his immigrant “peasant” neighbors on 22, 27, 29. At times London notes that he picked up racist notions from his mother, but he also perpetuates those notions throughout this book.
“stupid clods” who drank and worked his land in an ignorant bliss born of religious faith in “a transcendent over-world.”¹¹ Notably, London came to resent Barleycorn too. Drink, he claimed was the giver of “too strong a truth,” the “brazen law of the Ecclesiast” or what he termed “White Logic”: the tragic knowledge that all things are transient.¹²

Thus London called for alcohol prohibition and for the vote for women, the “true conservators of the race.”¹³ Man, the maker of morality, after all, must “live again if he has to die to do it,” the author exclaimed.¹⁴ As if in defiance of the cosmic order, London harnessed his horse and rode down through the Valley of the Moon to vote “John Barleycorn out of existence and back into the historical limbo of our vanished customs of savagery.”¹⁵

This dissertation is not about London. It is, however, about the logic of London’s work, *John Barleycorn*, for this publication fits into a discourse on alcohol that spanned the nineteenth century and ultimately pushed through the Eighteenth Amendment in 1918. At its core, London’s angst emerges from the promises of modernity in breaking old limitations, natural, cultural and otherwise; and the threat posed to the modernizing project by older, established cultural forms and practices, which alcohol, anthropomorphized as John Barleycorn, came to represent.

---


This desire for control, as evinced in London’s work, in many ways came down to a quest to control land. Though temperance was through and through a movement of a largely urban middle class, its literature expressed intense concern regarding who, specifically, controlled land, the modes of cultivation employed on it, and what agricultural products were thereon produced. Many dry activists were deeply enamored with private property as a tool of reform and generator of wealth. For them, private property implied mastery—the ability to mold the world into a perfect society that would usher in a millennial golden age. Ergo this project considers the temperance movement as a cultural arm of enclosure.

Our story begins in the early modern world. Notably, the American temperance movement inherited ideas from the “improvement” movement. As noted in Victoria Di Palma’s *Wasteland: A History* (2014) in the seventeenth century, enclosers began arguing for land commodification or the “improvement” of “waste”—the commons and unused land— as necessary for the health and well-being of Britain. Their pamphlets suggested that certain landscapes and their inhabitants who existed outside of market imperatives impeded national progress. In their enclosure, forest and fens, hilly and wooded lands as well as many commons were treated as vacant or worse. Inhabitants were cast as morally suspect, villainous and idle, while enclosers eagerly constructed ale-houses and commons as “Nurseries of Idleness and Beggary.” Glowing tributes to improvement obscured its negative consequences; namely, the displacement of people and destruction of a diverse

---

range of ecologies. Not surprisingly, “improvement” was rationalized as fostering social stability by providing the newly displaced poor with employment and commodity foods. A new science, promoted by eminent figures such as Sir Francis Bacon, also contributed to the privileging of certain types of knowledge in service of the mastery of nature. In appropriating the power of creation, humans would refashion the world like never before in human history.\textsuperscript{17}

Contests between the forces of enclosure and its opposition found form in the pamphlet wars of the seventeenth century. It is here that John Barleycorn, the central figure of our story, first emerged as a folk icon in defense of drink and the commons.\textsuperscript{18} That Barleycorn becomes the bête noire of the American temperance movement is testament to the cultural inheritance of the United States and the literary exchange between Anglo Americans and their British counterparts. Of course this exchange does not explain the tremendous appeal of John Barleycorn as a metaphor in the American context. In fact, this dissertation argues that Barleycorn’s ubiquity in American publications challenges us to consider the context in which the American temperance movement formulated its ideological cornerstones.

To meet this challenge, I investigate temperance as a movement that formed in the transition from a colonial society, which was divided between commercial and subsistence cultures, to a liberal nation-state with all the imperatives of a market revolution. Notably, this transition was not the smooth march toward nationalism that has

\textsuperscript{17} Di Palma, \textit{Wasteland: A History}, 45-47.

become a staple myth of undergraduate education. Indeed, as historian Alan Taylor notes, it is fitting that we view the Revolutionary War as incomplete as of 1783. After the Treaty of Paris, the conflict continued as a sporadic civil war between coastal elites and backcountry resistance—a conflict that lasted until approximately the early mid-nineteenth century. The inland rebels that spanned the frontier are known by many names: Green Mountain Boys, Regulators, Liberty Men, Shaysites, and of course, Whiskey Rebels.¹⁹ A close reading of temperance documents reveals that the early temperance movement defined itself in opposition to the inland farmer and rebel element. And much like the propagandists of the improvement movement, these early reformers couched the commodification of land and commercialization of agriculture as necessary for the survival of the new nation.

But, if the improvement movement provided the outline for the story, the temperance movement wrote it large, making the conversion to commercial farming and enforced abstinence from drink necessary for the completion of a uniquely millennial national mission. As movements go, the American war against John Barleycorn stands as the most vibrant and long-lived campaign to eliminate the production and consumption of alcohol. The American movement fed similar campaigns abroad, the most notable in Great Britain. But none of its emulators could claim as extensive a following, nor did they carry the cause as far as their American counterparts. Arguably, this is due to context. The Protestant groups of New England that championed temperance in the US

---

dominated the religious, economical, and political landscape. They were deeply invested in the country’s commercial revolution and stood out as powerful proprietors of culture. Elsewhere, the same sects constituted a minority. The English Church and political establishment viewed Calvinism and other splinter sects as a threat to its authority, and in Germany, Lutheranism and Catholicism held sway. Likewise, drinking was far more rooted in European identities than among Anglo Americans who, after the revolution, increasingly defined Americanism by abstinence. Contests over land, political power, and culture between these old stock immigrants and a continuous stream of new arrivals imparted the American temperance cause with a decidedly racist edge. In contrast, the British movement, which began with a strong following in the early 1800s, shrunk significantly by the end of the century as wet and dry lines solidified along class divisions and opposition from well-established producers.²⁰

As this dissertation points out, America’s frontier heritage informed the movement as well. Each territorial shift brought with it a new wave of migration, settlement, and improvement. Temperance reformers appeared on every frontier, ready to police development. In fact, reformers moved on several frontiers simultaneously: the ever-shifting westward settlements, the international frontier of enclosure and liberalism,

²⁰ In regards to Great Britain, see Stephen Orchard, “‘The Fangs of the Serpent are Hid in the Bowl’: The Temperance Movement,” (Lecture at the Museum of London, Mar. 25, 2013), accessed July 1, 2014, http://www.gresham.ad.uk/lectures-and-events/the-fangs-of-the-serpent-are-hid-in-the-bowl--the-temperance-movement. Orchard reviews the British movement, noting how it waxed with the dispersal of tracts and lecturing made possible by railroads, its early appeal for labour and suffragists, and limits due to class associations and demythologizing campaigns of producers. For notations on Germany see Jack S. Blocker, David M. Fahey, and Ian Tyrell’s Alcohol and Temperance in Modern History: A Global Encyclopedia, vol. I (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003), 257. This work notes that an early temperance movement emerged in Germany, but this minority movement could not compete with a majority that preferred regulation over suppression.
and the American South, especially during the region’s post-Civil War transformation. Each success was viewed by the movement as a sign of the righteousness of its cause. Each setback was blamed on the resilience of barbarism and “feudal power”—an imagined unholy alliance between an old aristocratic element and America’s immigrant peasantry.

Throughout this project, I explore the story of farmers and their attempts to either flee or successfully navigate the spreading market paradigm as well as the demands of its cultural gatekeepers. As commercial entities and employers seeking sober and industrious workers, some farmers found temperance appealing. Yet, farmers of all stripes (subsistence and commercial, old stock and new) relied economically on alcohol production, a fact that was rarely given due consideration by middle-class temperance reformers in their attempts to recruit farmers to their cause. In targeting whiskey and cider, dry forces sought to undermine subsistence culture and economies that depended on its inherent use and commodity value. Commercial-scale alcohol manufacturing was targeted for very similar reasons as an assumed threat to the industrial order. Resistance was treated as subversive. Consequently, the loyalties of farmers as a group were frequently held in question.

Scholars have long noted that farming as an intersection of society and nature is a poor fit for the demands of capitalism. Numerous works on the modern history of agriculture evoke Karl Marx, who famously states in *Capital*, Volume III, that “a rational
agriculture is incompatible with the capitalist system”. The reason for this incompatibility was found in the ethic of improvement as the ethic of exploitation fundamental to capitalism. For one, improvement compartmentalized production, breaking the nutrient cycle and social ecology that once bound town and country in a symbiotic relationship. As Marx notes, the problem was altogether visible for anyone with eyes to see. He states, “In London… they can do nothing better with the excrement produced by 4½ million people than pollute the Thames with it, at monstrous expense.”

Large populous cities, alienated from the countryside and geared toward industrial production, dumped their organic waste into ports, lakes, and rivers instead of directing effluence into farm and field. Second, the notion of improvement through the use of new seed, fertilizer, drainage, machinery, and longer hours for less pay, Marx contends, reflected a system-wide irrationality; namely, short-term fixes for systemic frictions and the ongoing art of “robbery” in the name of liberating tied up capital. Improvement had deep implications for quality of living as well. Mass production promised to feed vast populations but at the expense of other dimensions of life, such as the value of leisure and enjoyable and meaningful sustenance.


The contradictions of capitalism are deeply felt by farmers due to the nature of farming. As journalist Raj Patel notes, as an intersection of the natural world and human endeavors, farming is “a tangle of different social relations, of intervention and displacement in complex social and environmental webs.”

There is elegance in the very practical arrangements of subsistence farmers within their ecologies and their communities. That elegance is lost, however, when farmers are forced to respond to global markets instead of local environmental and human needs. Markets drive farmers toward monocultures, indebtedness, extractive processes, and “panicked self-exploitation”—growing more and more “in a desperate bid to survive” the downward market pressure on pricing. As this project details, farmers consistently framed their attitudes toward temperance in relation to this unremitting trend. In this process we see how a quest for cultural uniformity informs material demands for the production of surplus value. Indeed, the valorization of capital is as much a cultural product as a material process.

That being said, this dissertation is the story of two tricksters. By definition, John Barleycorn is a traditional trickster—a “giver and negator” of a very different value system than the one Americans know today. He represents the commons at their best as a functioning social system. In the world of the commercial revolution, temperance crusaders were quick to implicate Barleycorn as a source of all mischief and social ills.


27 Here I use a definition of a traditional trickster put forth in Lewis Hyde’s *Trickster Makes This World: Mischief, Myth, and Art* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010), 10.
But it is the market that most confounds farmers; and when farmers mistake the two and blame Barleycorn for their troubles, the consequences expose the real trickster of modernity. That trickster-- the market and its ethic-- is not a trickster in the traditional sense, for as Lewis Hyde notes, the trickster of indigenous peoples “isn’t a run-of-the-mill liar and thief. When he lies and steals, it isn’t so much to get away with something or get rich as to disturb the established categories of truth and property.”

By contrast, the modern trickster is opportunism personified in a “land where individuals are allowed and even encouraged to act without regard to community.” In keeping with Hyde and the trickster spirit, I hold up Barleycorn’s story in the temperance saga in hopes that he might illuminate a different perspective on the movement.

Unlike most historical treatments of temperance, which focus almost exclusively on specific waves of reform-oriented mobilization, this dissertation approaches the American crusade as a single project spanning over a century. As legal historian Richard F. Hamm contends, that temperance was “[a]s old as the republic”—a statement that bears some irony since Hamm’s *Shaping the 18th Amendment: Temperance Reform, Legal Culture, and the Polity, 1880-1920* (1995) only closely examines the last forty years of the crusade. I point out that despite an ebbing tide of involvement, the

---


29 Hyde, *Trickster Makes This World*, 11.

movement never really disappeared at any moment, and that across time its ideological framework remained consistent. Indeed, during the lull between first wave and second wave temperance running from the late 1850s and early 1870s, the work of devoted activists ensured the movement’s survival despite mid-century setbacks. I find that this extended perspective more accurately reflects how the movement perceived itself as evident in the histories produced by temperance activists themselves. Such sources include Pennsylvania Anti-Saloon League leader Harry Malcolm Chalfant’s Father Penn and John Barleycorn (1920); British temperance society leader P.T. Winskill’s The Temperance Movement and Its Workers (1892); Massachusetts WCTU president, Katharine Lent Stevenson’s A Brief History of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (1907), among others.31 These histories and other reform-oriented publications also reveal the common sentiment that temperance was a driving force of modernity, even though such writings also displayed ambivalence to social trends that contemporary historians would attribute to the very processes of social reorganization that the movement championed. Indeed, activists read the social ills of modernity as strong evidence that their reformation was incomplete.

Many small points make the bigger story, and in the spirit of maintaining the complexity of the movement, I include many temperance forays into the related realms of

---


the “food question.” The result is many layered stories which, when read collectively, evince a historical “Roman knot” that implicates temperance as a movement in the commercialization and industrialization of the nation’s food systems. Reformers of the early nineteenth century were quick to note that an industrial economy required a thorough re-orientation of both food production and consumption. The new commercial sector needed the conversion of the nation’s many subsistence farmers into market-oriented workers, producers, and consumers. To accomplish this, activists targeted the heart of the subsistence system—its land, food, and drink. When it came to the last two, reformers sought to sanitize the diverse landscape of “victuals”—a term that meant, in its archaic form, “commons” or “usual” foods. Items to be eliminated included wild and fermented food and drink that were staples of subsistence cultures and immigrant ethnic groups. In their stead was championed canned, pasteurized and “fresh” commercial fare such as table fruit, wheat, and dairy. I point out that ferments drew intense scrutiny as products of newly discovered microbes, broadly cast as the key to the elimination of disease and possibly even death. In their quest for economic vitality, social health, and immortality, temperance advocates launched educational campaigns against all products and people associated with microorganisms.

Understandably, attempts to instate temperance through law resulted in many unintended consequences that exposed the defects of temperance thinking and contradictions within the capitalist system the movement endorsed as a route to a perfect

32 Nathan Bailey, *Dictionary Britannicum, Or a More Compleat Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (London: Printed for T. Cox, at the Lamb under the Royal-Exchange, 1736), n.p. Section CO. “Commons” also carried a derogatory association as “sparing” community meals. The term has held over in the university commons where students gather to eat.
order. For one, while the drink and its cultural associations served as an embodiment of waste begging for enclosure, the commerce of drink and its presumably seductive wares only proliferated with increased commercial activity. From the start, in treating alcohol manufacturing as the antithesis of market society crusaders overlooked the industry’s economic weight and place in commercial development. By the mid-1800s, the existence of hunger, despite swelling abundance and new disturbing patterns in man-made famines belied the belief that technology, free markets, and the redirection of crops away from the brewery, winery, and distillery could effectively feed the world. There were environmental consequences as well. Throughout, dry activists –many of whom combined moral activism with agricultural boosterism and land speculation-- championed numerous unsustainable practices: massive irrigation projects, monocrop cultivation, and the production of alcohol for industrial needs using farm “waste”, i.e. detritus typically plowed back into the soil to help maintain its fertility. The consequences included the proliferation of agricultural pests and disease, soil salinization, and a form of cultivation that would ultimately lead to rolling ecological catastrophes. Moreover, new, fragile, and obscure lines of interdependency enabled a dysfunctional politics which, in the short run, worked to the benefit of the temperance movement with its simple faith-based panacea. Ultimately, however, such contradictions rebounded because temperance ideology bore little resemblance to reality.

The place of farmers in scholarship on prohibitionary regimes has been both problematic and slim. When it comes to the drive for alcohol prohibition, early works set a definitive tone, which seriously misconstrued the place of farmers in the movement.
John Allen Krout’s *The Origins of Prohibition* (1925) and Richard Hofstadter in *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* (1955) couched prohibition as an expression of cultural and demographic shift, with prohibition situated as a rural backlash to urbanization.\(^{33}\) In fact, scholars in the field widely recognize Hofstadter’s responsibility for establishing an enduring myth; namely, that prohibition served a fearful and prejudiced country mindset in an age of immigrant urbanization. States Hofstadter, temperance represented an “insistent… minority sentiment” that was “carried about America by the rural-evangelical virus.”\(^{34}\) Hofstadter’s stance is understandable yet seriously flawed. The urban press often blamed farmers for prohibition because of the way the Anti-Saloon League targeted rural voters to push through local option laws. Some farmers did support the cause, but none of this accurately reflects the long-standing antagonism between farmers and crusaders. Nor did Hofstadter seriously explore the origins of the movement. Unfortunately, because of Hofstadter, it is not unusual to read references to prohibition as the last desperate stand of stubborn rural provincials in contemporary history textbooks. For instance, the *American Pageant*, my high school textbook, referred to prohibition as a “peculiar spasm of progressivism” that appealed mostly to the rural Midwest and racist South.\(^{35}\)


Like all works, this dissertation is informed by a combination of personal experience and research. I originally sought to construct a comprehensive picture of the relationship between farming and prohibition regimes from alcohol prohibition to the war on drugs in an effort to address a gap in scholarship that spans both alcohol prohibition and drug interdiction. Common cultural assumptions as the driving mechanism across these prohibitionary regimes drew me deeper into the temperance movement than originally planned. In its entirety, the story that emerged could not be told in a single volume. That said, this dissertation is the first chapter of that larger story. More will follow.

When it comes to questioning historical treatments of farmers and temperance, my interest emerged from the type of cognitive dissonance that arises when the world you know does not fit the dominant narrative. As a child I spent many a barefoot summer on my maternal grandparent’s farm in Ottoville, Ohio, a small German-American farm community. I also heard lots of talk about my father’s family farm in Illinois and the wonderful things my grandmother baked, cooked, and fermented. Within my family circle on both sides, farming and fermenting went hand-in-hand. Farming meant homemade wine and bubbling crocks of sauerkraut in the cellar. Drink lacked stigma, though moderation was implied. My grandfather, George Brickner, until his death, was an unapologetic whiskey drinker. Family farming methods were conservative in the true sense of the word, relying on kin and neighborliness (not hired hands) to plant and bring in harvests. Instead of joining the rush to mechanize my grandfather working the fields with horse and plow until 1948 when he bought his one and only tractor. Most notably,
when I asked my mother how the family felt about temperance and prohibition her response was simple: “It didn’t apply to us.” It seemed a fitting sentiment. Of course, my family was German and Catholic. Then again, there were a lot of German-American farmers in the Midwest, and beyond cultural differences, there are very practical and pecuniary reasons for farm resistance to the so-called Temperance Reformation. Perhaps unsurprisingly, I have long wondered about the discrepancies between the world I knew and the history I have read.

As we know, history is a living discipline. Recent challenges to Hofstadter’s thesis have redirected historical focus to the middle class with emphasis on the relationship between temperance and other social reform and political agendas. Joseph Gusfield’s *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement* (1963) recast temperance as a largely symbolic movement in which temperance figured as a status-enhancing norm, which ultimately factored into the politics behind the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment.\(^{36}\) Ian Tyrell’s *Sobering Up: From Temperance to Prohibition in Antebellum America, 1800-1860* (1979) and John J. Rumbarger’s *Profits, Power, and Prohibition: Alcohol Reform and the Industrializing of America, 1800-1930* (1989) made important moves in locating temperance in the class dynamics of commercial society where urban, progress-oriented professions and respectable women found in temperance a marker of success and a way to police labor.\(^{37}\) Similarly, historian


18
Mary Ryan has pointed out that temperance, as part of a new middle-class value system, provided young men and women in the new commercial world with a form of “moral capital” that gave them an edge gaining employment in the early 1800s.\(^{38}\) Shifting gender roles, especially the roles of women in regards to separate spheres and domesticity in the nineteenth-century urban environment are also featured in Ryan’s work, among others. Ryan and Tyrell do discuss commercial farmer to some extent, but middle-class culture and interests of employers remained the primary focus of these works. Likewise, Gusfield does point out that in the 1880s disgruntled farmers in several states join the cause, however, he does not explain why farmers had not previously supported the movement or the limits of their dedication to the politics of prohibition.

Several more recent works offer valuable insight into prohibition messaging and tactics. Among these Richard Hamm’s *Shaping the Eighteenth Amendment: Temperance Reform, Legal Culture, and the Polity, 1880-1920* (1995), provides a legal history that also comments on the use of the budding discipline of social science to make a case for prohibition.\(^{39}\) Jonathan Zimmerman’s *Distilling Democracy: Alcohol Education in American’s Public Schools, 1880-1925* (1999), looks at the influence of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union in mobilizing women in defining public school curriculum. Catherine Gilbert Murdock’s *Domesticating Drink: Women, Men, and Alcohol in America, 1870-1940* (1998) supplies valuable analysis on the role of women in both the passage and repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. Notes Murdock, gender was


\(^{39}\) Zimmerman, *Distilling Democracy* and Hamm, *Shaping the Eighteenth Amendment.*
omnipresent in the debate over drink, a trend that reflected profound changes in gender relations with socio-economic change and search for new definitions of appropriate behavior. 

These works denote a new scholarly trend in the proliferation of histories on the various facets of this decidedly middle-class movement. Unfortunately, when Hofstadter was jettisoned, interest in the farm element became secondary as focus turned toward the largely citified proponents of the dry cause. At the same time, new works that do not specifically fall under the umbrella of prohibition scholarship have contributed much to an alternative vision of the temperance-farm connection. Among new regional histories of interest, *Johnny Appleseed and the American Orchard: A Cultural History* (2012) by William Kerrigan offers a close study of the life of John Chapman, aka “Johnny Appleseed” with insights into the changing nature of agriculture in New England and the Midwest during the nineteenth century. Kerrigan’s work is especially noteworthy for its revelations on the temperance crusade against cider orchards, and perhaps more importantly, seedlings (as compared to grafted trees) as symbolic of new cider orchards in the making and thus a threat to abstinence and commercial transition. In the South, with the 1960s and 1970s social and cultural turn in historiography, new works challenged older notions of subsistence farming as a backward culture of poverty. With regards to small-scale distillers, David W. Maurer’s *Kentucky Moonshine* (1974) stands as the foundational work on the moonshine craft as part of an enduring folk culture of the

40 Murdock, *Domesticating Drink*, 3-6.

southern Appalachians. Journalist Joseph Earl Dabney has also penned valuable publications on mountain foodways with background history on the role of the excise tax in the colonization of Scotland, and enduring practices among America’s Scotch-Irish.

In addition, Joshua Beau Blackwell’s “Used to be a Rough Place in Them Hills”: Moonshine, the Dark Corner, and the New South (2009) notes that prohibition served modernization efforts in Greensville, South Carolina, and that resistance to modernization found form in bootlegging. Likewise, in regards to mountain foodways as a signifier of place and people, Sidney Saylor Farr’s More Than Moonshine: Appalachian Recipes and Recollections (1983) and Walter N. Lambert’s Kinfolks and Custard Pie: Recollection and Recipes from an East Tennessean (1988) combine history with regional cooking. In the realm of food politics, there is also Elizabeth SD Englehardt, “Beating the Biscuits in Appalachia: Race, Class and Gender Politics in Women Baking Bread,” (2001), which explores the shifting meaning of food items with time and regional uplift. Moreover, numerous insightful works have scrutinized the role of the culture industry in the creation
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42 David W. Maurer’s Kentucky Moonshine (Lexington: University of Kentucky, 2003).


44 Joshua Beau Blackwell, “Used to be a Rough Place in Them Hills”: Moonshine, the Dark Corner, and the New South (Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2009).


of Appalachian otherness, though these do not consider the linkages of subsistence agricultural forms to ferments.\footnote{See David E. Whisnant, \textit{All that is Native and Fine: The Politics of Culture in an American Region} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983) and Henry D. Shapiro, \textit{Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978).}

To date, no one has thoroughly drawn out the connection between the improvement and temperance movements. This includes the recognition that the ubiquity of references to John Barleycorn by dry crusaders is a reflection of that connection. Nor has anyone thoroughly explored the on-going role of temperance in enclosure and tension between teetotalism and agriculturalists of all backgrounds through 1932 when the Eighteenth Amendment was repealed. These are the goals of this project. That being said, writing a dissertation is much like putting together a very large jigsaw puzzle. I have woven sections of this puzzle, already pieced together by other scholars, into the larger story. The fuller picture I have generated from an extensive reading of temperance literature, the agricultural press, oral histories, government reports, photojournalism, artwork, corporate documents, and newsprint.

As suggested, there is much room to explore the confluence of anti-alcohol campaigns and insurgent opposition to these campaigns with rural dislocation, demographic transitions, and a century of agricultural development. Doing so requires placing prohibition into a broader context of land-related issues and imaginings using primary and secondary sources. It also requires engaging literature on enclosure. As J.M. Neeson’s \textit{Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700-1820} (1993) notes, the polemics of improvement have long dominated our understanding.
of the commons and enclosure as a positive and inevitable transition despite an abundance of evidence to the contrary. Neeson was not the first scholar to challenge these polemics. Waves of scholarship have long debated the process of enclosure. Marx’s *Capital*, Volume I (1867) noted early on that despite the idyllic nursery tales of political economists, capitalism was born of the “economic original sin” -- primitive accumulation through the forcible expropriation of peasant from the commons. Gilbert Slater’s *The English Peasantry and the Enclosure of Common Fields* (1907) and John and Barbara Hammond’s *The Village Labourer* (1911), and E.P. Thompson’s *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963) corroborated Marx’s indictment. Other works including E.C.K. Gonner’s *Common Land and Enclosure* (1912) and J.D. Chambers and G.E. Mingay’s *The Agricultural Revolution, 1750-1880* (1966) took the improvement stance that while enclosure may not have been altogether just, its overall effect was beneficial.

Most recently, ecologist Garrett Hardin’s infamous essay, “The Tragedy of the Commons,” reveals the enduring power of the improvement mindset. Published in *Science* magazine in 1968, Hardin’s article postulates that the “inherent logic of the

---


commons remorselessly generates tragedy.”

According to Hardin, the commons compels overuse and, in short order, the exhaustion of natural resources and thus the destruction of society. In making this argument, Hardin describes a hypothetical pasture open to all where herdsmen take advantage of land, adding, out of personal interest, more animals than the land can bear leading to ecological ruination.

Hardin’s article inspired two responses. First, as author Simon Fairlie points out, “From 1970s to the 1990s Hardin’s Tragedy was picked up by right wing theorists and neo-colonial development agencies, to justify unjust and sometimes ruinous privatization schemes.”

Notes Fairlie, neoliberal land-grabbing is but the latest chapter in the legacy of enclosure, the primary result of which has been the extreme concentration of land in the hands of the few. Second, a robust body of revisionist literature arose to challenge Hardin’s work. Numerous critics from the humanities were quick to point out that Hardin’s unmanaged archetype bears little resemblance to actual commons. E.P. Thompson’s _Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture_ (1993) chastised Hardin for overlooking the fact that commons are defined by “common sense”—customary rules and socially negotiated “stints” (restraints). Elinor Ostrom’s Nobel Prize winning _Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action_ (1990), duly notes that Hardin’s two recommendations: coercive state control and

---


privatization, have, in comparison to the commons, sketchy tract records when it comes to resource preservation.\(^{55}\) As Fairlie adds, state-aided privatization has long privileged the use of land for extractive profit-oriented activities. English enclosure in the eighteen century, for instance, allowed the feudal elite to amass land for commercial wool production. In contrast, the commons have long served subsistence, i.e. the daily needs of people.\(^{56}\)

Ostrom points out that Hardin’s Tragedy presupposes that the absence of private ownership necessitates an unmanaged free-for-all. This conceptual dichotomy places Hardin’s premise in the same category as other rigged metaphorical models including as the prisoner’s dilemma with its assumption that humans act in only one way, as uncooperative, self-interest entities looking to maximize personal gain. Notes Ostrom, to uncritically accept this definition of humanity is to omit the logic of collective action.\(^{57}\)

And, as author Lewis Hyde asserts, the Hardinian Tragedy projects a market ethic into the commons where, by definition, it was not allowed.\(^{58}\) This being the case, Hyde offered Hardin a more fitting title for his article: “The Tragedy of the Unmanaged, Laizzez-Faire, Common-Pool Resources with Easy Access for Non-Communicating, Self-Interested Individuals.”\(^{59}\)
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\(^{56}\) Fairlie, “A Short History.”

\(^{57}\) Ostrom, *Governing the Commons*, 3-4, 6-7.

\(^{58}\) Lewis Hyde, *Common as Air: Revolution, Art, and Ownership* (New York: Farbar, Straus and Giroux, 2010), 34.

\(^{59}\) Hyde, *Common as Air*, 44.
In a similar manner, others maintain that Hardin ignores alternative way of conceptualizing property. E.P. Thompson identified common right as a separate type of property distinct from land ownership. According to Thompson, common right was the “properties of the poor” as defined by settlement, expressed as a “local right” to the product of the soil.  

In a similar note, legal historians Christopher P. Rodgers and Eleanor Straughton observe medieval lords who held land respected the use rights of tenants and commoners. These use rights existed as an expression of tradition, unwritten by law, and formal statute.  

By definition, the liminal quality of the commons, which bridge custom and written law, the private and communal, makes the commons a symbolic space in the on-going contest “between individual self-interest and the communal good.” In effect, the commons demand a balance between individual and social needs. By ignoring this function, Hardin disregards this very important purpose of commoning.

Notably, in her exploration of the vitality of collectively managed resources, Ostrom found hundreds of examples of successful commons, including some that had persevered for hundreds of years. The success or failure of these institutions, she argues, comes down to a set of design principles—whether or not they have clearly defined boundaries, a distinct community of users who contribute to the definition and maintenance of the commons, set rules for resource use, mechanisms for monitoring and

---

60 Thompson, *Customs in Common*, 184.


conflict resolution, and effective sanctions for addressing violations. Ostrom equally recognized that while commons can be undermined by poor design, disruption and appropriation by coercion (often by outside actors) stands out as a major factor in the failure of commons.\(^6^3\) In other words, “tragedies” are frequently created with the intent of undermining commoning.

Hardin’s article stands out for another reason in light of the topic of this dissertation. It is clear that Hardin’s argument is not a historical argument; nor is it ironically a scientific argument. Why *Science* felt inclined to publish it (and at the beginning of the back to the land movement) is worth pondering and arguably, doing so brings us back to the idea of improvement and its enduring appeal. Hardin claimed to argue a “platitude,” the origin of which is quite telling. Thompson points out that Hardin pulled his argument “from the English propagandists of parliamentary enclosure.”\(^6^4\)

Specifically, Hardin found his argument in Oxford lecturer Rev. William Forster Lloyd’s *Two Lectures on the Checks of Population* (1833).\(^6^5\) But Hardin didn’t just borrow Lloyd reasoning, he also borrowed some very telling nineteenth-century language. Towards the end of his infamous article, Hardin presents what he builds up to be the ultimate question: “how do we legislate temperance?” The author then proclaims, “the alternative we have chosen is the institution of private property coupled with legal inheritance”—a move that was admittedly “unjust”, but in his mind preferable to the commons, an “alternative…

\(^6^3\) Ostrom, *Governing the Commons*, 90.

\(^6^4\) Thompson, *Customs in Common*, 107.

too horrifying to contemplate."66 In sum, Hardin effectively reanimated the call for privatization by pitting “temperate” private property against the “wasteful” commons.

What Hardin expresses is temperance ideology minus alcohol. Temperance, for that matter, is and isn’t about alcoholic spirits. Because temperance ideology has always encompassed far more than abstinence from drink, it should not surprise us that this ideology could survive sans demon rum. In the nineteenth century, due to its associations with subsistence and frontier rebels, targeting alcohol made sense for middle-class reformers. Other scapegoats have filled the void since the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. And of course, as Hardin shows, in their repetition platitudes develop a life of their own.

We must recognize Hardin’s Tragedy as exemplifying some very culturally specific assumptions in which the commons become a catch-all term for waste with no consideration for the real historical commons or capitalism’s ravenous appetite for resources. I view the Hardin Tragedy as a testament to the enduring power of those assumptions as outlined in this dissertation. Notably, Hardin shared other traits with nineteenth-century temperance reformers. He advocated eugenics to eliminate the poor and “lesser” races. In fact, Harden served as a director for the American Eugenics Society

66 Hardin, “The Tragedy of the Commons.”
in the early 1970s.\textsuperscript{67} He also espoused anti-immigrant racism and opposed international food aid in the name of forcing the poor to become more “socially responsible.”\textsuperscript{68}

In addition, in penning this dissertation I quickly found that temperance arguments required a revisionist view of the American farming landscape exemplified in recent works on the “American peasantry.” Rather than viewing America’s small frontier farmers as merely “pioneers” opening land for empire, it is fitting that we regard them as a peasantry defined by a subsistence ethic. Allan Kulikoff’s \textit{From British Peasants to Colonial American Farmers} (2000), though primarily focused on colonial America and how British demand for commodities transformed subsistence farmers into a coastal commercial set, nonetheless concedes that the bulk of colonial emigrants were poor and middling European peasants who set off in a quest for land for their subsistence after watching “venal men” make off with the commons.\textsuperscript{69} Tony Waters’ 2007 publication titled, \textit{The Persistence of Subsistence Agriculture: Life Beneath the Level of the Marketplace}, looks beyond the colonial coast and argues that the European emigrant peasantry by the American Revolution had established a dominant subsistence paradigm in the space between the Appalachian Mountains and Mississippi River. These settlers maintained European subsistence ethics and practices, while working outside of national land grant and tenure systems. Notably, Waters argues that in the American context at


least initially, little could be done to remove these settlers much to the frustration of
eastern elites. In this context, I locate the birth of the American temperance movement.

Regarding the question of commoning in the Americas, I refer to Peter Linebaugh’s *Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberty and Commons for All* (2008) which reminds us that what became the United States was a land of many commons: the common lands of natives, the land tenure system of the Spanish, and commoning practices of other European émigrés and once enslaved Africans. Though their diverse ways of commoning may seem unrelated and certainly different from practices in European medieval village, as Linebaugh illustrates, they nevertheless shared specific principles: production for subsistence or use value, fellowship or neighborliness, common pasture, usufruct rights, and the right to estovers or customary gathering. Notes Linebaugh, each passed through their own antienclosure struggles against modernity and its attributes: market dependency, state coercion, the slave trade, witch hunts, the birth of the prison, labor discipline, and the feminization of poverty. As shown herein, the temperance movement intersected some of these struggles. In addition, I explore the United States with its vast tracts of land as an attractive place for various groups seeking to revive elements of the commons or to reinvent the commons via various collective social experiments. In their endeavors, many of these groups embraced alcohol as integral
to the spirit and festivity of the communal atmosphere. Viewed as a backward shift through the eyes of temperance, these too would come under the movement’s scrutiny.

To better understand the rise in the temperance movement, I consider what Karl Polanyi demonstrated in his seminal work, *The Great Transformation* (1944). As Polanyi outlines, for many millennia all economic systems were ensconced within interlocking community, kinship, religious and other social systems. Thus “embedded,” reciprocity and redistribution defined economies. Enclosure represented a radical shift that disentangled economic activity from its subordinate social role while installing profit as the organizing principle of society. This reshaping of social relations was accomplished through the commodification of land, money, and labor in the attempt to fulfill a utopian vision of a market society. Polanyi notes that the liberal creed, which served these ends, was animated by a unique “crusading passion” and “evangelical fervor.” This is especially evident in the temperance movement.

Due to the prominence of the Protestant religious element, I summons the spirit of German sociologist Max Weber and his foundational work, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905). As Weber outlines, Protestants did not invent capitalism, but they did provide its “spirit”—a rational and a social ethic. In seeking to rationalize Christianity, Protestantism repudiated “all magical means to salvation as superstition and
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sin.”\textsuperscript{75} Having been deprived of the consolation of salvation through sacraments, penance, and “ecstatic-contemplative absorption of the divine spirit by the soul,” the Protestant calling combined asceticism with a materialistic work ethic in a constant drive to reshape the world according to their understanding of a perfect divine order.\textsuperscript{76} It was a project, notes Weber of intense anxiety over the status of the soul, separated from God “by an unbridgeable gulf” put in place by post-Reformation theology and new notions of predestination.\textsuperscript{77} In this new protestant worldview, certitude that one was a member of the elect could only be surmised through personal success. Specifically, social achievement came to mean conquest over the state of nature to aid the glorification of God on Earth. This made the destruction of spontaneous and impulsive enjoyment in the name of order a task of urgent import.\textsuperscript{78}

Protestantism dominated each wave of temperance agitation all the way through national prohibition. But, as Weber notes, while Protestantism animated the spirit of capitalism, once wealth accumulation was internalized as a duty, the religious scaffolding could fall away. Ben Franklin, with his ethic of utilitarian morality, may have been a deist, but he carried a secular version of the protestant ethic, which, Weber notes, “his strict Calvinistic father drummed into him again and again in his youth.”\textsuperscript{79} So too,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{76} Weber, \textit{The Protestant Ethic}, 86.
\textsuperscript{77} Weber, \textit{The Protestant Ethic}, 103.
\textsuperscript{78} Weber, \textit{The Protestant Ethic}, 111, 118-119.
\textsuperscript{79} Weber, \textit{The Protestant Ethic}, 53.
\end{flushright}
London could claim to be an enlightened man and still display the same spiritual isolationism, convictions regarding social achievement, and contempt for those who saw otherwise.

Methodologically, this project investigates the formation of narratives in the fields and fences. As abstractions, ideologies need space to endure and exist. Thus I draw inspiration from Henri Lefebvre, David Harvey, Michel Foucault, and others who have applied Marxism to the movement of capital spatially. Harvey has explored trends in global urbanization and alterations of environment with capitalist development. I am much indebted to Professor Harvey for insight into the historical process of accumulation by dispossession and how the inherent contradictions of capitalism materialize in produced space.\textsuperscript{80} Likewise, I rely on Foucault’s understanding of the asylum and prison as a space in the service of the bourgeois temperance moral order.\textsuperscript{81} Similarly, I evoke, Foucault’s study of “biopower”—political strategies that target the basic biological aspects of life.\textsuperscript{82}

Most of all, I turn to Lefebvre for my method of analysis. In his foundational work, \textit{The Production of Space}, Henri Lefebvre asks: “What is an ideology without a space to which it refers, a space which it describes, whose vocabulary and links it makes


use of, and whose code it embodies?"  

This need applies to representational space (the space of imagination and ideas), representations of space (the mapping and definition of space), and construction of lived space that reinforces the ideology. Implicit in temperance was the need for converting social consciousness to the temperance world view so as to achieve sufficient consensus to make political action possible and to expand its territorial holdings in creating the very thing it promised. Temperance advocates were sure that prohibition, once the law of the land, would birth miraculous results: disease would vanish, the commercial economy would blossom to the benefit of all, and higher productivity would jettison Americans into a new utopian age. The hope was that the benefits, once felt, would be so obviously desirable as to authenticate the assumptions on which temperance was founded.

However, as Lefebvre contends, because ideologies harbor internal contradictions, their proponents seek “consistency by intervening in social space and in its production.” Thus the claiming and construction of space to fit ideological needs entails the erasure of “countervailing factors”—alternative ways of knowing or being that challenge the logic of the ideology. For temperance, this meant not only opposition in the form of alternative drinking cultures but also the erasure of factions within the movement itself towards the goal of universal abstinence. In nineteenth- and twentieth- century America, we bear witness to this process as temperance forces labored fervently to redefine fields, barns, and mills, while targeting the saloon, beer garden, and tavern for
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83 Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Madden: Blackwell, 2010), 44.
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either elimination or conversion into more benign recreational facilities. Dry colonies, counties, cities, and states, and ultimately, a “dry” American nation, were all attempts to make the temperance promise a reality. The ideas advanced by temperance came to inhabit the abstract space of genre and popular economic thought, as well as conceptualizations of domestic space, social gatherings, and work life. And, while the Eighteenth Amendment ultimately failed, deep-seated temperance attitudes have survived. Scholars have noted how ideas advanced by temperance were channeled into enduring perceptions of disease, gender, poverty, addiction, education, law and order, and much more.85 It should therefore be of no surprise that temperance has had a lasting impact on conceptions and realities of the land. People like Hardin are proof of that impact.

This project is divided into four thematic and roughly chronological sections. Section 1: Into the “Waste” explores the origins of John Barleycorn in the improvement and early temperance movements. Chapter 1 traces the history of Barleycorn as a folk form that takes on a new life in the seventeenth-century pamphlet wars and the endurance of this icon in the American setting. The second and third chapters locate Barleycorn in the debates over land use leading to the passage of the Maine Laws during the nineteenth-century American transition from the dominant subsistence ethic to the new commercial order. Section 2: New Frontiers investigates the shaping of mid-century temperance

activism in the social and political disarray of revolution, civil war, and the continuing process of enclosure. In the midst of this state of turmoil, in Chapter 4, we see emergent commercial beer, wine, and liquor “districts,” the development of which materialize out of utopian and romantic endeavors, new waves of immigration, and commercial expansion to the South and West. Simultaneously, as outlined in Chapter 5, American temperance crusaders engage in reform-oriented excursions into new geographic and commercial frontiers, where their activism encouraged a combination of enclosure, agricultural improvement, and social uplift. Working within genre of travelogues, temperance excursionists to the old world construct a vision of utopia, or conversely, decline, with temperance as the linchpin of their millennial objectives. These works leave a deep impression on the American movement which seeks, as described in Chapter 6, to create colonies where the full benefit of temperance could be exhibited for all to see. Here, we see the improvement imperative at work in the promotion of experimental farms, irrigated fields, and commodity foods, as well as the displacement and uplift of various subsistence-oriented groups.

In Section 3: Contested Terrain, I locate the birth of the second-wave temperance movement in the contested terrain of the state of Ohio. Chapter 7 examines the contemporaneous rise of the Women’s Crusade, the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, and the Grange in the 1870s at a time when farmers were in crisis and old-stock Americans were losing ground to new-stock immigrants. An alliance of middle-class temperance women and middling old stock farmers formed, and then fragmented, in light of unresolved contradictions within temperance ideology. The formation of the Anti-
Saloon League follows in Chapter 8. Using the force of the pulpit and savvy lobbying strategies, the League once more rallied old stock farmers to the temperance cause but struggled to maintain their farm following due to the same lingering failures of dry activism to address the economic realities of farmers. New legislation for farm-based industrial alcohol production pushed through by the National Grange briefly revived the bond between agrarian and temperance elements, as detailed in Chapter 9, but this development too, would not last.

The last section on Appalachia investigates the role of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century temperance activism in the industrial transformation of the southern mountains. Due to the middle-class obsession with the foodways of mountain subsistence farmers, I explore the construction of the stereotypical hillbilly moonshiner in service of the arrival of new industrial interests in the region. Chapter 10 provides a deep history of the mountain farming, the rhythms of life as an adaptation to the terrain, and the “homeplace” as the produced space of the subsistence economy. The following chapter outlines the role of middle-class literature and the programs of uplift championed under the rubric of progressivism, as rhetorical groundwork for the radical transformation of the region. The final chapter examines the new terrain of modernity as defined by settlement schools, company towns, environmental degradation, prohibition, and illicit moonshine.

In the conclusion, this project highlights the wide-spread rejection of prohibition by American farmers in the immediate wake of the ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment in 1919. As I detail, prohibition contributed to a devastating rural
depression. With their backs to the wall farmers mobilized, their latent radicalism
rediscovered. Thus, John Barleycorn is resurrected and prohibition laid to rest.
Section 1: Into the “Waste”

Introduction

O! Barleycorn is the choicest grain
That ever was sown on land;
It will do more than any grain
By the turning of your hand.
--John Barleycorn86

According to the New York Times, the 1920 New Years’ celebrations were heady and wet, rivaled only by gatherings held little over a fortnight later preceding the official enactment of national prohibition as of midnight, January 16th.87 That evening’s festivities matched none other. Across the country wets mourned while dries celebrated the death of alcohol, and much more, as John Barleycorn was laid to rest. Earlier that day Americans scurried about, relocating liquor from stores and offices to the private seclusion of homes. And, in the dwindling hours of the workday, banks finalized the transfer of millions in whiskey certificates to Liberty Bonds thus hoisting on unaware taxpayers the cost of a shuttered alcohol beverage industry. Simultaneously, police were on the clock, anticipating mayhem and positioning forces to seize any spirituous libations from the tables of mourners as of 12:01.88

Urban restaurants and hotels capitalized on the occasion with elaborate décor: mini-souvenir caskets and all the trappings of a wake. “Black was the prevailing color”

86 Robert Bell and James Henry Dixon, eds., Early Ballads Illustrative History, Traditions, and Customs: Also, Ballads and Songs of the Peasantry of England, Taken Down from Oral Recitation and Transcribed from Private Manuscripts, Rare Broadsides, and Scarce Publications (London: Griffin, Bohn, and Company, 1861), 301.


draping bodies, tables and walls while mourners enjoyed a night of beer, wine, whiskey, and every other spirit available, toasting the deceased with tin cups over coffins in a manner reminiscent of old world wakes. Meanwhile, temperance forces celebrated. In every outpost laid claim by the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, churches held ceremonies with “raised prayers of praise for ‘dry’ forces.” So too, the Anti-Saloon League held victory banquets with a night watch service and its own brand of souvenirs—artwork depicting the First Congregational Church of Oberlin where the ASL was born, and medallions bearing the likeness of ASL founder, Howard H. Russell. Evangelist preacher Billy Sunday, hosted the largest gathering of all – a funeral service for Barleycorn in Norfolk, Virginia with 10,000 in attendance. An over-sized coffin arrived by train from Milwaukee and was carried to Sunday’s tabernacle by twenty pallbearers with “His Satanic Majesty trail[ing] behind in deep mourning and anguish.” Sunday, however, bearing “a delighted grin,” performed his sermon and said his farewells. “Good-by John,” stated the preacher, “You were God’s worst enemy; you were Hell’s best friend. I hate you with a perfect hatred; I love to hate you.”

Not everyone shared Sunday’s conviction. Among the broader population, people mourned the death of leisure and cordial meetings that Barleycorn represented. “It is not


an enemy of mankind who has been slain,” opined one contributor to the New York Times, “but the Joy of Living”—a remark that evoked a central point of 100 years of temperance debate.\textsuperscript{93} The dawn of prohibition also inspired a sense of cultural impoverishment and death of something bigger, as voiced by an anonymous Times editorial which decried the “Puritan Law” as the demise of the harvest song—a reference to Barleycorn’s folk origins and the moral compass of an older generation who navigated the world by a rural ethos. Barleycorn’s burial spelled a long list of potential casualties synonymous with this cultural birthright including Chaucer, Shakespeare, and poet Robert Burns. “How shall they survive in an arid land?” states the author, “For death by misapprehension is final.”\textsuperscript{94} America’s rural heritage and the philosophical arts that flowed with Barleycorn’s spirituous inspiration were at risk of being lost. It was a fitting sentiment. The 1920s census marked another milestone: the tipping of American population from one that was definitively agrarian to an urban, industrial majority, with prohibition the official usher of a modern morality.

How did America come to this night and why did it choose to bury John Barleycorn, that old personification of grain and the moral economy of farm and subsistence? Of all potential metaphors for alcohol, why this one?

Over the course of the previous one hundred years of temperance activism, the United States had changed dramatically from a fledgling nation populated largely by


\textsuperscript{94} “Must We Dealcoholize Literature?” New York Times, Mar. 16, 1919, 77. ProQuest Historical Daily Newspapers.
subsistence farmers whose lives were defined by folk experience, to an industrial powerhouse that spanned a continent transformed by capitalist revolution. It is well-known that the temperance movement spread with industrialization, an association that led early scholarship to couch temperance as a conservative rural response to modernity. Under this paradigm farmers were viewed as a reactionary if not backward element that took up temperance out of fear and suspicion of the rise of a modern cultured immigrant urban world. Indeed, Richard Hofstadter long ago established prohibition as an “insistent… minority sentiment” that was “carried about America by the rural-evangelical virus.” Recent challenges of the Hofstadter standpoint have redirected historical focus to an aspiring middle class as the prime mover of the temperance agenda, but the relationship of this element to farm interests remains largely unexplored.

This project argues that upon investigation it becomes clear that temperance, from the start existed in tension with farming cultures as well as the economic interests and production challenges unique to farming. Farming, fermenting and distilling, after all, share a lengthy history and many farmers have held long standing economic interests in the production of spirits. In contrast, the temperance movement with its ideology that formed in tandem with the market revolution, needed farmers to fulfill economic and reform agendas. Temperance organizations required farmer votes and commitment in

95 Hofstadter, The Age of Reform, 290.

challenging both established home economies and customs, and a growing economically and politically powerful alcohol industry. In addition, the concepts fronted by temperance sought not only to convert farmers, but also the ontological nature of farming so that agricultural resources might be put into the service of a modern industrial economy. Towards these ends, temperance advocates sought to sway farm loyalties with a combination of coercion, religious suasion and a specious vision of farm economics that frequently compounded agricultural problems and advanced the decline of family farms. An exploration of the farm icon John Barleycorn offers us insight into these matters, for references to John Barleycorn were ubiquitous in debates between wet and dry forces leading up to prohibition.

Scholars love quoting renditions of the harvest song, “John Barleycorn,” because the song’s central theme. The repeated death and resurrection of the main character neatly encapsulates the futility of prohibition for, as we know, alcohol production and consumption never actually died.\footnote{See, for instance, titles like Ben F. Johnson III, \textit{John Barleycorn Must Die: The War Against Drink in Arkansas} (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2005); Martin Hintz, \textit{Farewell John Barleycorn: Prohibition in the United States} (Minneapolis: Lerner Publications 1996); Paul W. Glad, “When John Barleycorn Went Hiding in Wisconsin,” \textit{The Wisconsin Magazine of History} 68, no. 2 (Winter 1984-1985), 119-136.} Especially from a twenty-first century perspective, the very idea of banning the natural process of fermentation, or consumption of alcohol, which predates humanity itself, sounds like a fool’s errand. And, indeed it was. Yet ironically, scholars have only in passing grazed lightly on the agricultural debates surrounding prohibition or John Barleycorn’s function therein. In 1919, poet and essayist Benjamin De Casseres rather playfully suggested that the liminal figure of John
Barleycorn initiated his devotees into the “Queer Phantasies of the Alcoholic Dimension.” In this spirit, we might call on good Sir John to be our guide into the agrarian story of temperance and prohibition.

Chapter 1:
Enter the Trickster

Was’t ever your lot
To visit the spot
Where the heather was once in its glory;
Where farmers and yeoman
Would give in to no man,
In mowing, or telling a story.
--The Bard o’ Bow Green 99

In the age of acorns, before the time of Ceres, a single barleycorn had been of more value to mankind than all the diamonds of the mines of India.
--Henry Brooke (1765) 100

We should probably begin with some introductions. John Barleycorn, the image of a medieval Greenman cast in pewter as a bottle opener, hangs in my kitchen—a reminder of my European heritage and the fact that there is beer in the refrigerator. This visage, for me, is a source of endless fascination, for this figure has occupied temperance debates since the early modern era when radical socio-economic change put, as so eloquently stated by historian Joyce Oldham Appleby, “an end to that equilibrium between people and land, labor and repose.” 101

As stated in the Chicago Daily Tribune in 1913, this “ancient” figure has been part of “the eternal contest between those who have ‘sworn an oath John Barleycorn should die,’ and those who maintain his merits and uses for


mankind.”

An undying spirit that continues to capture the imagination of many moderns especially in times of crisis, I believe Barleycorn can tell us a great deal about the place of prohibition in the commercialization of American agriculture in the last two centuries.

In defining John Barleycorn we must first recognize that determining the meaning of folk figures is a slippery endeavor since meanings shift according to geography, usage, and timeframe. Within their original social context they embody a lived existence. With that context’s demise, they, like people become “displaced” in the most literal sense. Captured in collections of ballads and folklore, many become, as Raymond Williams states, “part of an elegy for a lost way of life.” As lingering elements of traditional popular culture revivified by print, folk figures often reemerge with ambivalence towards the Enlightenment ethos of progress and its attendant logic of scientific authority, materialism, individualism, industrialization, and market economy. Their histories are endlessly complicated as their meanings shift and are historically constructed. Ergo, their stories are never static, nor do they end with their folk origins.

Because folk forms are figures that offer an elaborate medium for cultural expression they can also function as are vehicles of reenactment, debate and social reconfiguration. Folk figures as metaphors for premodern cultural traditions serve the conveyance of ideas from one place to another, one idea or endeavor to another.

---


case of John Barleycorn, we encounter a folk figure who, while displaced, carries an
association with a specific landscape—the medieval village, its economy and culture. As
we shall see, Barleycorn and his village haunt American temperance debates from the
origins of American teetotalism to the enactment of prohibition.

Barleycorn’s Genesis

John Barleycorn, a personification of alcohol as well as the brewer’s favored
grain as expressed in English folklore and song, was first put into print in the sixteenth
century, presumably from much older preexisting oral traditions of North England and
Scotland, though exactly how old is difficult to say. Anthropologist James George Frazer
in the late nineteenth century placed the character’s origins in a long line of icons and
traditions dating to pre-Christian harvest customs of Europe where the blood of sacrificial
victims guaranteed the return of the corn spirit to the field each spring. This practice,
according to Frazer, survived in pretense in the medieval fashioning of corn dolls from
the harvest sheaf and their annual return to the soil, and in modern times in the ritualistic
cannibalism of the king in grain form, as traditional barley “soul-cakes” or in liquid form
as beer. Whether the song’s originator(s) had these things in mind is difficult to say.
But scholars generally agree that the song personifies the elemental changes and
processes of nature and a rural ethos rooted therein. As author John Matthews writes, the
song orates the “vegetative cycle of the year” that has long informed “the eternal round of

and Co, 1912), 251-4.
birth, growth, death, and rebirth” that sustained the medieval village.106 Thus states the first three stanzas of the song:

There were three men come out of the West  
Their fortunes for to try,  
And these three men made a solemn vow,  
John Barleycorn should die.

They ploughed him in the earth so deep,  
with clods upon his head,  
Then these three men they did conclude  
John Barleycorn was dead.

There he lay sleeping in the ground  
Till rain from the sky did fall;  
Then Barleycorn sprang a green blade  
And proved liars of them all.107

Ploughmen may harvest the cereal in the field and sow seed that, for winter’s duration, appeared dead, but as outlined by Matthews, “[l]ike the Green Man, John Barleycorn (whose name means “the heart of the barley”) would not lie down.”108 Verses that followed extended the metaphor to Barleycorn’s physical form as a plant whose death at harvest transferred his spirit to thatch, fodder, bread, beer or whiskey, and back to grain again, with Barleycorn transcending death in the kind of Medieval Christian animism we might expect from his cultivators. In addition, as each of Barleycorn’s incarnations made their round, he linked farmers and petty tradesmen: the miller, the malter, the brewer, the baker and the thatcher through trade and a wide range of cooperative forms of labor. The result, as Burns’ scholar Pauline Mackay notes, is a folk allegory of the transubstantiation

107 This version is taken from Matthews, 11.
108 Matthews, The Quest, 75.
of grain to spirits, referred to in the song as “his heart’s very blood.” Barleycorn’s story is the carnival of birth and death -- the essence of Scottish poet Edwin Muir’s verse, “The Island”:

Men are made of what is made,
The meat, the drink, the life, the corn,
Laid up by them, in them reborn.\(^\text{110}\)

According to Robert Bell’s *Early Ballads Illustrative of History, Traditions, and Customs; Also Ballads and Songs of the Peasantry of England*, John Barleycorn was “sung at English merry-making and country feasts.”\(^\text{111}\) As a harvest song, John Barleycorn celebrated the importance of barley in European agriculture. Barley arrived in Europe with the earliest farmers. Hardier than wheat and more tolerant of climatic variations than other cereals, it became the principle grain of these temperate northern zones.\(^\text{112}\) In the prizing of things, as Irish poet Henry Brooke so eloquently stated in the epigraph above, barley’s historic value was rooted in a very tangible economic sense. What use does the “ploughman” have for diamonds when they could have barley? mused Brooke in his novel *The Fool of Quality* (1765).\(^\text{113}\) Indeed, barley provided many


\(^{111}\) Robert Bell and James Henry Dixon, eds., *Early Ballads Illustrative History, Traditions, and Customs: Also Ballads and Songs of the Peasantry of England, Taken Down from Oral Recitation and Transcribed from Private Manuscripts, Rare Broad sides, and Scarce Publications* (London: George Hall & Sons, 1889), 300.


\(^{113}\) Brooke, *The Fool of Quality*, 68. Notably, while Brooke’s relation sought their fortune in India, he pursued an honorable, if not impoverished, livelihood in agricultural pursuits. See the preface to *The Fool of Quality*, xxxvi.
generations of farmers bread and drink, as well as straw thatching, bedding for humans and animals, and fodder for the latter. The central role of barley in the seasonal and communal activities of sowing, harvesting, reaping, threshing, malting and milling of European farms rooted time itself in rhythms of barley cultivation.

Linguistically, the word “beer” came from Saxon “beor,” from beow or barley as the beer grain. Since its inception among Celtic peoples malted fermented barley was far more than just “beer” in the modern sense; rather it was often a combination of ale with mead or various herbs or spices—Yarrow, sweet gale or bog myrtle, Labrador tea flower, marsh rosemary, juniper berries, wormwood, caraway seed, aniseed, ginger, and nutmeg, among others, in the making of “gruit” which offered a wide range of flavors and medicinal and psychotropic qualities. Certain blends of gruit were also known as sexual stimulants, while herbs such as wormwood contributed psychoactive and preservative attributes. Much like mead, gruit ale was an entheogen—a substance that could provide not only unusual sensations, but also spiritual clarity. Used by Gaelic bards in the ceremonies of Celtic polytheism, drink facilitated poetry and early European forms of spirituality.

In northern European Low Countries ale brewed from malted barley was an integral part of foodways and much more. Among Anglo-Saxons, ale served as currency

---


in the giving of gifts, and payment of dues and penalties. Alcohol (beer, wine, mead or brandy), as a symbol of sacrifice became the mortar of bonds in the “contract drink,” the common practice of “tying one on” -- finalizing agreements with a shared horn or drinking bout as the means of sealing pledges and promises.\textsuperscript{116} Considered a common and necessary drink, beer spread through Germany, Scandinavia, and British Isles during the Middle Ages. At this time brewing was a household industry performed by women, complemented in the eighth and ninth century by larger scale production in monasteries and in official and estate production beginning with the Carolingians. Beer served the spiritual and medicinal needs of monks and nuns. Monastic brewing was an obligation not only for the provisioning of mendicants, but also of pilgrims, paupers, and travelers who came knocking at the gates. On monastery grounds brewhouses were situated next to bakehouses and shared many features thus exhibiting in spatial continuity the common equivalence of bread and beer.\textsuperscript{117} Likewise, with the introduction of the distilling arts in Roman times, people used barley to procure ardent spirits as a “religious act” linked to the metamorphosis of “animal and vegetable matter” into a spiritual and “life enforcing” substance of usquebaugh (whiskey).\textsuperscript{118} In agricultural production, medicine, language, and altered states of mind, the lifecycle of barley pervaded the fabric of reality of early European agrarian communities. A versatile and nutritious grain, barley remained a


staple of the English and northern European diet into the nineteenth century, when it fell out of favor with the rise of the wheat industry, though barley remains the world’s fourth largest cereal crop largely due to its importance in brewing. Barley’s significance was such that it still lingers in western agricultural landscapes and language. The word “barn”—the ubiquitous symbol of farm life—is derived from Old English “berærn” from “barley” (bere) and “house” (ærn).

In folksong John Barleycorn bore the indignities of cultivation, harvesting, and brewing, and was generous in the process. He could be “benign, courteous and good” serving “us of our daily food, and that with liberality.” Scottish poet Robert Burns praised Barleycorn as a “hero bold, of noble enterprise” that brought “joy” to men and “the widow’s heart.” This refrain pulled from other renditions that praised Barleycorn for his role in treating the ill, inspiring the poet, warming bodies, and soothing hearts:

If sickness come, this physic take,
It from your heart will set it,
If fear encroach, take more of it,
Your heart will soon forget it.
Apollo and the Muses nine
Do take it in nor scorn,
There’s no such stuff to pass the time,
As the little barley-corn.

‘Twill make a weeping willow laugh,
And soon incline to pleasure;

---


121 Robert Burns, *The Poetical Works of Robert Burns: To which are Now Added Notes Illustrating Historical, Personal, and Local Allusions* (Edinburgh: William and Robert Chambers, 1838), 95.
'Twill make an old man leave his staff,  
And dance a youthful measure;  
An though your clothes be n’er so bad,  
All ragged, rent, and torn,  
Against the cold you may be clad  
With little barley-corn.¹²²

Other treatments cast Barleycorn as essential for merry-making and many daily tasks, as seen in this verse:

The huntsman he can’t hunt the fox,  
nor so loudly blow his horn,  
And the tinker he can’t mend kettles or pots  
without a little of Barleycorn.¹²³

Aside from the inspiration of alcohol, the ballad evinced the recognition that individuals were dependent on something bigger than themselves, namely, community and its land base. The power of alcohol encapsulated that power in the cup. For this reason and the more obvious and immediate effects of drink’s intoxicating power, Barleycorn also appears as a harsh counselor that dealt retribution. Some ballads gave “warning to obey the neighborly village economy of fair weight and measure”; brewsters, in particular, should not water-down the ale.¹²⁴ Within the transcribed ballads, John acts a “merry prankster” that “deals reversals to the boastfulness and folly of an exhaustive list of petty tradespeople”; namely, those that imbibed too much of his most powerful incarnations.¹²⁵


¹²⁴ Bernard, “The Transit of ‘Small, Merry,’” 89.

¹²⁵ Bernard, “The Transit of ‘Small, Merry,’” 89.
As a trickster, Barleycorn returned abuse in kind, depriving drinkers of their legs, gold or dignity.\textsuperscript{126}

But in the quickest of turn-abouts, “Little Barleycorn,” this “cunningest of alchymist” brought “cheer” to the “tinker in the stocks.” These very qualities made Barleycorn “even for to change our nature” in the broadest sense, more powerful than money:

\begin{quote}
It [Barleycorn] is the neatest serving-man,  
To entertain a friend;  
It will do more than money can  
All jarring suits to end.\textsuperscript{127}
\end{quote}

Barleycorn, the “spirit” seated at the center of the village economy did, indeed, soothe “jarring suits”. The village tavern was not just a drinking space. Village juries heard complaints and settled disputes at the inn, with commoners in attendance in earshot and all drinking together.\textsuperscript{128} Barleycorn was more than drink. He represented customary processes of negotiation among commoners.

Likewise, Barleycorn evokes a musical and poetic tradition embedded in the politics of religion and class dynamics of pre- and early-modern Gaelic and English culture. With the shift to Christianity, pre-Christian Baltic traditions lost royal patronage, but these traditions endured in the popular Druidism that began in the twelfth century with bards as self-proclaimed keepers of the past. Their trade a form of competition through stimulating oratory and song, bards engaged in wars of wit; with high class bards

\textsuperscript{126} Bell and Dixon, \textit{Early Ballads Illustrative History}, 301.

\textsuperscript{127} “The Little Barley-Corn,” 104-105.

\textsuperscript{128} Neeson, \textit{Commoners: Common Right}, 2.
performing songs of flattery for their patrons and low-class bards, or “small beer poets,”
denounced by monarchs and clergy as “lead[ing] the common people to mischief.”\textsuperscript{129}

If nothing else, John Barleycorn, the icon and harvest song, reflects this spirit. As
alcohol, barley was associated with inspiration and the creative power of words. Keeping
in mind what this personification of nature implies, we see John Barleycorn, the song, as
an earthy and humorous analogy for the give and take of nature’s rhythms; an
embodiment of the Anglo-Saxon notion of \textit{wyrd} (to become, to owe), and the constant
interplay of people and community whose economy was embedded within the material
world, religion, and social obligations.\textsuperscript{130}

This type of story making emerged from the moral economy of production and
sustenance of the medieval village and the commons. The village was where most
medieval Europeans from farmers to artisans lived out their lives, where they labored and
socialized, lived and died as a common enterprise. States Frances and Joseph Giles, “A
distinctive and in its time an advanced form of community, the medieval village
represented a new stage of the world’s oldest civilized society, the peasant economy.”\textsuperscript{131}
Church, barns, houses and orchards accommodated the center of each settlement, with
fields extended outwards. By 1200, the village evolved into a “unique form of agrarian
organization” in which surrounding fields and pasture were defined by the complex

\textsuperscript{129} Sir John Evans, \textit{A Popular History of the Ancient Britons or the Welsh People: From the Earliest Times
to the End of the Nineteenth Century} (London: Elliot Stock, 1901), 319-320.

\textsuperscript{130} “Wyrd” derived from Anglo-Saxon mythology, also known as the fates or providence. Fate, in this sense
implies the weaving of destiny through one’s actions and the workings of a specific environment. Wyrd
“grows” in a complex tree of cause and effect.

workings of the open field system, a combination of family land use and cooperative community arrangements for plowing, pasturing and planting.\textsuperscript{132}

J.M. Neeson’s history of the English commons paints a striking picture of life in the village using as example, Laxton, the last remaining English village with an open field system. He states,

The description of common fields as \textit{open} fields is entirely appropriate. Distances are shorter when fields are in strips. You can call from one to the next. You can plough them and talk across the backs of horses at the same time. You can see at a glance whose bit of the hedges or mounds needs fixing, what part of the common ditch is choked with weeds. Standing at the centre of the village feels like standing at the hub of the whole system: the fields spread out around you, the decision to sow one with wheat, another with barley is written in the landscape. For all that individual men and women work their own bits of land, their economy is public and to a large degree still shared.\textsuperscript{133}

As Neeson explains, the shared space of the village and countryside were spaces of an abundance of activity and common interest. Common flocks made their rounds, along with “[f]ieldsmen, pinders, and haywards” as they carried out the ratified orders for the management of fields, as determined by jurors in biannual meetings at the inn.\textsuperscript{134} Stints (restraints) on land use and the kind and number of animals brought to pasture were also enforced in the “beating of the bound”—an annual procession when the villagers walked the fields and parish boundaries, axes and spades in hand, rooting out any violations of

\textsuperscript{132} Giles, \textit{Life in a Medieval Village}, 6-17.

\textsuperscript{133} Neeson, \textit{Commoners: Common Right}, 2-3.

\textsuperscript{134} Neeson, \textit{Commoners: Common Right}, 2-3.
the stints and common right. This festive affair, marked with “cakes and beer,” notes author Lewis Hyde, “assured the longevity of the commons.”

Land use in this system was a matter of right, not ownership, and right to use had to pay deference to community decisions regarding crop rotation, grazing, and gleaning that served all members of the community. In the words of Marc Bloch, “Only a society of great compactness, composed of men [sic] who thought instinctively in terms of community, could have created such a regime. The land itself was the fruit of collective labour.” The agrarian economy, spatially defined by openness, integrated individual and public interests. The pub, notably, was truly a public house—a place where community decisions were made democratically by commoners in the presence of their fellows.

Beyond land use, markets also faced restrictions. Notions of the common weal demanded that the purpose of grain was first and foremost food and not a source of profit. According to common law and custom, the marketing of grain was strictly regulated. As historian E.P. Thompson details, in this model farmers were required to bring their grain to the local pitching market where the poor were afforded “the opportunity to buy grain, flour, or meal first, in small parcels, with duly-supervised weights and measures,” before “large dealers (duly licensed) might make their purchases.” Thus, restrictions on

135 Hyde, Common as Air, 37.
137 Thompson, Customs in Common, 194.
exports and the profits of dealers, bakers, and millers ensured that access to bread remained a community service.

In the words of Appleby, the village rested on “face-to-face direct consumption economies” where “the law of economic relationships appeared enmeshed in a social context where duties and rights were closely tied to the needs of security and survival,” where “the economic structure remained visible and tangible… a possession of the whole society,” of mutual dependency, where land was not yet alienated from labor; where grain production was a social prerogative not a gainful enterprise. This was a world of “coherence between religious sentiment and the economy.”

Likewise, this was a world of royal obligations to the maintenance of social stability through a commitment to feeding all members and, in a connected fashion, attempts to “replant” displaced people in times of population growth or social disruption thus “reknitting the old social fabric.”

In sum, members of the village and its peasant economy engaged in similar or complementary tasks, shared a comparable standard of living, with life governed by cultivation and pasturage within a communally controlled field system, families bound by kinship to share with the less fortunate and to lords by dues and labor owed, and lords to villagers by tenure rights, privileges and provisions. The latter included the recognition of

\[\text{138} \text{ Appleby, Economic Thought and Ideology, 25, 54.}\]

\[\text{139} \text{ Appleby, Economic Thought and Ideology, 29.}\]
leisure and festivities that punctuated work life and brought together country folk and trades people in communal gatherings.\textsuperscript{140}

Enclosure proceeded when authorities became lax in maintaining customary statutes, or actively moved against them, that is, until popular pressure reasserted the need for enforcement. For example, during the twelfth century the growth in pauperism and other deleterious effects of feudal encroachment on the commons, a growing money economy, and military competition of centralizing monarchies, roused numerous movements from below in defense of customary rights. These movements in combination with certain rebellious barons pushed the hand of King John of England to sign, in 1215, the Magna Carter which put, as historian Peter Linebaugh states, “an emergency brake on accelerating state despotism.”\textsuperscript{141} The Magna Carta prohibited torture and ensured habeous corpus and trial by jury. Moreover, in protecting various interests—the feudal lords, the church, and merchants, and peasantry—the charter “assumed a commons.”\textsuperscript{142} Specific chapters secured common rights that were reinforced in 1217 with a second charter—the Charter of the Forest. Together these charters were recognized as the common law of the land reinforced from time to time with regular reissue as the Charters of Liberty.\textsuperscript{143}


\textsuperscript{141} Linebaugh, \textit{Magna Carta Manifesto}, 22.

\textsuperscript{142} Linebaugh, \textit{Magna Carta Manifesto}, 28.

\textsuperscript{143} Linebaugh, \textit{Magna Carta Manifesto}, 39.
By the Tudor era, the growth of intra-European markets challenged, once more, monarchical commitments to maintaining the existing social order. Yet again, disruptive effects seen in roving and displaced poor inspired a recommitment by the Elizabethans to reforging the old social fabric with the passage of the Poor Laws—a series of acts for poor relief.\textsuperscript{144} Still, the market economy, shaped by commercial initiative, continued to animate demands for social reorganization. As Appleby explains, beginning in the sixteenth century, apologists for a new social order centered on markets began the intellectual task of forging a rationale for policies and statutes of enclosure.\textsuperscript{145} That rationale could be summed up as the “improvement” of “waste”. In the not so distant past, “waste” from the Latin “vastus” implied “unoccupied” or “uncultivated” commons that villagers defended nonetheless for grazing, enjoyment, and as a source of wood or peat fuel, foraged acorns and other nuts, as well as berries, herbs, and other useful items.\textsuperscript{146} Couching the commons and village economy broadly as “waste,” the authors of pamphlets and philosophical treatise argued that the existing order was a problem in need of a solution in the privatization of land. This well-spring of human betterment required a transformation of space. Enclosure would replace presumably useless “weeds” with useful commodity “crops”; it would civilize the poor by eradicating their haunts and wild source of nourishment; and in the place of these provide disciplined employment. Privatization would preserve resources such as forests once “wasted” on subsistence and

\textsuperscript{144} Appleby, \textit{Economic Thought and Ideology}, 29.

\textsuperscript{145} Appleby, \textit{Economic Thought and Ideology}, 26-27.

\textsuperscript{146} Bloch, \textit{French Rural History}, 18.
simultaneous commit these resources to higher ends. Furthermore, enclosure meant monetary wealth in the form of profits for landholders and revenue for governments in the division and sale of land.\textsuperscript{147} Taken together, the benefits of enclosure offered “nothing less than the transformation of England into a Puritan Utopia”. In the words of historian Victoria Di Palma, “improvement” ideology implied a “reformation” of “soil and soul”.\textsuperscript{148}

Improvement had many apologists. Philosophical, the origins of improvement drew on the works of essayist and statesman, Sir Francis Bacon (1561-1626) for whom human advancement required making nature subservient to human designs. In this spirit, numerous others compiled natural histories and encyclopedias in the quest to amass information for determining how waste might be improved. New disciplines emerged as well, including development of cartography to differentiate productive space from wasteland.\textsuperscript{149} Most conspicuously, waste and improvement embodied a dichotomy of wilderness and paradise as imagined by John Locke, the philosophical father of classical liberalism. Locke’s \textit{Two Treatise on Government} (1689) defined the state of nature as a state of waste and property as the polar opposite divinely sanctioned state of productivity. Indeed, nature, waste, uninhabited wilderness and habited commons, Locke conflates as if they are interchangeable terms.\textsuperscript{150} Simultaneously, Locke speaks of two types of social

\textsuperscript{147} Di Palma, \textit{Wasteland}, 44-45, 50.

\textsuperscript{148} Di Palma, \textit{Wasteland}, 50, 52.

\textsuperscript{149} Di Palma, \textit{Wasteland}, 46, 65-68, 72-78.

equality—that of common ownership and that of improvement—the first being undesirable as a hindrance to the full exploitation of natural resources by labor and industry, the creators of “value”.\textsuperscript{151} One can also imply from these writings that no person nor collective had a right or authority over land not held as property under title and duly improved. States Locke, “The same measures governed the possession of land too”, that is, land not properly improved by its possessor should “still be looked on as waste, and might be the possession of any other.” This stance validated not only English enclosure, but also appropriation of native lands under colonialism in America.\textsuperscript{152}

In disparaging the commons, Puritan reformers took aim at the inn or tavern, the locus of common decision making. Common land and ale-houses alike were condemned as “Two great nurseries of Idleness and Beggary.”\textsuperscript{153} Thus, in fashioning an abstract space where a beneficent market-centric society operated for the good of all, writers conceptually linked the commons together with alcohol as fostering waste. The language is telling, for it implied the cultivation of people and plants—two primary foci of the improvement movement. The association would continue, ultimately taking on new life under the temperance movement.

Beneficiaries of enclosure that declared common land “worthless” and a “waste,” claimed these spaces for themselves.\textsuperscript{154} Land enclosure for commercial wool production
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the raw material of textiles-- displaced many subsistence farmers and disrupted longstanding patterns of village life. Enclosers—ambitious landlords and yeoman of substance-- using court orders, legal statutes, and finally private Acts of Parliament, eliminated the system of common rights piecemeal from the fourteenth to nineteenth century. Vast tracts were fenced and sheep replaced people on the land, not for local sustenance, but instead, to feed growing commercial wool and grain markets. In addition, enclosure provided a means to socialize the debt of aristocrats on the backs of the poor as when the Tudors sold off communal and monastic tracts to satisfy their creditors. In other cases, enclosure allowed the wealthy to claim forests and fishponds as private recreational hunting and fishing parks.

The land was irrevocably altered to the loss of many. Arable land was fenced for more lucrative endeavors than community food production. Over this landscape, the process of “improvement” was writ in the land: Woodlands were felled, fens drained, and heathlands cleared, eliminating sources of subsistence farming, fuel (wood and peat), pasture, fodder, wild foods, and fowl that had long been part of local livelihoods. Consequently, enclosure instigated the rapid turn-over of land and depopulation of the countryside as people were unmoored from an old mixed agrarian existence. In their place rose commercial agriculture and its nexus of private profit. Meanwhile, in

155 Neeson, Commoners: Common Right, 187.
158 Neeson, Commoners: Common Right, 302.
economic tracts, emphasis shifted from the good harvest and its “life-supporting qualities,” to food as “a commodity interchangeable with other commodities.”

Modern westerners conditioned to notions of improvement tend to measure medieval life by a lack of things: modern institutions, technologies, and consumer items while dismissing other aspects such as religious and communal life that stressed mutual support and obligations. Indeed, medieval life involved many challenges, first among which was the persistent need to stave off hunger and the threat of flood, drought, and frost in these endeavors. Social regulation, risk-sharing, and innovations geared toward collective security, addressed these needs in a manner that made the open field system and commoning an enduring model. There was little room for wealth accumulation for private lucre was not the goal. Peasant farmers did not, by and large, engage large commercial markets; most of what they produced they consumed, and surplus typically went to tithes, taxes, and dues. Life expectancy was low—somewhere between thirty and forty years of age; death by infectious disease in this pre-antibiotic age was common. But notably, village life was good compared to the alternatives. In the early years of enclosure displaced persons became wandering paupers, vagabonds that survived by begging or theft. The separation of people from the land served too, as the historical premise to the capitalist mode of production by providing surplus population for

159 Appleby, Economic Thought and Ideology, 57.
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exploitation in emerging industrial cities. Those that shifted to urban setting faced an altogether different existence. Here, beginning in the eighteenth century, the factory came to serve as “the visible manifestation of the coming economic order.” Massive and multistoried, these “grim leviathans” … “dominated their environment,” drew off capital via exploited labor, belched the black smoke, and “generated massive wealth, but also great squalor.”¹⁶³ French social critic Alexis de Tocqueville’s *Journeys to England and Ireland* (1835) provides a vivid description of what enclosure helped birth:

Thirty or forty factories rise on the tops of the hills… Their six stories tower up; their huge enclosures give notice from afar of the centralisation [sic] of industry. The wretched dwellings of the poor are scattered haphazard around them. Round them stretches land uncultivated but without the charm of rustic nature, and still without the amenities of a town. The soil has been taken away, scratched and torn up in a thousand places, but it is not yet covered with the habitations of men. The land is given over to industry’s use.¹⁶⁴

As de Tocqueville noticed, the new production system of industry restructure space, and with it, social life. Factories dominated the new landscape in a manner that reflected the industrial hierarchy, while workers and soil alike were much reduced. For de Tocqueville, the industrial city was a new, disturbing form, comparable to a disjointed body with parts that grew disproportionate to the frame according to misplaced priorities. He states,

The roads which connect the still-disjointed limbs of the great city, show, like the rest, every sign of hurried and unfinished work; the incidental activity of a


population bent on gain, which seeks to amass gold so as to have everything else all at once, and, the interval, mistrusts the niceties of life.\textsuperscript{165} The results were obscene—“Heaps of dung, rubble from buildings, putrid, stagnant pools are found here and there among the houses and over the bumpy, pitted surfaces of the public places”.\textsuperscript{166} Labor, in the modern city enclosed in factories, served the demands of industry, not community. The land, “given over to industry” was reduced to desolation and a new form of wasteland.

Moreover, life in a sprawling metropolis such as London or industrial Manchester was alienating. Large cities were spatially obscure—vast and impossible to know completely, on a personal level. Contradictions abound. Cities harbored many, but lacked unity. Though sites of concentrated wealth, cities were spaces where not everyone had a place at the table. Separated from the means of subsistence, unemployment and poverty meant hunger amidst plenty, extravagance alongside destitution. As sites that evinced the trauma of the Protestant Revolution, London, and other centers of commerce served as symbols of “the triumph of individualism over communal endeavor.”\textsuperscript{167} Culturally fragmented into wards, cities were simultaneously circuits of mobility. They were an amalgamation of people and things so daunting that they evoked fears that the “distorted economy” of commerce had produced “monsters”—spaces of disease, human

\textsuperscript{165} De Tocqueville, \textit{Alexis de Tocqueville}, 305.

\textsuperscript{166} De Tocqueville, \textit{Alexis de Tocqueville}, 305.

degradation, and social chaos.\textsuperscript{168} Most ironically, their lifeblood, commerce, displayed exceptional vigor alongside human suffering.

Barleycorn’s roots in the temperance discourse date to the English Reformation when Puritanism emerged in opposition to lingering vestiges of Catholicism in the Anglican Church and in response to social disruption that went with an emergent market economy in the seventeenth century. Puritan reform theology approached a spike in poverty, highwaymen, and vagrancy with a vision of church reform, self-restraint and fasting. Animated by their belief in predestination and of everyday life as a constant drive for perfection, these Protestants poured their energy into capital accumulation as the marker of improvement.\textsuperscript{169} In its criticism of the crown, Puritanism found a following among the new professional classes and London merchants that chaffed at royal mercantile economic restraints. This wedding was not altogether new. In the name of social reform, legal measures in Post-Reformation continental Europe and Norway restricted the number and types of herbal additives brewers might employ, thus ending gruit production. As detailed by Odd Nordland, the motive of these reforms was both religious and commercial. In marketing the hopped beer of Westphalia, Protestant reformists and merchants challenge the formidable ecclesiastic hold on ale production. To break monastic control, reformists cast herbed beers as symptomatic of Catholic hedonism and a danger to individual and social health. Hops, in contrast were upheld for their antiseptic powers and lack of supplementary psychoactive or inebriative qualities.


\textsuperscript{169} See Weber, \textit{The Protestant Ethic}. 
And in the Protestant war against all thing sensual, hops offered an additional selling point as an herbal sexual suppressant.\(^{170}\)

In seventeenth-century England, the revolt known as the English Civil War brought puritan rule to power under Oliver Cromwell, who initiated a period of harsh austerity measures. In the logic of Cromwell’s religious regime, the quest for internal order demanded obedience and self-denial. Alehouses and taverns were limited and taxed. Festive foods, theatre, dance, maypoles and the extensive Christmas celebration were banned as wasteful and immoral.\(^{171}\) Widespread protests followed. Alienated social factions that pined for a return to regional conventions were particularly recalcitrant. Riots broke out in towns and cities over Christmas, 1647-1648, followed by demonstrations in the rural West Country.\(^{172}\)

This was a time of street ballads and ballad mongers when folk stories and tunes were marshaled in the celebration of old ways and heroic outlaws including a fictional “Robin Hood” and other highwaymen that fled to the forests where they robbed the gentry who were removing people from the commons in the name of commercial pasturage.\(^{173}\) In the heady blend of political insurgency, upheaval, and popular revolts,

\(^{170}\) Nordland, *Brewing and Beer*, 221 and Buhner, “The Fall of Gruit.” As Buhner notes, hops contain phytoestrogens and were known at this time to cause “brewer’s droop.” Notably, the herbal qualities of hops made hopped beer a prescribed drink for lactating women because it was understood to add the flow of milk.


the oral tradition of John Barleycorn emerged as an evocative symbol within popular print culture. As folklorist and historian Joel Bernard outlines, “John Barleycorn” was a popular title in the broadsheet ballads of a nascent penny press that sold its wares not only from bookstalls and street-corner of cities to recently displaced populations, but also within the provinces at markets and fairs. For this reason, it is perhaps not surprising that Barleycorn also became a central figure of a satirical chapbook titled *The Arraigning and Indicting of Sir John Barley-Corn* (1650s), which served an entertaining defense, not only of recreational drink, but also “the economic benefits of drink” for rural society in the face of puritan moralism and the rule of Oliver Cromwell.\(^{174}\) By evoking John Barleycorn, popular print culture “symbolically fused” Royalist politics and village ethos in the alehouse and barley cultivation, which, as Bernard notes “could persuasively be defended as an ancient staple that employed tens of thousands in its cultivation, malting, brewing and baking.”\(^{175}\) Via mock trial-- a well-established satirical form within political pamphlet wars, the diminutive simulacrum of John Barleycorn, a scarecrowish figure with tufts of thatch protruding from his sleeves, stood before the bar awaiting judgment. He is aided by the testimony of the “Plow-man,” “Bunch the Brewer,” “Mistris Hostiss,” and the “Exciseman” whose survival hinged on Sir John’s cultivation and employment. Indeed, with bits of verse the chapbook evoked the central role of Barleycorn in the village economy:

His Name is Sir John Barley-corn,  
which makes both Ale and Bread:

174 Bernard, “The Transit of ‘Small, Merry,’” 97.

What should all do which now are born,  
if Barley-corn were dead?176

Needless to say, Barleycorn’s defense was so moving that he was set free confirming his value, economic and otherwise, for common people as well as the health of the state. In its totality, Barleycorn’s judgment captured the sentiment of the times. Cromwell’s reign was ultimately short-lived and his bans were lifted with the restoration of Charles II in 1660. In this world of rural or recently displaced persons who still found meaning in farm work and pastimes, the ballad and its derivatives offered a recognized if not idealized form of humor and sociability. For the target population, the chapbook reasserted the benefit of mockery, not censure, in dealing with human shortcomings when it comes to drink. It reaffirmed the value of dwindling traditions in referencing the seasonal rhythms of rural life and “homey details of petty trades.”177 As Bernard makes clear, the chapbook capitalized on the substance and intuitive knowledge of village life at a pivotal moment when “economic thought of the late seventeenth century…began to subsume the consequences of individual economic choices into ever more abstract theoretical aggregates.”178 As a literary participant in a war of words within a broader “dramatic evolution of popular political consciousness,” The Arraignment and Indicting of Sir John Barley-corn tapped into anti-Puritan sentiment.179 Barleycorn’s figure would survive as part of a literary tradition with the continuation of enclosure and enduring

176 Bernard, “The Transit of ‘Small, Merry,’” 97.
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ethics and aspirations shared by commoners that were increasingly marginalized to the point of outlawry. And, once established as a fixture of a rural economy and culture in opposition to the politics of self-denial, Barleycorn would resurrect time and again in modern temperance debates.

Colonial America

“Who first violated the temperance pledge in the garden of Eden?” asked Leonard Withington, Massachusetts temperance enthusiast in his essay “The Puritan” (1836). Female influence was not, according to Withington, to be blamed as with Eve for the downfall of mankind in the biblical Genesis, nor did the event take place in the garden of middle-class domestic bliss. Rather, this stalwart teetotaler located the fall in the habits of men, resulting in loss of their own colonial garden and its profitable fruits.

This image of Eden gone awry was a favorite of early American temperance thinkers that enjoined total abstinence and could not seem to resist the analogy of harmful forbidden fruit lingering in their midst. This fruit took the form of the cider apple, beer and ardent spirits that survived with custom and certain populations that made the Atlantic passage and whose use in a new world amounted to original sin. Returning to paradise, colonists had attempted and failed to reject the pleasurable fruit first sampled in the primordial garden. It was a transgression deserving of the most culturally loaded imagery.

Amidst references to serpents and forbidden fruit we might expect from quasi-religious temperance jeremiads, stands the uniquely European figure of Sir John

---

Barleycorn. At first, he seems an odd fit, for John Barleycorn is an illusive figure in colonial folklore. Whether any small farmer hummed the traditional folksong with his hands on the plow is difficult to say. Barleycorn’s home was the medieval village, the central feature of an old order that was fading from existence and did not transfer to the Americas. Moreover, barleycorn’s namesake, barley culture, enjoyed only a limited existence in the colonial landscape of cash crops and indigenous maize. Still, Barleycorn’s people made the trip, and his name was part of an established cultural lexicon that was refreshed with new immigrants and continuous contact with England. Most of all, Barleycorn represented the endurance, in colonial fashion, of a premodern moral economy in which alcohol, the good creature of God, played a pivotal role.

Temperance histories and the penwork of temperance opponents locate the arrival of Barleycorn’s spirit in the first instances of settlement. Henry Malcolm Chalfant, a Pennsylvanian teetotaler and author of *Father Penn and John Barleycorn* (1920), claimed the “liquor traffic” and all of its associations, arrived with early settlement as part of the “story of Colonial experiences and customs.”181 So too, Pennsylvanian lawyer, poet and antiquarian Henry Lee Fisher, on pondering the origin of the “art” of the still and fermentation in America, credits the founders for keeping Barleycorn alive:

So then, we find John Barleycorn,
A man of royal origin;
And usquebaugh and barley-bree
Together came across the sea
In company with Holland gin;
And here, among the brave and free
Have reared a mighty dynasty.

181 Chalfant, *Father Penn and John Barleycorn*, 11.
Down through the ages came these arts—
From East to West, across the sea;
The men who brought the Bible here,
Brought here the art of brewing beer
And ale, and drank their barley-bree:
They founded Princeton, Cambridge, Yale.
But drank their whiskey, wine, and ale.\textsuperscript{182}

Obviously, depending on one’s loyalties, the transference of drink with European culture
into the new world either translated into original sin or confirmed the value of tradition in
making something new and prosperous.

Most importantly, alcohol—Barleycorn’s most potent spirit-- was a signature
element of the agricultural society that dominated the colonial economies and life. In fact,
alcohol was part of two colonial worlds that existed side-by-side: the commercial coastal
plain and what sociologist Tony Waters has termed the “triumphant” subsistence
paradigm. As Waters has argued, each was implicated in the other. Establishing a
foothold of settlement along the Atlantic required the ability to subsist, but for many
would-be settlers, this means was also an end—a chance for the displaced peasant to
settle and endure.\textsuperscript{183}

To be clear, commercial production was the formal impetus of settlement.
Conceptions of land ownership outlined and enforced by joint stock companies
safeguarded commerce as the core colonial purpose. As noted by historian Allen
Kulikoff, property concepts brought from Europe set the stage for later development and

\textsuperscript{182} Henry Lee Fisher, \textit{Olden Times: Or, Pennsylvania Rural Life Some Fifty Years Ago, and Other Poems}
(York: Fisher Bros, 1888), 183.

\textsuperscript{183} Waters, \textit{Persistence of Subsistence}, 100.
these settlements differed notably from the northern European and English village. Land, as property offered the primary inducement for emigrants drawn in by the enticing marketing of colonial promoters that targeted farmers to produce a long list of agricultural commodities. Thus, colonial economies were structured around agricultural exports: tobacco in the South, wheat and corn in the Mid-Atlantic, and a mixture of grain and timber, among other things, in the Northeast.

A prime example of this ordering of land and economies can be found in New England—the cradle of temperance and thus the site of primary interest for this dissertation project. In this region, colonial towns were highly structured formations from their founding. The Puritan settlers of the northeast were not interested in recreating the medieval English village. Unlike many who lives unraveled as the new economic order swept European society, these ambitious colonists were among those individuals who sought opportunity in revolutionary change and in the great space of land in the Americas as a potential source of wealth as the spirit of commercialism altered attitudes towards land now “sought as an object of speculation and investment for profit.”

Colonial founders such as John Winthrop, lawyer and governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, established the notion of the colony as a Christian commonwealth in which Puritans, through a covenant with God, would establish a model purified community far from European corruption and royal interference. The ideal, however, came with admonishment should the covenant fail. So states Winthrop:

184 Kulikoff, From British Peasants, 42-46.
Consider that wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill, the eies of all people are upon us; soo that if wee shall deale falsely with our god in this worke wee have undertaken and soo cause him to withdrawe his present help from us, wee shall be made a story and a byword through the world…\(^{186}\)

With so much at stake, town formation could not be left to spontaneous development.

“The task of founding towns, so different from the ‘automatism of village life,’” notes historian John Frederick Martin, “called for a complex organization” something akin to the “borough, but with the additional capacity for harnessing people’s initiative and activism and for apportioning a myriad of new rights and duties.”\(^{187}\) The English joint-stock company served this requisite. New England towns were raised with commissioned surveys that organized land holdings. Founders were investors in this project and expected future returns. For instance, the Mayflower Compact served as a business covenant with each pilgrim, or “planter,” committed to labor in the construction of towns and in return, each received a share, with additional shares awarded for contributing financial backing to the venture.\(^{188}\) After seven years the profits, including buildings, cattle, land, were to be divided among the planters according to shares held. Thus, as Martin explains “Far from being limited … by a medieval, communal view of land, the English coming to America arrived with the help of corporate entities that markedly advanced the commercial use of land and were themselves the product of England’s new, expansive commercialism.”\(^{189}\)


\(^{187}\) Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 133.

\(^{188}\) Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 135.

\(^{189}\) Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 133 and 123.
Protestant social theory contributed to these developments and mindsets in other ways. The Puritan preoccupation with idleness and “waste” made the conquest and development of the American “wilderness” an ethical imperative. The power of their obsession with land development not only validated its enclosure and use as a means of profit, the pursuit of a proper commonwealth also inspired Puritan writers such as William Pynchon of Connecticut, author of “The Meritorious Price of Men’s Redemption, Justification, etc.” (1650) to view gains made via genocidal campaigns against the indigenous Pequot as an act of Providence.\(^{190}\) To “waste” was to sin. Native land use patterns, their seasonal mobility, apparent poverty amidst natural wealth, preference for subsistence and failure to “improve” the land, met, as historian William Cronon asserts, the “full scorn of English criticism” which envisioned the lives of Indian men, in particular, as “perhaps too close to certain English pastoral and aristocratic fantasies for Calvinists to tolerate.”\(^{191}\)

Not all settlers were like-minded; their inter-ethnic encounters and attachment to old world ways insinuated, for Puritan Separatists, the threat of Bacchanalian release: the mixing of race and class, work and play. In 1625, lawyer-turned-adventurer, Thomas Morton took charge of the Wollaston settlement to the South of Plymouth, renamed it “Ma-re Mount” (Merry Mount) and proceeded to break all the taboos of Puritan decorum. In exchange for furs, Morton offered liquor, and worse still, “peeces, powder, & shotte to

\(^{190}\) Martin, *Profits in the Wilderness*, 123, 126.

ye Indeans,” complete with instructed in their use.\footnote{William Bradford, \textit{History of Plymouth Plantation} (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1836), 238} And, in keeping with English tradition and folkways of Devonshire, his birthright, Morton raised a May pole around which the indentured servants and natives celebrated May Day with feasting, dancing and drinking. Predictably, Merry Mount’s Separatist neighbors responded with alarm, voiced here by the plantation’s second governor, William Bradford:

…they fell into great licentiousness, and led a dissolute life, powering out them selves into all profanenes. And Morton became lord of misrule, and maintained (as it were) a schoole of Athisme. And after they had gott some good into their hands, and gott much by trading with ye Indeans, they spent it as vainly, in quaffing & drinking both wine & strong waters in great excess, and, as some reported… They also set up a May-pole, drinking and dancing about it many days together, inviting the Indean women, for their consorts, dancing and frisking together, (like so many fairies, or furies rather,) and worse practices. As if they had anew revived & celebrated the feasts of ye Roman Goddes Flora, or ye beasly practieses of ye madd Bacchinalians. Morton, likewise (to show his poetrie) composed sundry rimes & verses, some tending to lasciviousness, and others to ye detraction & scandal of some persons, which he affixed to this idle or idol May-polle.\footnote{Bradford, \textit{History of Plymouth Plantation}, 237.}

In the above quote, the violations of Merry Mount encompassed “atheism” (Athisme), as well as drinking, trading and otherwise consorting with the natives. Under the May pole, a symbol of medieval European folk festivities of pagan origin, old world and new world commoners fraternized in a manner that “anew revived” the practices of old—a threat too much to bare. Merry Mount’s diversions were short-lived. In 1628, colonial authorities seized Morton and returned him to England on charges of trafficking arms with the
natives. The settlement was relinquished to the patent of a Mr. John Indecott who removed the May pole, reined in the populace, and renamed the place Mounte-Dagon.\textsuperscript{194}

As historian Kate Van Winkle Keller informs us, the festivities at Merry Mount – from the rising of the May pole to Morton’s poetic endeavors-- were in line with established English traditions that dated to Celtic Britain when Beltane customs ushered in the summer months and May Day celebrations were “enjoyed by everyone, from royalty to the servant classes.”\textsuperscript{195} But for Protestant reformers in England and in the Americas, such celebrations were an adulterous pagan holdover. Comparable to England, colonial May Day practices would not die easily. Erected poles were regularly removed from colonial towns, only to resurrect mysteriously, and in larger form. For many settlers the poles served as “a potent symbol of opposition to Puritanical rule” and their presence resurged with the restoration of the crown in 1660. In the colonies, May Day rituals also merged at times with indigenous seasonal celebrations, and in the 1770s as “Liberty poles,” with popular resistance to imperial policies.\textsuperscript{196}

Notably, strictly controlled religious or commercial settlement was unrealistic. The extent of policing mechanisms and commercial activity required means of transport and transport was limited to the coastal ports and major waterways along the coast. Hence, subsistence and associated folkways endured because commercial development took time to establish and was limited in its geographic extent. Settlement also entailed a


\textsuperscript{195} Keller, \textit{Dance and Its Music}, 302.
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period of adaptation for both survival and commerce. Not all European crops or agricultural methods fared well in the new world. Cereal grains, in particular, languished in New England’s short growing season and rocky soil. Ergo, the early years of colonial settlement were marked by a transition between indigenous and European subsistence ecologies with Europeans adapting native crops such as squash, beans, and maize to English cultivation practices.\textsuperscript{197} Thus, while the settlers of New England may have been “enterprising men” that dreamt of cultivating gold--small grains such as wheat which could fetch high prices from abroad, when European cereals, with a few exceptions, fared poorly, New Englanders resorted to Indian corn, apples and livestock that could guarantee their survival.\textsuperscript{198}

Colonial uses for alcohol were an extension of custom, but alcohol also served practical needs when environment, lack of currency, shoddy transportation systems, and restricted markets forced settlers to focus on family maintenance. Alcohol was the safe drinking option when water quality was questionable. It was also the primary medicine taken in the form of spiced beers, wine, and distilled tonics. Alcohol served as currency when coinage was scarce and alongside other fermenting arts, alcohol production provided a way to store nourishment for sustenance over the winter. According to custom and as a form of currency, alcohol was used to pay laborers.\textsuperscript{199} It was also used to provision slaves. As a derivative of bulky barrels of apples or bushels of corn, fermented

\textsuperscript{197} Waters, Persistence of Subsistence, 101, and Cronon, Changes in the Land, 160-161.


and distilled spirits were invaluable because they were useful, compact, and fairly imperishable. For this reason, nearly all farmers from the smallest subsistence farmer to the largest planter relied on alcohol as an indispensable item for use, barter, or sale.

Aside from the environment demands that made subsistence a necessity, there also existed a class of settlers who dreamt less of cultivating gold and more of land removed from the ever-expanding market. This population, derived from the influx of displaced European peasantry had arrived, some willingly, some by force, as “free” or cheap bonded labor. When able, these migrants settled the spaces beyond the narrow strip of coastal commerce and in the land too distance from water transport to farm on a commercial scale. In this American hinterland, they established the scattered homesteads of a subsistence paradigm whose loyalties lay, as Waters details, along long-established social systems and values “that had developed on the farms of Eurasia and had only recently been transplanted to North America.” Subsistence, in contrast to market orientation, was defined by a focus on family maintenance and labor intensive farming, complemented by hunting, patriarchal organization, limited markets, and kinship or clan loyalties. These settlers often worked outside of land grant and tenure systems and with territory that was, even as of 1800, not yet commodified, despite official efforts to “bind” it through surveys and land patents to the system of civil land ownership. Even when these settlers acquired or even accumulated land titles, many proved informal or unenforceable, especially when families moved and were no longer occupying the land. For all practical purposes, most subsistence farmers like the indigenous population

---
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operated according to usufructuary land rights, with boundaries defined by “corn,” “cabin” and “tomahawk rights” (the marking of trees).\textsuperscript{201} Moreover, subsistence farmers shunned the large, extravagant houses, the priority of market access, and improved fields that defined status in commercial society. Rather, they sought stature through the obligations and responsibilities of the extended family. Thus, despite the designs of colonization, American settlement found form in a limited commercial world which extended a mere twenty to one hundred miles from water transport, and extensive inland subsistence regime.\textsuperscript{202} In essence, colonial America sat somewhere between old and new; poised for commercial development that was stayed by distance and living conditions. With these two worlds at truce, life in America lingered on the cusp of what Karl Polanyi called the Great Transformation.\textsuperscript{203}

As previously stated, alcohol was part of both subsistence and commercial worlds. On the level of subsistence, alcohol is the product of one of several fermenting arts that defined food systems the world over prior to the industrial revolution. Its manufacture is part of a “deep history” of human interaction with their environment and ecological processes.\textsuperscript{204} The consumption of fermented fruit predates agriculture and human civilization while grain ferments date to the Neolithic. All ferments are the

\textsuperscript{201} Waters, Persistence of Subsistence, 110.
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product of simple technology that utilizes natural locally occurring microorganisms for
the preservation of foodstuff and the enhancement of these items as a source of
concentrated nutrients, flavors, and psychoactive substances. Fermentation provided
premodern peoples with an effective way to engage and adapt to an environment and in
the face of limited resources. The advent of fermentation has also been identified as
integral to the formation of human culture, providing people the “transformative power”
necessary to procure and preserve harvests as land was brought under cultivation and as
people intentionally engaged nutrient cycles with their co-evolving microbial partners.
Unlike today’s market systems, which intentionally separate health, food, and the
environment into separate categories for commercial needs, food production centered on
fermentation underscores, as food historians Mark West and Bill Schindler note, “the
interconnections between these categories, with food being an essential element that links
people with the environment.” As a product and producer of culture, fermented foods
and drink are markers of place, tradition, security and cultural identify.

The colonial home economy produced a wide range of ferments including cheese,
pickled fruits and vegetables, brined and cured meats, leavened bread, wines, beers, and
distilled spirits. All provided farmers with the capacity to store seasonal abundance in
line with long-established patterns of subsistence common to Eurasia. The capacity to
direct fermentation processes allowed people to weather winter’s retraction—that aspect
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of the vegetative cycle when nature reclaims that which was given. Directing this cycle insulated populations against the lean months of nature’s seasonal economy using a controlled form of decomposition while also allowing communities pleasurable sustenance. When combined with collective labor and social gatherings-- the feasts and festivities of subsistence from barn raising or funerals-- ferments, especially alcohol, confirmed the social role of such foodways for sustaining community and buffering its members against depravation. We might even see the role of ferments in the subsistence paradigm as a definitive factor in Polanyi’s notion of embedded economics; a way of being that contrasts strikingly with dynamics of the boom-bust cycle of the market economy.\textsuperscript{208} Subsistence folk, with their cellars and attics packed with the fruits of their labor entered winter with harvest celebrations. Market downturns, in contrast, elicit panic.

On the commercial end of colonial existence, fermented libation facilitated the growth of colonial commerce and bound the disparate colonies together economically. The trade in rum alone amounted in a highly profitable industry. Derived from molasses, a waste product of Caribbean sugar plantations and slave labor, rum served as substitute for familiar drinks left behind in Europe and as a palliative for the stress, disease, coercive labor, boredom, and unequal sex ratios of colonial life.\textsuperscript{209} Rum was drank by colonists of various ranks spiced or buttered or in a punch or nogg, but especially by


members of the poorer classes including slaves, poor whites, and seamen.\textsuperscript{210}

Economically, rum found a market in ports around the Atlantic world with several harbors specializing in its distillation and exportation. The resulting product was integral to the French and British fur trade with native peoples and contributing factor in the slave trade in distant Africa. In the Northern Atlantic, the first rum distilleries opening in Boston in the early 1700s. Others followed and rum became an important export for the Northeast. Within the elaborate workings of the early commercial economy, rum, like other spirits, served as an alternative to difficult to obtain hard currency and risky credit options. Also known as “rumbullion,” rum offered a profitable black market for colonial merchants in face of trade restrictions imposed by British Navigation Acts in the late seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{211}

In North America, the consumption of rum was coastal since inland transport was expensive.\textsuperscript{212} Seeking to expand and diversify the commerce of spirits, the mid-Atlantic region by the late seventeenth century began exploring the domestic production of beer and wine. William Penn himself hoped the banks of the Delaware might become, as Chalfant notes, a “rival to France in the production of rare wines, and hence he zealously urged the importation and cultivation of grape vines.” Likewise, to encourage beer production to consume surplus grain, Pennsylvania’s legislature passed a 1722 act that
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prohibited the use of molasses in brewing and distilling. But imported grapevines failed to flourish and home-brewed ale, porter or stout, blended with herbs to produce gruit, remained the most common form of colonial beer prior to the Revolution.

Meanwhile, in the northeast, hard cider had become a staple with the proliferation of orchards that echoed the orchards of England where apples had been, next to barley for many centuries, “the backbone of the rural economy.” For family farms lacking funds, cider was necessary to attract seasonal labor. It doubled as money and payment for rent, or could be sold to local towns for cash. The cider apple in England was so revered by farmers that English agricultural reformer William Marshall, in 1796, commented that “Their [farmers’] Orchards might well be styled their Temples, and Apple Trees their Idols of Worship.” Savored along with good stories and company in informal cider houses, some held in sheds and barns, cider signified “direct links with the land without any interfering middlemen or health inspectors…”

In New England, the poorest land and poorest farms bore cider apples. Grown from pips, early American orchards represented one of several pre-capitalist farming traditions and strategies that provided a resilient, reliable, and free source of fruit that was not necessarily market-worthy, aside from the cash or goods traded for a few barrels of

---
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cider. Seedlings, cultivated and selected for their hardiness ensured few catastrophic losses.\textsuperscript{218} The resulting land races took well and yielded generously in orchards of mixed cultivars, berries, cherries, plums and pears that were also fermented for perry or wine. For subsistence, apples were an ingredient in favorite meals: baked ham or chicken stewed in cider. As elsewhere with whiskey, in the northeast, cider facilitated barn raisings and was ever-present at family and community get-togethers.\textsuperscript{219} It is also worth noting that cider and vinegar doubled as valuable items for trade. All things considered, the apple its derivatives bridged home and commercial economies and mindsets at a time when environment, distance and protective isolation hindered the type of commercial development the initial settlers had hoped for.

In the South, large and small planters produced some ale and cider, but also a variety of brews and distilled products using “ingredients such persimmons” that were, as Sarah Hand Meacham reminds us, “unfamiliar to Europe and New England.”\textsuperscript{220} Water in the southern colonies was particularly dangerous and associated with typhoid, malaria and salt poisoning. Under the circumstances, all members of society-- large planters and small farmers, women and children, laborers and slaves-- consumed alcohol. Cidering, brewing and distilling was women’s work and part of home economy while men focused on tobacco production. The dispersed and rural nature of settlement meant little in the way of commercial production, though large planters typically made surplus to sell to
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small planters, tenants and local taverns. Backwoods subsistence families in the South and mid-Atlantic, in contrast, malted their corn for whiskey for home use or for barter or sale as their ancestors had in the old world. But unlike the peasantry of the British Isles, colonial farmers were unencumbered by the excise duties on distilling that served as one device employed by Cromwell in 1643 and later as an aid to landlords in the enclosure of their estates, especially during the Highland Clearances following the Act of Union with England (1707).

On the seaboard, the tavern played an important role as a tool of empire and comfort to traveling merchants. Prior to the completion of more formal civic spaces, taverns served as meeting places for the proceedings of courts and government, which, as Christine Sismondo maintains, qualified taverns as integral in laying “the groundwork for empire building.” Taverns were considered a necessity in facilitating travel and commerce, so much so that Royal governors encouraged their proliferation. This impulse was tempered by concern over taverns as a potential distraction and spaces of drunkenness, which, long before the temperance movement, inspired their limitation and the restriction of these businesses to respectable members of the community. In the South, colonial taverns were an extension of large plantations since large planters controlled licensing and items for sale were either imported or derived from the large
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stills of large planter households. Nevertheless, taverns were social spaces. Taverns were central structures in even the smallest inland towns by the late seventeenth century. Some taverns were located near mills, churning out local brew using local grain and at times even exchanging beer or spirits for grain with farmers. As in the old country, taverns also served many social functions, doubling as auction-houses and central markets. People socialized, heard and exchanged news in taverns, attended banquets and church services, on occasion, were even married in taverns.

Opposition to alcohol was limited in the colonial era. In the early 1700s, the New England Puritan minister Cotton Mather denounced the flood of commercial rum as instigating disorder through its role in promoting a trade imbalance that drained hard currency from the northeast and in its consumption by the volatile lower orders of society. This complaint diminished with the establishment of distilleries that reduced the region’s dependency on imports. Some ministers and officials decried the role of alcohol in the fur trade, often blaming alcohol for the degradation of indigenous peoples who had incorporated drink into their patterns of consumption as an entheogen and palliative for epidemic disease and the harsh realities of social change. These complaints, however, did little to alter the role of alcohol in the trade. And, overall, objections to alcohol sales belied race and class prejudices as arguments ran in two contradictory directions: the first
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against the exploitation of natives, and second out of distaste for “wretchted [sic]… spectacles” of drink and potential up-swell of violent drunken discontent.\textsuperscript{229}

In the land rich and labor scarce environment, subsistence bore the advantage and proved “triumphant,” at least until the mid-nineteenth century. Abundant land allowed subsistence production to reproduce itself via a positive feedback loop of family labor provided by numerous offspring who, with each generation, brought more land under subsistence cultivation. Consequently, a European horticultural subsistence regime came to replace a similar indigenous subsistence regime. The high growth rate of frontier farms made for a formidable demographic surge into the lands between Appalachia and the Mississippi River between 1750 and 1840.\textsuperscript{230} Meanwhile, the adaption of indigenous crops to European cultivation methods and technologies, and the keeping of livestock for labor and meat, gave European-American families the capacity to reproduce their mode of subsistence with remarkable vitality. The result was a class of farmers who enjoyed more independence from the market than either the European peasantry with its shrinking land base and dues owed to the aristocracy, and native peoples who purchased the cloth, tools and spirits that European farm families could produce themselves.\textsuperscript{231}

Henry Lee Fisher’s poetry mentioned above, refashioned John Barleycorn, the “man of royal origin,” into a symbol of American subsistence spirits (most notably humble maize whiskey) and the independence that the American subsistence regime
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afforded. As in the European tradition, Fisher linked the still, free of the odious excise, with the ability of American farm folk to make payments (gales) on their land and accomplish certain tasks cooperatively—in other words, those things necessary for anyone who wished to live the simple farm life. Fisher, who sympathized with the subsistence farmer, also located moderation in the American hinterland. He writes:

Our simple, rural ancestors,
   As matter of economy,
Set up their stills to raise their gales
   And drank their whiskies, gins, and ales,
But always drank them moderately,
   Except, perhaps, on holidays,
Or, when there was a barn to raise.

O! for the good old moderate times
   Which have been, but, no more can be;
Each farmer had his still-house, then,
   And stilled his surplus fruit and grain;
From exciseman and excise free,
   In Conestogas drawn by four
He hauled the bree to Baltimore. 232

Fisher also found an inkling of old world carnival in the “plain but loved ways” of small subsistence farmers and enduring spirit of Sir John, minus his honorary title. In one poem titled “Winter Carnival” Fisher describes the “savory mess” of early winter pig butchering, its “rude” and “carnal” scenes, the making of sausage and metzel soup:

And help themselves they freely did, as need required--
The stalwart butchers, suffering from thirst--
John Barleycorn could make their labors light,
   And give a keener edge to appetite
For the coming feast of sausage, souse and ‘liver-wurst;’
   And many a weighty bet was lost, or won--
To him who lost, the bet was all in fun.

What wondrous changes in one winter-day were wrought!
Where were the entrails at the dawn of day?
Within the bodies of the doomed swine;
And where were the swine at the day’s decline?
Within their entrails stuffed and deftly hung away;
And now, with sausage hanging up and bullocks salted down,
Let snows descend and winter rage and frown.\textsuperscript{233}

The labor light and appetites keen, the feast ensues, made possible by the carnival of life and death. Drink lightens the work which blends with play in the ecology of social life that long defined European peasant ways. Winter ends life, but gives it to another in the transubstantiation of food and drink into flesh and blood.

As we can see, in the American context the slaughtered pig could serve as a stand-in for barley and holds the symbolic weight of John Barleycorn. As Peter Linebaugh observes, the pig had long carried import in English commoning. The custom of pannage served as “one of three defenses against destitution,” alongside gardens and other allotments. Pork was the poor man’s “venison”—a guarantee of meat.\textsuperscript{234} The pig’s significance in the American setting was not, however, to be outdone. Indeed, the powerful endearment for the early winter “hog killing” lingered into the twentieth century, evident in cookbook advice on how to recreate “the same scenes, on smaller scale” (and with a pre-butchered pig, no less) as the traditional community event.\textsuperscript{235}

\textsuperscript{233} Fisher, \textit{Olden Times}, 178.

\textsuperscript{234} Linebaugh, \textit{Magna Carta Manifesto}, 58-58.

\textsuperscript{235} See, for instance, Social Workers M.E. Church South, \textit{The Spartanburg Housekeeper’s Cook Book} (Spartanburg: Everett Waddey Co., 1909), 27-28.
The subsistence paradigm stood in stark contrast to the development paradigm which sees land, capital, and labor only through the lens of the market. And, in many ways, the farmers of the American hinterland were “uncaptured,” notes sociologist Tony Waters, by the marketplace, participating with the market on a minimal level, surviving and thriving even when market options failed.\textsuperscript{236} Still, the subsistence regime served commercial coastal needs. Though its ethos was not market oriented, American-European agricultural forms employed by farm folk encouraged the opening of new lands. Subsistence in flight before a growing market converted indigenous ecologies into imperial ones. Frontier farms cleared land and buffered the coast from native incursion.\textsuperscript{237} The proprietors that received land grant via the crown made allowances for frontier settlement with the knowledge that it would feed their mercantile empires a steady stream of wilderness products such as furs and timber.\textsuperscript{238} Thus the encroachment of a fleeing peasantry on native land claims and its limited engagement with the market made subsistence an odd but powerful ally of market imperialism. That is, until the market caught up with these farmers at which point they might expect, in the words of Wendell Berry, to “sooner or later become ‘redskins’”—the new designated victims struggling to preserve their way of life.\textsuperscript{239}
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From the 1730s onward, a flush of Scotch-Irish immigrants and a culture of home distillation arrived and moved to the frontier where they worked their stills. This migratory trend and shifting trade patterns increased whiskey consumption over rum, swapping out one low-class drink with another. Likewise, during the American Revolution, the breakdown in trade with the British blockade shifted colonial drinking toward whiskey. Continental troops received whiskey rations, whereas in past wars they received rum. Further trade disputes with Britain limited trade with West Indies after the war and into the early 1800s. Meanwhile, settlers flooded west, and distilling expanded with them, and in competition with high-class producers who found shifting drinking trends lucrative, for commercial production also expanded as the likes of George Washington went into distilling with rye production in Maryland and Pennsylvania.240

Increasingly, squatters were resented by eastern elites such as Washington. In anticipating westward expansion following the French and Indian War and territorial cessions to the British Empire, such elites engaged in land speculation with claims made on thousands of acres already occupied by natives and subsistence farmers. Prior to the American Revolution, however, royal rule and the Proclamation line of 1763 stymied the legitimacy of speculative land claims. In the years preceding the revolution, attitudes towards farmers and alcohol began to shift with a growing regime of commercial development and state building. Chalfant’s temperance history identifies this as a time when farmers frequently “stirred up trouble” either as commercial agents trying to sell grain or as backwoods farmers in defense of their land and stills. During the war,
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Chalfant suggests that farmers weren’t consistent in their support for the patriots, pointing out that farmers were loath to give up bins of grain that would have “kept the army in comfort” and instead turned their grain to whiskey despite bans on the use of grain for making spirits. A 1778 Pennsylvania ban was so “flagrantly violated,” that a second law was passed in 1779, forcing formal inspections to ensure the enforcement of grain use for wartime needs. Widespread opposition, however, also ensured the law’s repeal the following year.\(^ {241}\) Perhaps most importantly, this temperance history, rooted in revolution, reveals how entwined the movement was in the formation of the nation-state and its role in facilitating land commodification and a culture of capitalism.

Chalfant’s vision of farmer insubordination reduced the complex politics of the revolutionary era to a vision of stubborn individualism. In reality, the military market for foodstuff “was neither reliable nor lucrative.”\(^ {242}\) After 1775 when inflation made hard currency scarce, military officials either offered farmers paper money or forcibly seized supplies with little more than promises of future payment. Both were practically worthless. Ergo, farmers could hardly be blamed for refusing to empty their cellars when most home economies could ill afford the loss. Regardless, officials and soldiers alike protested the “avarice” of farmers and imagined hoards of grain where there were none.\(^ {243}\)

\(^{241}\) Chalfant, *Father Penn and John*, 37, 43-44.
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Beyond the issue of requisitions, farmers as a class were not, by far, detractors of the revolutionary cause. Farm laborers, tenant farmers, and backwoods subsistence farmers characterized the bulk of American farming and bore the brunt of war’s costs. Landless and unmarried farm sons and day laborers—“the poorest third of taxpayers,” were the regulars that committed years of service, bore the inequities of rank between gentlemen officers and ill-provisioned infantrymen, endured hunger and cold, before returning home to face creditors and debt suits with little more than worthless debt certificates in hand as payment for their service.\textsuperscript{244}

There is another reading of the “trouble” cited by Chalfant that is a pattern of backwoods resistance as the expansion of subsistence came to loggerheads with gentlemen who sought to use their political connections to lay claim to large land grants. From the mid-eighteenth century to the 1830s, conflicts between yeoman and gentlemen farmers over unequal land distribution and emerging new republican order spanned the frontier. Swelling cadres of disgruntled folk mushroomed in the remote backcountry of New Jersey, New York, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Massachusetts, Connecticut and the Carolinas. These agrarian rebels went by many names: Wild Yankees, Green Mountain Boys, Liberty Men, Regulators, Whiskey Rebels, and Anti-Renters. Their more daring stands have names as well: Ely’s Rebellion (1782), Shays’ Rebellion (1786-1787), the Whiskey Rebellion (1791-1794), and Fries’ Rebellion (1799-1800) -- insurrections that surged in the wake of war and with the struggle over the definition of the nation.\textsuperscript{245}
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Their primary fear was that America would go the way of European society, where abusive landlords exploit tenants to the point of poverty and eviction, ultimately pushing the farmers off the land and into urban centers and wage slavery. Agrarian rebel and evangelical preacher, Samuel Ely, voiced this connection in 1797, when he identified the “peasants” as the voice of “liberty,” defying the laws that set “traps and snares to catch men.”

Newly enfranchised farmers, artisans and laborers used their votes and decisions as jurymen to force state politicians and courts to pass highly democratic state constitutions, deny foreclosures and to pass laws sympathetic to the plight of commoners that suffered most from the post-war economic depression. They also gathered in protest in opposition to policies that tried to hoist the lingering war debt held by New England and European bondholders onto the rural population. In many ways, the Constitution which was put into place in September of 1787 by the propertied class in order to secure centralized control in the name of commercial and political stability against “unruly democracy,” was strongly opposed by the very people the document evoked. And for good reason. Those present at the Constitutional Convention were largely in favor of John Jay’s favored maxim that “those who own the country ought to govern it.”

Moreover, those of notable wealth were busy using their political privilege to increase
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their holdings even as they structured political power around concentrations of private
capital.

The American Revolution, while appealing to mass population as a struggle for
liberation from the older social hierarchy in the name of equality was belied by new
demands of capitalist entrepreneurs, financiers, manufacturers, large landholders and
speculators with their eyes on western territories and revolution as means to jump-start
industrialization. Perhaps nothing signaled contention over the post-war change of course
better than the Whiskey Rebellion, a conflict in which six western counties of
Pennsylvania and Virginia rebelled over the passage of a new whiskey excise that many
viewed as a symbol of inequality under the direction of federal policy and the nation. A
“frontier-wide movement” the Whiskey Rebellion stands out as the “single largest
e Example of armed resistance to a law of the United States between the ratification of the
Constitution and the Civil War.”249 The excise at its heart was no mere tax; rather, it
represented the course of the nation and economy. As author William Hogeland’s history
points out, excises had long been resented and “aristocratic literature condemned all
excises as nasty attempts by crown and ministry to shift the economy from its only
legitimate basis, land, associated by landowners with aboriginal English freedoms, to
grubby ones like manufacture and slimy ones like finance, associated by landowners with
decadence and tyranny.”250

249 Thomas P. Slaughter, The Whiskey Rebellion: Frontier Epilogue to the American Revolution (New

Landed men viewed merchant-finance as corrupt, but Congress needed New England bondholders like Robert Morris who saw in the reworking of the Revolutionary War debt an opportunity to make a profit. A large part of the debt entailed war bonds--IOUs to farmers and artisans for services rendered and goods confiscated during the war. As years passed and payment failed to materialize, these notes rapidly exchanged hands, at which point Morris, who was simultaneous busy collecting war bonds at a fraction of their original value, called on the newly forged federal government to exchange the IOUs and at face value for new interest bearing bonds. To pay for this move, a newly devised federal tax would be placed on the very same people who had initially received the IOUs and who had parted with them to people with inside information.\textsuperscript{251}

A regressive tax on whiskey was devised by Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, for this very purpose and passed in March, 1791. The tax also effectively targeted small farmers and squatters that impeded the claims and profits of absentee landholders and speculators, many who had rented land they had never seen to tenants with plans of selling the land for a profit after it was cleared of forest and natives. Washington was one such speculator who had purchased land in the west despite the 1763 proclamation. With his holdings legitimatized by the revolution, Washington was eager to enforce both rents and foreclosures while the land bubble remained viable.\textsuperscript{252}
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In the words of Hogeland, “The tax redistributed wealth by working itself deeply into rural people’s peculiar economic relationship with whiskey.”\textsuperscript{253} In reality, this relationship that defined whiskey as a medium of exchange within a system that was an obstacle for the development paradigm, was not peculiar at all. Rather it was the latest rendition of an old and enduring system. Hamilton, the architect of the tax, understood the workings of the English excise as a means of consolidating state power as well as production and commercial agriculture through the competitive advantages built into the law. Parliament issued the first excise on alcohol as a revenue measure during the English Civil War. Notes Slaughter, the practice “quickly became the heart of the revenue system in an age when wars and administrative centralization put unprecedented strains on the empire’s fiscal resources.”\textsuperscript{254} So too, the measure was well-known as divisive and a devastating burden to small producers. Following the Act of Union (1707), the English crown granted loyal Scottish lairds control of vast tracts of land for “improvement”—the clearance of whole communities. These evictions provoked the Levellers’ Revolt of 1723-1725. By consequence, numerous clan members were sold into indentured penal servitude in the Americas. Meanwhile, demands for money rents instigated a conversion in exchange that was complete by the 1740s. This revolution in capital was met by a simultaneous shift towards entrepreneurial farming and industrial development. Revenue officials contributed to this transition through their heavy-handed enforcement of a regressive excise on whisky which effectively outlawed production by small subsistence
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farmers. But the practice of small scale distilling did not vanish. Rather, illicit distillation flourished as an act of subversion and economic necessity.\textsuperscript{255} The interstices of the landscape, its rocky crags and mountainous highlands, became home to clandestine stills that defied the impositions of empire and an economic revolution that proved lucrative for landlords and industry.

At nine cents per gallon, the American tax took far more from small producers. Large producers paid a flat rate that boiled down to about 6 cents per gallon and even less with revisions made in 1792. To continue to make money small producers would have to raise the cost of their whiskey significantly, even as large producers lowered theirs. Hamilton portrayed the tax as a levy on vice or luxury, but farmers experienced it as a tax on income and threat to their lifestyle.\textsuperscript{256}

Attempts to serve warrants for tax evasion resulted in the servers being whipped, branded, robbed, and tarred and feathered by the rebels. Going by the name “Tom the Tinker’s Men” --a name derived from the tinker as a stock character of English folk tales, including Robin Hood, which represented social outcasts-- the rebels also threatened to destroy stills of those that cooperated according to the excise and pressured newsprint to publish their demands.\textsuperscript{257} This was a time of agrarian radicalism, of Levellers, Diggers and Regulators. Rebel tactics were not new. Apart from what they borrowed from the revolutionary era, they also mimicked blackfaced gangs of men in dresses that attacked
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officials charged with enforcing hunting restrictions on what had been common land in
England.\textsuperscript{258} But most worrisome of all for the new republican elite was the highly
democratic and organized nature of the rebellion which fought in yeoman military
tradition and held regional congresses that recognized the votes of all white men whose
demands and petitions for redress were effectively communicated across states using
committees of correspondence, gathering support in transit.\textsuperscript{259}

As with the ritual contract drink of premodern Europe, drinking whiskey signified
a common bond and loyalty among rebels who took whiskey with food and at gatherings.
Just as drink brought people together for communal labor, so too it stood for solidarity—
the defense of localism to protect farmer interests against systemic restructuring by
outside interests. One embodiment of this solidarity took form in the planting of
“whiskey poles” in towns and on roadsides, an extension of the tradition of May Day and
Liberty poles.\textsuperscript{260} In this regard, we should recognize that whiskey held symbolic
significance—it represented the heart of a social system that challenged the power of the
emerging American elite. As Hogeland notes only one third of the rebels operated stills.

\textsuperscript{258} A tradition of the mumming of carnival traditions in the British Isles, blackface and transvesting
disguised those engaged in anti-authoritarian mockery. The Irish Molly Maguires would employ similar
forms of protest in Pennsylvania’s coal fields in the 1870s According to Kevin Kenny, the mumming of
Irish and Scottish culture involved demands of food, drink, or money for door-to-door performances on
festive occasions. As such, mummers reinforced an “alternative social order against external authorities”.
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Many joined the cause because they viewed the tax as unjust and a harbinger of politics gone awry with the course of the country itself at stake.\textsuperscript{261}

The guerrilla war on tax collectors and propertied persons culminated in a 7000 man march of landless laborers, struggling farmers and victims of debt foreclosure on Pittsburg and the arsenals at Fort Pitt and Frederick. Flying their own flag, they demanded access to land and progressive taxation that placed most tax burden on the wealthy. Some, disappointed with the government forged by the Constitution, also sought a revised federal structure around a unicameral senate that redistributed power back to the democratic base. In response, Washington sent a peace commission to stall the rebellion while the militia was secretly mobilized under the newly passed Militia Act. With the peace commission declared a failure after demands of total submission and no redress, the militia marched west.\textsuperscript{262}

Faced with overwhelming force of 13,000, the rebellion dispersed with many rebels moving further into the interior. In retribution, the troops pillaged the locals through the night of November 13\textsuperscript{th}, 1794. On this “Dreadful Night,” soldiers burst into homes of Pittsburgh residents without warrants. Hundreds of men were dragged out of bed and through the snow in chains to jails where they awaited interrogation. The prisoners were allowed no food, drink, or warmth for two days. In the end, the men were
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released and the point of the federal government was made: any further resistance would be suppressed with the full force of the military.263

The origins of an American temperance ideology at this crucial moment cannot be emphasized enough. The Whiskey Rebellion, in particular, sat at the epicenter of the formation of what David Harvey has termed the state-finance nexus. The state-finance nexus can be defined as “a confluence of state and financial power” that serves to orchestrate the integral relationship between debt and capital accumulation.264 The state provides the legal means for the “privatization of what were once considered common property resources” and secures the ongoing process of accumulation by dispossession through a centralized military.265 This nexus is typically shrouded from view but can be glimpsed in the transition of power arrangements. As Harvey points out, “Each state has a particular form of the state-finance nexus.”266 In this instance, the confluence of events and state response fused alcohol symbolically to resistance to the building of state, empire, and capitalism.

For those sympathetic toward small backwoods farmers, the excise represented an assault on a way of life that was central to notions of agrarian independence. Fisher tells how “John Barleycorn,” the spirit of subsistence, had made his way to America where he ran once more into the “odious exciseman.” The repeal of the tax by Thomas Jefferson
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who won the presidency in 1800, vindicated the subsistence farmer, a move celebrated in verse:

Free from the odious whiskey-tax,
For, this repealed, was now no more;
And ‘Liberty and No Excise’
Had come by law, free from the vice
Of Tom the Tinker’s lore;
And old Monongahela-bree
Flowed exciseman and excise-free.267

But, overall, history has been less charitable to the rebel cause. Richard Hildreth’s 

*History of the United States* (1849) painted the western farmers as wild drunks.

Contemporary textbooks are only marginally better, casting the outcome as oppressive but necessary for the survival of the nation and part of “securing the frontier” against farmers that were terrorizing tax collectors.268

For temperance crusaders to come, the rebellion offered a definitive example of alcohol’s lawlessness and potential as the instigator of anarchy. Indeed, political instability, heady economic boom, anxiety over the survival of nation, many called for hard work, moderation, and temperance as necessary for the survival of the nation. The ascendency of whiskey and backcountry insurgency attracted criticism from the class of professionals and revolutionary leaders, including physician and Surgeon General of the Continental Army, Benjamin Rush, who out of fear of the threat of anarchy in the problematic years following the war, espoused self-discipline and moderation in all


things as requisite for the success of the national project. The event also signaled the threat of the recalcitrant farming class to the finance and commercial revolution. This narrative began with Alexander Hamilton who disparaged the whiskey rebels as “drunken” and “anarchic.”

In short order, frontier farmers had become “white Indians.” Henry Malcolm Chalfant’s *Father Penn and John Barleycorn* (1920) assumed the farmers rebelled because they lacked the ability to get their grain to market. Like many, he surmised that had transport been available farmers would simply stop producing alcohol. As with other temperance reformers, Chalfant seemed unable to imagine farmers preferring a subsistence lifestyle, nor did he acknowledge popular notions of democracy at the heart of farmer uprisings. Likewise, Chalfant did not recognize the possibility that a market economy could boost alcohol consumption through commercial sales. “Rioters” forced Washington to restore order on the frontier, claims Chalfant. With “advancing civilization,” he assures us that old western stills would become, with time, little more than “useless relics of an age… passed on and left… by the wayside.”
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Chapter 2:
The New Commercial Order vs. the Economy of Alcohol

I see as you do, and with the deepest affliction the rapid strides with which the federal branch of our government is advancing towards the usurpation of all the rights reserved to the states, ... under the authority to establish post roads, they [the federal party] claim that of cutting down mountains for the construction of roads, of digging canals, and, aided by a little sophistry on the words 'general welfare'.... I doubt whether a single fact, known to the world, will carry as clear conviction to it, of the correctness of our knowledge [sic] of the treasonable views of the federal party... now look to a single and splendid government of an Aristocracy, founded on banking institutions and monied in corporations under the guise and cloak of their favored branches of manufactures commerce and navigation, riding and ruling over the plundered ploughman and beggared yeomanry...

--Thomas Jefferson

Let three more kings from the east,
Teetotallers great and high,
And let them take their solemn oath
John Barleycorn shall die.

-- Jabez Inwards, *Temperance Reminiscences; or Glimpses of the Past* (1854)

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the northeastern coast of the American continent housed two prominent trends: First, the “explosive expansion” of the American subsistence regime consequence of high birth rates and waves of old world folk migration from English, Dutch, German and Scotch-Irish peasant villages; and second, the rapid expansion of capitalist marketplace as a post-war commercial boom invaded the remote spaces beyond river and seaboard.

In many ways subsistence was triumphant. Demographic pressure could and did consume much available land on the Atlantic plain. Thus the subsistence regime expanded into the backwoods of Maine and New York, into Ohio and west of Appalachia to the Mississippi in its quest for land. Many arrived with land scrip awarded for service
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rendered during the Revolutionary War, and unaware of federal land ordinances or the
million-acre claims made by land proprietors on the lands they settled. In the end, the
scrip which failed to detail which lands, if any, could be settled, did little to secure any
claim.

The New Commercial Order

In the first few decades of the nineteenth century, commerce was on the make and
as with subsistence, counting on abundant and cheap land. Toward these ends, the federal
government provided the legalistic structure for land commodification using registries,
“fee simple” land ownership, and expedient packaging of land for sale through a grid
system—moves fitting a society ordered by world markets, the expansion of which was
delayed only by time needed to construct new transportation systems and the workings of
surveys and settlement. In this sense, the federal government furnished what Lefebvre
identified as a primary function of the state in providing a “strictly hierarchical
organization of space” for the “service of economic goals.” The grid, in particular, could
serve as an organizing principle that could be repeated on small and large scale, on a
micro architectural level and as super-structure or all-embracing order. Meanwhile,
Adam Smith’s treatise, *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) popularized the idea that the pursuit
of private gain somehow advanced the welfare of the whole society so long as men
abided the virtue of “temperance,” that is, self-control. This classical liberalism frame

276 Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 152-153.
Allman, 1825), 379. Also see Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments: Or, An Essay Towards an
by Protestant moralism became especially popular in the United States where political and economic freedom was eagerly intertwined by the architects of the American Revolution. The Revolution also served market interests in opening of overseas trade with the end of British mercantilism which also facilitated the rise of domestic manufacturing beginning in the northeastern states.

Development was tied to land, but land was contested. In the years following the war many families sought asylum from war and depression in the North and many, given wartime promises that the land previously held by distant British proprietors of the lands on the Massachusetts-Maine frontier would be redistributed as homesteads for veterans and the poor. But this land, held by the old proprietors of the northeast, the holders of the Plymouth Company (the Kennebeck Proprietors), Pejepscot Proprietors and of the Waldo Patent went, however, to the elite of the new political order who “parlayed their political connections and savvy into legislative confirmation of their claims.”278 The key here was legislative assistance--the commonwealth’s endorsement of private land grabs. The new Great Proprietors included prominent Federalists such as international investor Charles Vaughan, Major General Henry Knox, Massachusetts Governor James Bowdoin, and Colonel Josiah Little. All figured in as prominent military men, politicians, and/or speculators of real estate and commercial development. The most formidable shareholder
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was Knox who commanded millions of acres that granted him a “monopoly of the whole” in the sense that, with limited competition, he could effectively fix land prices.\textsuperscript{279}

As with Washington, these proprietors loomed large in the questionable politics of the early republic. Bowdoin’s harsh policies as Massachusetts’ second governor instigated Shays’ Rebellion, the showdown between the veteran farmers of central-western Massachusetts facing foreclosures and debt prison, and state officials located in Boston. Knox, military officer of the Continental Army and Washington’s Secretary of War, aided Bowdoin in suppressing the Shaysites in the winter of 1786-1787. Little, another war veteran, succeeded his father, Moses, in managing the Pejebscot claim and played an important role in the claim’s transference by petitioning the courts of the Massachusetts commonwealth to settle disputes regarding the claim in the late 1790s. Little proved particularly relentless in pressuring settlers to pay for the land they already occupied.\textsuperscript{280}

War debt dictated the selling off of public lands via profit-driven middlemen and levying of high taxes on those with the least power. For the Great Proprietors, the situation couldn’t be better. High prices, they assumed, would allow them to evict squatters and attract proper farmers who were interested in improvements and commercial production. Federalists protected the Great Proprietors in the name of

\textsuperscript{279} Taylor, \textit{Liberty Men}, 18, 34-48.
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preserving social order and opposing “anarchy” and the “leveler” spirit. Juries might rule for settlers, but were often over-ridden by court justices and arbitrators. 281

Since the mid-1700s, ambitious organizations such as The Society for Encouraging Industry and Employing the Poor had hoped to reap the labor of “undisciplined” backcountry farmers by directing hands into linen manufacturing. In the same spirit, Vaughan established a foundation for Improvements of Agriculture, Industry, Morals and Education of the rising Generation and other ventures for the reform of locals. Knox, working from the belief that an abundance of land discouraged industrious labor and proper deference to superiors sought to bar arbitrary settlement and direct frontiersmen into towns and lives of sober industry and social stability. Proprietors also contributed funding to the construction of churches, schools, flour mills, turnpikes, canals, and bridges. Vaughan even distributed apple scions and a constructed a brewery – cider and beer being the “temperance” beverages of the 1790s--to discourage the consumption of ardent spirits long associated with the coastal poor and latest wave of migrant farmers. 282

To encourage the proper division of labor and transition to an economy of capital, the Great Proprietors sought to reclaim farmers and wilderness for civilization using year-round work projects and societies that encouraged commercial farming. There were, nonetheless, barriers to their endeavors. Hard-scrabble farmers remained largely uninterested in risky investment and contributing labor to projects outside their
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homesteads. Indeed, the very idea of investment and rising property values which might raise land prices worked against the interests of small farmers that needed extensive tracts of cheap or free land for their progeny. Nor were commercial farmers eager to purchase titles in the cold, rough, and remote northeast.283

In comparison to the proprietors of old who might resent but tacitly allow squatters who could not afford formal titles, settlers viewed the Great Proprietors of the new republic as the “more dreadful usurpers.”284 But in the wake of the violent suppression of insurrections elsewhere, backcountry farmers of the northeast resorted to more diffuse forms of pre-industrial resistance--“frolics” or “capers” that brought together frontier communities around food, drink and collective assaults on surveyors and agents and the property of gentlemen. Actions included the torching of barns, lifting tools, shooting of livestock, all of which sought to restore local control of the land.285 Embracing the disparaging title of “White Indians,” settlers also relied on theatrics: noisy ambushes of surveyors and agents by farmers in mock-Indian dress and faces blackened with charcoal.286 The proprietors responded by seeking aid from ambitious neighbors and the leading men of backcountry communities who frequently acted as arbitrators in the conflict. These entities saw benefit in securing titles to their holdings which were more substantial and developed. Proprietors also pushed for the arrest of backwood evangelical
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preachers, such as Samuel Ely, who bolstered frontier agrarianism with their own variety of antinomianism.\footnote{Taylor, \textit{Liberty Men}, 140-144, 157-161.}

The initial fear of the “hill folk” was replaced, after 1812, with contempt of backcountry resistance and the occasional act of violence. Consequently, insurgency lost the support of leading men. Passionate resistance resurfbed occasionally into the 1830s, but to a great degree the resistance faded into rebellious “tavern” talk and support for Jeffersonian politicians that bore offerings of minor land reform. There were tradeoffs. The Betterment Act (1808) granted evicted farmers the right to sue proprietors for the value of improvements made to the land. But this and other acts endorsed purchased titles as defining property ownership and made legal action the means to redress.\footnote{Taylor, \textit{Liberty Men}, 157, 230-231.}

The temperance movement emerged in the context of these struggles. As stated, the Great Proprietors were among the earliest pioneers of reform. Their successors quickly surmised that the independence of subsistence and culture of alcohol presented a problem to themselves and to business. For one, emerging entrepreneurs took care to define themselves as people that sprouted from prudent and reputable families. For example, Neal S. Dow, an ambitious up-and-coming industrialist and prominent temperance figure of Portland, Maine, in his autobiography titled \textit{The Reminiscence of Neal Dow} (1898) described his farm heritage as “useful, respectable, and estimable men
and women” whose “industrious habits and simple, frugal tastes” set them apart from “those early settlers in the woods.”

Dow grew up in a temperance home. His father, Josiah, had left the backwoods family farm to join his brother-in-law in the tanning business in the 1790s. Living in the city of Portland, Josiah joined one of Maine’s earliest temperance societies, the Sixty-Niners, which formed the year after the War of 1812. Dow’s earliest memories were inhabited by his father’s tales of men who “drunk up” their land and otherwise squandered opportunities for advancement. Brought up in a Quaker home defined by rational Protestant asceticism, Dow, from an early age, begrudged alcohol’s prominent place in farm communities and was especially moved by what he viewed as the “indisposition to work” caused by alcohol. Young and eager to make a name for himself, Dow chafed at delays—coachmen who felt inclined to stop at local taverns for conversation and a cup of hot flip (cider mixed with liquor and warmed with a hot poker) and the “noisy” gatherings of “village people” who squandered hours drinking, talking “horse” and politics. Dow was especially mortified when otherwise “respectable gentlemen” felt inclined to “jump upon the tables and dance a jig to the encouraging


shouts of those present” who had, as he stated in his autobiography, a preference for the “good old times” despite “all the progress [being] made.”  

Dow’s fierce distaste for the alcohol and rural culture drew inspiration from a growing landscape of print, specifically, the London publication, the *Medical Intelligencer* and lectures of Pennsylvanian physician, Benjamin Rush, both of which linked drink to the corruption of the health and principles of a people seeking freedom from the confines that defined the premodern world. Dow’s indignation toward drink grew as he made a career as a successful tanner and investor in land and timber. In Dow’s eyes, Maine was “rich in materials” yet “undeveloped,” with “immense forests” waiting to be cleared and rivers to be “harnessed” to the loom, but the “intemperate condition of the people,” their “common use of alcohol” and attachment to “good times” translated into neglected resources and “badly cultivated farms” and population mired in “shiftlessness” and “idleness.” For Dow, the subsistence farmer stood physically and culturally in the way of progress.

Dow recognized alcohol as crucial to the economic and social life of farm communities. The range of spirits from cider to rum was central to rural exchange. Corn was husked and barns were raised using cooperative gatherings brought together by large meals and plentiful drink that also defined social and religious events. “Indeed,” mourned Dow, “liquor was generally accounted to be one of the good gifts of God, not to

---


293 Dow, *The Reminiscence*, 29, 162.


be lightly refused” and its “production of a great benefaction.” And, while…”[r]egret was doubtless felt, and sometimes expressed, that that gift was misused…” abstinence “was not even regarded as a wise precaution for personal safety, much less a Christian obligation by way of example for the good of others.” Drink was part and parcel to a day’s labor, daily breaks in fields or shops. Acting from an emergent middle-class mindset, Dow and others took on what they saw as their responsibility to oppose the “intemperate condition of [the] people.” As a founding member of the Maine Temperance Society (1827), Dow proselytized abstinence in opposition to the “general habit” of the people.

In Dow’s narrative we see how the impetus of commercialization heightened a preoccupation with the possibility that old colonial patterns of settlement were not uniformly committed to commercial enterprise; or perhaps, those patterns were corrupted somewhere along the colonial path. Indeed, Dow viewed all incarnations of drink as working to undermine the “path to plenty,” an “incubus” that “impose[d] its multiform burdens upon an entire community.” Encumbered by its customs and costs, Dow concluded that the:

Honest, industrious, frugal, enterprising, [and] thoughtful, … were themselves on the highway to prosperity, and were making plain the paths to plenty for all who should profit by their example … When at length they found their way onward
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blocked by a trade serving no useful purpose whatever, they devoted themselves to removing the enemy obstructing their progress.\textsuperscript{301}

A contest between two visions of wealth and independence was underway. The subsistence culture attributed to their farms the source of every necessity and thus freedom from obligations and debt beyond neighborly and family responsibilities. Farms had even supplied alcohol, a valuable medium of exchange. The civilizing mission of the Great Proprietors had made moves to bring frontier settlers into the commercial fold, but the market revolution demanded a more complete social reorientation away from what temperance writers called the “economy of alcohol” to an economy of commerce and sober industriousness, in other words, an economy of capital.

For many, the transition was not welcome. Temperance was a minority sentiment and Dow’s autobiography attests to the rejection experienced by early advocates, the “few good citizens” who “saw that something must be done.”\textsuperscript{302} Their proselytizing was subject to widespread derision. Mocked by even the lowest “urchins,” they endured “multiform, determined and powerful” antagonism which made them all the more adamant in their resolve. States Dow:

The new school was everywhere spoken against. Under the standard of hostility were found the old and the young, the rich and the poor. The temperate and intemperate met on common ground, and ‘even female tongues launched forth shafts of ridicule.’\textsuperscript{303}

\textsuperscript{301} Dow, \textit{The Reminiscence}, 177-178.
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But reformers had to their advantage demographic pressure and the expanding organizational structure of capitalism. Demographic pressure was due to ongoing immigration as well as natural reproduction. By the 1790s, spiraling population fostered an agrarian crisis in northeastern seaboard states that caused land prices and farm tenancy to soar and migrants to shift towards the interior. This crisis was intensified by land grabs and the expansion of commercial relations with new networks of exchange. From the 1790s to 1830s the “turnpike era” reshaped the landscape of mid-Atlantic and northeastern states through a wave of construction modeled on similar developments in England from the 1660s to the 1770s. To grasp the changes that occurred one must understand the significance of spidering bridges, turnpikes, and toll roads built by companies whose stockholders included farmers, artisans, merchants and land speculators. In essence, networks of roads and bridges were made possible by those who could afford stock at a median investment of $150, and who would benefit most by connecting western lands and backwood regions to burgeoning coastal markets. This process which was on-going, converted farms and fields into production units in service of cities. It also set in motion a frenzy of infrastructural development necessary to sustain the project of capitalist development. In the rush, reformers called for greater

\[\text{Sources:}\]
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commitment to agricultural and social improvement. But the consequences of commercial revolution were already being felt by farmers.

The expansion of commercial farming in response to demands of growing cities offered the allure of cash and consumer goods that enticed farmers into commercial production. As historian Mary Ryan has noted, booming cities prompted commercial farming “to support a number of processing plants—saw and flour mills, tanneries, distilleries, and carding factories,” in a manner that promoted the clearing of undeveloped land for agricultural commodities.307 The process was rapid by historical standards: transforming much of the northern states within just a few short generations and by the onset of the Civil War. This trend made it increasingly difficult for families to procure inexpensive land for their children as they came of age.308 The loss of land base central to the home economy in turn, increasingly made commercialization not only necessary for profit, but also for survival. Increased focus on commercial production and the shift of young adults from farm to factory undercut the home economy that depended on family labor.309 The result was a struggle for family maintenance which was previously promoted and protected by the lack of infrastructure, labor, and markets.

Gains made by farmers were also threatened by ever-expanding trade networks made possible by an ongoing transportation revolution, the production and appropriation of space that incorporated villages and towns in the global marketplace through a
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growing network of transportation that included canals and railways. Towards these ends, the construction of the Erie Canal stands out as a turning point. Hailed as a symbol of progress, the canal dramatically reduced the expense of bulk shipment. In 1817, hauling grain from Buffalo to New York City cost $100 per ton—three times the market value of wheat and six times that of oats. The price dropped to $15 per ton upon the canal’s completion in 1825. Any benefits reaped were, however, limited to a few farmers within a closing window of opportunity. Wheat brought the highest prices, but at great risk since crop failure or rapidly shifting markets could as easily bankrupt as enrich a farmer. Aided by additional canals in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, the Erie Canal ultimately connected major trade centers east and west, which, over the course of the next thirty years, opening the floodgates for western grain into eastern markets. Meanwhile, the elaboration of the Atlantic economy as steam became an adjunct to the sail opened New England to cheap grain from Europe. Previously stored grain and other northeastern farm products were, in the canal era, put into the expanding commodity market, making life for farmers more precarious in both lack of food stores but also dependency on market pricing. Similarly, while specialization could produce a variety of farm products across the region, it simultaneously reduced variety on single farms and due to competition from abroad, a reduction of certain specialized items as well. Beef fattening, dairy, and specialized market-gardening survived to some extent alongside the production of famous local cheeses. But overall farming became increasingly speculative. In the


process, some achieved wealth and consolidated landholdings, others hunkered down in subsistence and shrinking farms and social status, and many more were displaced. Landless, the dispossessed wandered from town to town seeking employment. The other option was to move west. In some areas of the northeast, more than half of the population fed a steady stream of westward migration.312

Commercial trends did not, however, diminish the manufacture and sale of alcohol. To the contrary, in the capital hungry economy, farmers often became more dependent on alcohol’s inherent commodity value. In addition to the stubborn resistance of subsistence farmers that continued their patterns of production even as they shifted deeper into the backcountry, in the risky field of agricultural specialization, commercial farmers relied on a growing landscape of breweries and distilleries to absorb their products and to sustain the price of grain. Farmers and the manufacturers of alcohol, in the provisioning of a rapidly expanding population of seamen, non-agricultural merchants, tradesmen, and laborers supplied the growing population not only cider and rum, but also large quantities of beer, brandy, gin, and whiskey. As of 1810, western Massachusetts produced annually 265,000 gallons of brandy from cider. In that same year, there were 500 distilleries in Connecticut alone and numerous others “in places as scattered as Kent and Newtown in western Connecticut, Woodstock in the east, and

Granby and South Oxford in Massachusetts." Some farmers even experimented with wine grapes.

As the farmscape commercialized, thousands of distilleries blossomed, many in association with farms and alongside gristmills equipped with patent, steam, or column stills that were larger than the household pot still. Farmers began to bring their crop to these establishments where, for a portion, they could have their grain distilled. These connections were practical. Bulky, locally grown grain had only a short distance to travel and the mill provided distillers, who needed a mill at hand to grind freshly malted grain, an efficient means to do so. Spent grain from the stillage could also be used as fertilizer or fed to hogs or dairy cows raised next to the same facility. Once run, whiskey from these local distilling operations was traded or sold locally, or shipped to larger refining operations that aged the product in bondhouses. These trends encouraged distilling operations and a livestock industry to grow in tandem, and as the ventures became larger and more profitable with the advent of continuous distillation, they took to selling dried stillage as feed for dairy cows. Large capacity stills likewise made the double distillation of alcohol possible for the production of an ethanol lamp fuel that, by the late

1830s, was replacing expensive whale oil throughout the county. Known as “camphene” (a blend of ethyl alcohol, turpentine and camphor oil) or simply “burning fluid,” ethanol was, as historian Bill Kovarik notes, “a mainstay of distilleries.” That said, it is important to keep in mind that the very same facilities that produced spirits for drink were also selling upwards of 33-80% of their product as fuel.

Other developments steered regional agricultural products into the manufacture of alcohol. Wheat suffered damage due to the accidental import of the Hessian fly in the late 1780s. Farmers fell back on corn or rye, thousands of bushels of which went to local distillers. Barley production was another stand-in for wheat which was complemented by a spike in hop cultivation in 1810 when hop prices rose to 37 cents per pound. These products found demand in a swelling brewing industry that, in many cases, extended out of the farm home economy. A prime example of this trend is the Hudson Valley Brewery, established by Matthew Vassar. Vassar’s father, James, began a home brewing operation that became a small commercial brewery in the late 1790s. Matthew and his brother, John, took charge of their parents’ brewing sales and ultimately, the brewery. Matthew also went on to found his own brewery in the 1840s, as one successful establishment in a
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growing landscape of hundreds of a growing domestic industry that served as outlets for abundant grain.  

When it comes to the proliferation of temperance societies, as Ryan details, in the face of shifting systems of production, displaced young men and women experimented with new value systems by participating in voluntary associations and societies and the ferment of the Second Great Awakening which reached New York by 1820. These associations and societies fostered movements for abolition, female moral reform (the elimination of prostitution), and temperance, with emphasis on controlling working-class morals, and in some cases, creating a “purified commercial system” by locating moral power in youth, especially young women who were associated with the enshrined space of pure, uncompromised domesticity. Temperance, in particular, offered individuals the “moral capital” many found increasingly necessary to acquire the credit and employment in this rapidly changing society. Temperance was also linked to consumer trends. Broadening trade networks made coffee and tea affordable to the middle class. Once a luxury, these products became a fashionable alternative to alcohol that evoked qualities of refinement, sobriety, and rational thought. Throughout the colonies, by the late 1700s tea and coffee had become the preferred drink of travelers patronizing taverns, rapidly supplanting beer and wine that had enjoyed brief status as the “temperate”
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alternatives to ardent spirits during the revolutionary era.\textsuperscript{324} One’s commitment to temperance qualities, especially by the 1830s as measured in drink, could even make moderate consumption of alcohol a socio-economic liability. For this reason, organizations like the American Temperance Society, established in Boston in 1826 grew rapidly, boasting approximately thousands of chapters and 1.25 million members within ten years of its founding.\textsuperscript{325}

As the middle class grew and farm and middle-class economic interests and culture diverged the stage was set for an acute confrontation over the social value of drink. Drinking was an established part of life that members of the middle class saw as regressive in contrast to their progressive move toward abstinence. Tradition and disinclination towards modernity were, indeed, factors in the maintenance of farmer and consumer habits; but equally so farmers were acting as economic agents in response to the market demands of their time. Their recruitment, or lack thereof, by temperance societies hinged on the ability of temperance to serve their basic economic needs. As early as 1789, some of the more “respectable farmers” in places such as Litchfield County, Connecticut formed associations against the use of distilled liquors, their primary concern being an ability to accomplish more work and getting more and better labor out of hired hands.\textsuperscript{326} For large commercial farms not tied to the liquor business, eliminating the cost of cider or rum as a customary form of payment made sense. Laborers, in need of
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cash, also appear to have welcomed the change, if we are to believe temperance records, though there is also evidence to the contrary. Many farm laborers figured drink into their expected pay as hired hands. Moreover, farmers who sold cider direct to the market or with an economic interest in the local distilleries and breweries would not have benefited in a similar manner to that of large commercial farms. Likewise, the shift to cash payments would have put small farmers, accustomed to paying seasonally hired help with room and board or at least in part with victuals and drink, at a disadvantage.

The Economy of Alcohol

Temperance literature reveals frustration that farmers, as a group, were not consistently enthusiastic supporters of the cause. To remedy this, special publications were fashioned that targeted farmers with economic arguments for the “temperance farm.” In 1825, the American Tract Society series, a publication wing for the movement, issued and dispersed Tract No. 176, titled “The Well-Conducted Farm.” This publication claimed to disclose the results of an experiment made upon an extensive farming establishment in the county of Worcester, Massachusetts, with results revealing the advantages of sobriety within the new business ethic of farming. Notably, the tract focused most intently on abstinence as a “remedy” for farm concerns regarding the need for higher productivity with claims that sober workers “performed more labor and with greater ease” and in a “better manner,” and paid more deference to their employers.328

327 Kerrigan, Johnny Appleseed, 144.

From this we can surmise the higher expectations placed on labor as farms commercialized.

Temperance activism also targeted farmers through agricultural publications. For instance, the *New England Farmer and Horticultural Journal* in 1829, offered up temperate role-models found among farmers and mechanics and the growing membership of temperance societies. The paper claimed that “They [temperate men and women] find that they are more free from ill turns,—can perform more labor …[and] their work is better and more expeditiously done.”329 Similarly, the Presbyterian minister Lyman Beecher, the co-founder of the American Temperance Society, suggested that prosperity belonged to temperate farmers:

What merchant in looking out for a place where to establish himself in trade would neglect the invitation of temperate, thrifty farmers and mechanics and settle down in a village of riot and drunkenness, made of tipplers, widows and degraded children, of old houses, broken window and dilapidated fences?330

In effect, Beecher proposed farmers should clean up their act and their property if they wanted the benefits of commercial success. And, of course, Beecher used the old image of the uncouth “village” of tipplers as the paragon that held back business.

In the tallies of temperance auxiliary memberships as of the early 1830s, farmers generally ranked low and many auxiliaries had no farm membership. For instance, in Hartford County, Connecticut, the auxiliaries of Enfield (306 members) and Canton (294 members) each boasted thirty “temperance farms” while the auxiliaries of Hartford, New


Britain, Kensington, Worthington, and Salmon Brook recorded no temperance farms in their vicinity. East Windsor (south parish) boasted fourteen temperance farms, but East Windsor (north parish) not only recorded the absence of temperance farms, but also the use of 353 bushels of grain daily by four local gin distilleries. In the growing trade center of Hartford, upwards of one quarter of the population were employed by the “liquor traffic.” Across the board, the majority of parishes were home to multiple cider distilleries, if not gin or other, unspecified distilleries. Salmon Brook topped the county list with forty resident cider distilleries with Canton in second place as home to thirty such facilities.\footnote{See the \textit{Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Connecticut Temperance Society} (Middleton: Gazette Office, 1832), 31-34, accessed June 5, 2014, https://books.google.com/books?id=bQpOAAAAYAAJ It is difficult to say whether all of the facilities listed were in fact distilleries. Just as “rum” became synonymous with all alcohol, “distilleries” appears to have served as a shorthand for all producers of alcohol.}

In attempts to manage space, temperance societies gathered “temperance intelligence” using members acting as spies or “agents” on the “field.” The work of these agents revealed four major trends: the proliferation of commercial production, a growing class of “paupers,” swelling penitentiaries, and a divided population of farmers. For instance, Nathan Crosby, Esq. of Newburyport serving as an agent for the Massachusetts Temperance Union, in his first quarterly report of 1838, chronicled the commonwealth’s landscape as pitted with numerous almshouses serving 8000 paupers. Added to this were approximately 3000 intemperate “commitments” to the penitentiaries, tallies of taverns and their operators, and of farmers that “would not consent to give up their cider.” In contrast to the latter, Crosby reported “gentlemen” farmers who “were not only ready to
give up cider, but had given it up,” and some that even conceded to smashed their mills and converted the product of the old grisly cider orchard to fodder for commercial livestock. 332 The architectural features detailed in this type of reporting—the poorhouses, prisons, distilleries, cider mills, orchards, and taverns, spuriously link alcohol to poverty and crime in the absence of other information, including the double role of distilleries as producers of spirits and lamp fuel. In this case, temperance logistics epitomize a common problem in the reading of space, as notes Lefebvre:

When no heed is paid to the relations that inhere in social facts, knowledge misses its target; our understanding is reduced to a confirmation of the undefined and indefinable multiplicity of things, and gets lost in classification, descriptions, and segmentations. 333

Within a commodity culture, people’s perceptions of space are skewed because market relations teach people to view the world not as a function of relations, but as a list of things. As Cronon asserts, in the quest for the merchantable commodity, New Englanders treated all aspects of their society and ecosystem as “extractable units” and in doing so “fell into this way of looking at things, so that their descriptions often denigrated into little more than lists.” 334 Left to casual assumptions and linkages, space is misread and dislocated from a landscape of production. The author and, consequently, the reader, fail to see space as produced by and representative of a mode of economic production. Rather, the landscape of alcohol and poverty was assigned the mantel of sloth, greed, and
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recidivism deserving of moral outrage poignantly expressed by the increasingly influential ATS to the readers of *New England Farmer*. The message, as of 1833, read simply “it is wicked to make ardent spirits, or to furnish it to be drunk by others.”

Thus reformers saw themselves as fighting an old demon. The temperance mythos sacralized market enterprise as an oppositional impulse to folk tradition and its assumed commercial extension. From this perspective all alcohol production represented the growing mast of an old unwanted tree that marred the commercial field. “The [teetotaler] pledge was the axe laid at the root of the tree,” states one American Temperance Union essay, “Cut it down… it is the deadly Upas, why cumbereth it the ground?” Proliferation took on a mystic quality with alcohol imagined as an evil whose colonial seed had grown out of control, infiltrating the political body as alcohol-saturated blood through a network of veins. States the essay: “Alcohol was diffusing itself through all the veins of society in fermented drinks. Breweries sprang up as by enchantment.”

As Sellers notes, “While revitalizing traditional piety against market corrosion, Calvinism also became the spiritual medium of capitalist transformation by sanctifying worldly work as religious duty and wealth as fruit of grace.” The ethos it bred bore its own mythology and supernaturalism that Christianized in a post-Calvinist Protestant
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manner, the mechanistic marketplace. Temperance contributed much to the epistemology of the market in which alcohol was featured as a dark trickster, who, in contrast to the Greek Prometheus, fashioner of men and enabler of progress, threatened to undo human striving to the end of civilization.

When it comes to placing alcohol in the Protestant sacralized market, Dr. Justin Edwards’ essay, “Laws which authorize the Traffic in Ardent Spirits as a Drink, Morally Wrong” (1833), stands as arguably the most highly referenced and widely distributed argument against the manufacture and sale of all forms of alcoholic drink. Edwards’ essay on the immorality of the traffic in spirits, laid the groundwork for the 1833 Philadelphia National Temperance Convention and quest for government enforced elimination of alcohol sales and production.

According to Edwards’ “Laws…”, as of the 1830s a grand “Temperance Reformation,” was well underway, evident in the landscape of 6000 societies and the “kind moral influence” of their one million members, however, its success was hindered by the legal traffic in spirits. This Presbyterian minister and Beecher’s co-founder in forming the American Temperance Society sketched the issue along two strains of thought: first, that production was a morally wrong and a violation of the divine will, and second, that the provisioning of alcohol to anyone was effectively an assault on national


wealth. In truth, Edwards blended the two points in a consciously constructed economic religiosity that defined the crusade as the next phase of the Reformation.

In his tract, Edward asserts that the furnishing drink to others is a sinful “offense against God” that was “injurious to the temporal and eternal interest of men.” This stance was based on the conviction that alcohol was poison and therefore its historic use was “a fundamental and fatal error” that made even moderate use “positively hurtful.” This central tenet (that alcohol was poison) had emerged with a middle-class obsession with food defined by suspicion of deception or fraud that went with transitioning from a home economy, as defined by familial labor which nourished, literally, all members of the household, to reliance on strangers for sustenance. Indeed, a growing landscape of literature frequently evoked the vulnerable consumer beset by a wide array of poisons ranging from common herbal remedies that made their way into patent medicines, to popular consumer items, such as tobacco. Hence, the byline of the Journal of American Temperance Union which read “Total Abstinence from All that Intoxicates.” These fears were fed by the rising availability of early English and American medical journals such as those read by the young Neal Dow. According to Edwards, because drink was a “poison…no man has a natural right to furnish it; or to wish for laws which shall authorize him to do it.” This being the case, the author contends that production of
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alcohol did not fall into Lockean theory—the idea that certain rights (specifically the right to property) granted by God, were applicable to the producers of spirits. While productivity was a general good, the traffic in ardent spirits did not qualify as contributing to the common good. No amount of licensing or regulation could alter this, and, in fact, Edwards viewed licensing as “morally wrong” because it sanctioned both the “wickedness” of manufacturers and the “ruin” that came with use. That said, Edwards argued against economic liberalism, but only in so much as it applied to drink.

How exactly alcohol ruined society was not merely an issue of personal health. Indeed, for Edwards alcohol was most ruinous as an economic factor. Building on the work of Adam Smith, Edwards couched his argument in terms of national prosperity defined by an increase in capital—an imperative threatened by drink. Edwards states,

…”the wealth of the nation consists of the wealth of all the individuals that compose it. The sources of wealth are labor, land, and capital. The last is indeed the product of the two former; but as it may be used to increase their value, it is considered by writers on political economy, as one of the original sources of national wealth. Whatever lessens either of these, or their productiveness when employed upon each other, lessens the wealth of the country.”

Notably, Edwards casts capital as holding special status as the origin of wealth that emerged from land and labor, yet somehow preceded both. How this could be is not scrutinized. Nor does Edwards ponder how capital emerges from land and labor. Capital

---

https://books.google.com/books?id=58vvAQAAMAAJ. The 1836 version, used here for reference, represents Edwards’ fullest argument, revised and fleshed out since the essay’s original 1833 publication. Print-wise, it is also better preserved and thus easier to read.
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just is—appears as if by magic alongside the state to act on land and labor for the creation of wealth.

Likewise, Edwards turned Smith’s valorization of self-control into a singular indictment against alcohol. Envisioning alcohol as the antithesis of wealth, Edwards claimed the very manufacture of drink undermined capital and thus, national prosperity, on three levels: loss of wealth from the land by directing crops to the distillery, loss of wealth in labor by equating drink with sloth and social inertia that deterred industry, and the loss of capital as the source of new wealth in its expenditure, not to produce new capital, but “merely to afford gratification.” Thus the production and consumption of alcohol squandered property –wages and products of the land, and transformed capital into indolence instead of turning capital into more property and labor, and thus more capital.

In light of this revelation, Edwards identified alcohol as the ultimate saboteur—a monkey wrench subverting the working of the “Divine hand” of Providence in the otherwise “unerring laws” of the market. If the economic system was not working as hoped, if not everyone was prospering according to market philosophy-- that hallowed Smithian formula where the invisible hand directed production towards the common good-- alcohol was at fault. Never mind the fact that capitalism was incapable of

345 Smith, *An Inquiry*. Smith used abstinence from drink only as an example of self-control as thrift, stating, “If a workman can conveniently spare those three halfpence, he buys a pot of porter. If he cannot, he contents himself with a pint, and, as a penny saved is a penny got, he thus gains a farthing by his temperance,” 379.
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producing a utopia for all, even on its own terms. After all, the core ethic of capitalism was accumulation by dispossession. The market system would work fine, explained Edwards, if Americans could oust alcohol, the backward holdover from the unfinished and quasi-“pagan” civilization of the old world.348

The inherent flaws of this strain of thought become particularly evident in Edwards’ treatment of farmers. Edwards seems reluctant to acknowledge that agriculturalist benefited from the production of alcohol or that many farmers, distillers and brewers were acting according to market mechanisms. Rather, he chose to cast all profits from the manufacture and sales of drink as temporary at best and ultimately so destructive as to overshadowing the value of short-term gains. Explains Edwards, “[e]ven if the present profits of those who sell” were “vast,” the deleterious effects of alcohol could only serve to diminish the property of consumers resulting in a “total loss” for society and even “the merchant and the distiller and the grain grower” who had “received their pay.”349 Through the consumption of alcohol, the farmer and his land became less productive, resulting in loss of capital by land and labor that affected all others in a most negative fashion. Grain became alcohol and alcohol became sloth, resulting in “no future harvest.”350 Edwards states, “thriving farmers” run to ruin through the purchase and association with drink, “Their farms…growing up to briars and thorns, … their children were at the grogshop or the scene of revelry and dissipation, and their whole interest…

withering under the indignation of the Almighty.” Ergo farmers, along with their children and all of the community landed into the almshouse where they become a “public burden… on the sober and industrious.” In this way Edwards directed blame for every social ill and farm failures onto alcohol and farmers themselves as guilty of the misallocation of resources.

Edwards’ remarkable piece of rhetoric was republished repeatedly across the nineteenth century. In the antebellum period it first appeared in the *Religious Intelligencer* (1833), followed by the *New England Farmer and Horticultural Journal* that same year, and by the *Temperance Manual of the American Temperance Society* in 1836. In addition, numerous publications referenced and built on Edwards’ argument. For instance, *The New York Evangelist’s* editorial “The Economy of Alcohol,” (March, 1836) merged the central themes of “Laws” with the well-established Protestant obsession with “waste,” redefined according to industrial needs as the destruction of valuable property or products with alcohol couched as a “waste of grain” and hence “a waste of property.” As noted, the word “waste” was previously reserved for wilderness—the failure to “improve” land through the displacement of its indigenous population, followed by its enclosure and development. While alcohol had served a lubricant for business and a role in farm maintenance, local economy and social web in...

---
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the not-so-distant past, the storage of grain or fruit as alcohol, or its sale to proliferating local cider mills, distilleries and breweries qualified as a new form of waste because it failed to contribute, in the eyes of moralists, to the emerging commercial economy. The workings of this vision, according to the article, could be seen in “the destitution and poverty in wine, beer, and cider districts.” To subsist was no longer acceptable. It was, in fact, equated with poverty. Moreover, alcohol could be blamed for the failure of rural farm regions under the logic that the destruction of valuable farm products in the making of alcohol necessarily reduced any population to “poverty, misery, and crime.” The paper even went so far as to blame breweries and distilleries for suppressing the price of grain, in reality, a consequence of the transportation revolution. *The New York Evangelist* acknowledged that farmers had been skeptics of this line of reasoning, and in its counterargument we hear the farmers’ concern that “temperance would injure the market for coarse grain.” But the author assured all farmers that the problem was with their culture and their product, concluding that, “[o]ur farmers would do well to remember this, and instead of embarking largely in the culture of barley and hops for the brewers, turn their investments in such a way as will tend to the prosperity of all, for there can be no permanent and valuable individual prosperity in the midst of general disaster and poverty.”

It’s difficult to read Edwards and not see a classic case of projection—the displacement of blame and frustration for the disruptive effects of the new commercial economy.
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order on the whipping boy of alcohol. As Donald E. Frey asserts, Puritan moralists, while enterprising and ambitious, were aware, on some level, that the spirit of acquisition could be a pitfall for individual and community; hence, the need for “temperance” – some way of reining in the consequences of socially sanctioned greed, a need that translated into discomfort with self-indulgence, luxury, and sensuality. Smith’s rhetoric regarding virtue and temperance offered them a direction. As Stephen J. McKenna points out, “propriety, a key idea of Smith’s rhetorical and ethical thought, is craftily deployed in his sociological system to advance the twin causes of free market capitalism and genteel morality,” a move that won sympathy for the idea that “stylistic virtue… is best acquired by imitating the ‘better sort’ by whom Smith means those who bear ‘the character of a gentleman.’” But the dilemma for farmers posed by temperance advocates laid bare the inherent contradiction of the Puritan success ethic. While the drink and its cultural associations served as an embodiment of waste that offended community sensibilities and begged for enclosure, delineating responsibility for the commerce of drink and its presumably seductive wares that proliferated with increased commercial activity was no easy task. Farmers, limited in their production options by environment, policy and markets, were forced to live within this contradiction of varying demands and anxieties.

The tortured logic of these writings was not without its agendas for it is clear from Edwards and others that they had class interests in mind though it may be difficult to see


at first glance. Let us take, for instance, the argument for “productive consumption” – an assumption that all purchases exist in a reproductive circuit of capital. By evoking the power of consumers, Edwards suggested that anyone and everyone, including the farmer, might prosper by simply “replac[ing] what they consume with something of greater value,” thus consumption could “becomes a source continually of increased reproduction, not only to them, but to the nation.”

This power located in temperance promised farmers “constantly increasing” property that would reverberate through society in “the value of their custom to the merchant, and of their wealth to the community” and to “their children” in the for of “increased advantages, might more than have filled the place of their fathers, and thus, without injury to any, the good of all been promoted.

Aside from confusing the productive consumption of a business with personal consumption, Edwards’ notion of “productive consumption” carried other implications fleshed out by his contemporaries. Further insight into this matter can be found in the arguments made by the Board of Managers of the State Temperance Society to the 1837 Constitutional Convention of Pennsylvania. After presenting collected data on the state’s landscape of inns, taverns, almshouses, penitentiaries and distilleries, the Society delved into the economic need for “proper” employment and agriculture, as defined by diligence, frugality, skill and contribution to industry as the leading purpose of society and

---


family.\textsuperscript{360} The Board bore particular exasperation toward those farmers who found freedom in making their own shoes, tools, ploughs, wagons, houses, bread and alcohol. Instead, the Board encouraged farmers to view themselves as “professional” men that might benefit more through the division of labor and in trusting manufacturers with the task of producing everything aside from commodity foodstuff. Above all, farmers were not to not sell spirits, but instead to grow grain-- preferably wheat, and to trust the grain dealer to “carry their wheat across the ocean.”\textsuperscript{361} By committing to petty commodity production, farmers would then be “free” to consume manufactured goods. In the Board’s words, the lifeblood of society depended on specialization and exchange and “if his [the farmer’s] business were to cease, the traffic of the world would cease with it; and the whole of society stand still.” To ensure that such a travesty did not occur, the Board called on the end of state protection for the “traffic” in spirits—the lifeblood of subsistence and many commercial farmers, recast by the Board as a “Slave Trade” because it encouraged farmers to maintain self-sufficient lifestyles which failed to contribute to the profitable pursuits of others.\textsuperscript{362} The new commercial order needed a market to absorb all of the goods being produced. To be productive, according to the arguments of capitalist political economists, farmers needed to become consumers.

Being a consumer, according to the Board, was not just about freedom. It was equally a duty to society. To not participate in the commercial landscape was to deprive

\textsuperscript{360} Memorial of the Board of Managers of the Pennsylvania State Temperance Society, to the Convention for Revising the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: Brown & Sinquet, 1837), 10, 16, 25.

\textsuperscript{361} Memorial of the Board, 25-27.

\textsuperscript{362} Memorial of the Board, 27.
“the printer, the butcher, and the baker” business and thus, “mutual support” towards the “harmony of the whole.” This rhetorical move echoed Adam Smith who fancied factory production as simply the latest extension of artisanal craftsmanship working together for the greater fulfillment of community needs. In contrast, the Board and others equated the production of alcohol with abuse of grain and of consumers. A testimony by an unnamed, but quoted reformed moderate drinker, plied the folk vision of tortured grain towards these ends:

I am determined to have barley in its full bloom, just as God made and sends it. I will not have it bled, and scalded, and mashed, and it nose sprit out, like an urchin. Only take off its rough coat, and I will eat it soul and body. John Barleycorn is good, but they abuse him, and he abuses them in return. I wish they could not get carts to cart about those casks full of murder… The scripture says lay down your lives for the brethren. They will not lay down that which is a source of sickness and death, to promote the health and life of others.

On one hand, this quote illustrates one of the central conceits of the new commercial order: the idea that all benefit from the socio-economic arrangements of capitalism. This quixotic notion stands in striking contrast to the spirit of give-and-take celebrated in the original folk song that recognized a simple truth: nothing comes without blood. Grain had to be sacrificed in the making of both ale and bread. But bread, in the above quote, never bleeds.

On the other hand, the stance of the temperance board and teetotaler testimonial highlighted a new harsh reality lurking below the surface of commercial idealism. That is, modern cities were dependent on capitalism for growth and sustenance. The

363 Memorial of the Board, 26.

relationship between city and countryside had changed. In the past, exchange was local and direct. Now commodity markets and capital served as the arbiter of all exchange. Capital commanded access to even basic foodstuff, which meant a deplorable amount of misery and destitution.

Industrial demands for consumers were matched by a marked resentment for the social cost that went hand-in-hand with the market revolution. This resentment emerged in temperance arguments that evoked the ugly sentiment of a middle- and upper-class tax revolt. While habitual drink might be equated with the bondage of addiction or subsistence, it was as frequently equated with “slavery” of another sort --the economic bondage of taxes hoisted on the unflaggingly temperate. Crusaders recognized that many farms were failing in the new commercial landscape and they begrudged having to bare the social costs of an impoverished population. For them, this “double bondage” of addiction and levies threatened to undo the liberty loving and industrious men of the region. As one spokesman for the movement claimed in an 1835 address, temperance stood for liberty from “oppressive taxation,” consequence of the burden of the unvirtuous poor falling upon the temperate and industrious. If farms failed, farmers only had themselves to blame. Their failures were all the more scornful because when “their farms went to wreck” they were no longer able to “pay their own share of the taxes.” Thus the frugal were forced to bear an “unequal burden.”

Here we see the notion of “accumulation as renunciation”—the paradoxical asceticism of capitalism where
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enrichment is associated with “personal labor and restricted consumption” instead of that which is “squeeze[d] out labour-power from others.” All are required to renounce the enjoyments of life. Meanwhile, the new commercial order, in capitalizing the means of sustenance, proved indifferent to the hardships of the expropriated population.

It is perhaps unsurprising that the wedding of religion and economic philosophy would birth a penchant for moral remedies to socio-economic dysfunction. Notes Gusfield, Malthus, as a minister, “sought to reconcile his gloomy prediction with the image of a good and charitable Deity” using the “cult of character”: a vision of economic salvation through moral restraint. But once applied to class dynamics, the Malthusian cult had the unsavory effect of justifying the depredations of an economic elite who claimed temperate lifestyles as the guarantor of their success. Like Malthus, temperance advocates believed that moral restraint distinguished the rich from the poor. In fact, Malthus found an admirer in Scottish theologian Rev. Dr. Thomas W. Chalmers, whose prolific writings made him a notable figure in the international antebellum temperance movement. As did other preachers that led the movement, Chalmers fused religion and political economy, concluding that Malthusian moral restraint offered a means to perfect Adam Smith’s system, and vice versa. In the spirit of the purgative evangelical mindset of his age, Chalmers advocated policy reforms including free trade and the repeal of the

366 Marx, Capital, 1:741.
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Poor Laws, the latter of which, according to Malthus, could only exacerbate the problem of overpopulation and social decline. Market discipline, however, according to Chalmers rightfully provided the temptations and trials necessary to nurture the growth and exemplary habits of a well-ordered society.\textsuperscript{369}

Of course, this formula set forth by Edwards and the \textit{New York Evangelist} also supported the needs of an industrial order for a sober, hard-working populace, where surplus was controlled and directed to feed a growing urban workforce. But the discrepancy in relation to the realities of farm economies also reveals tension between farmer interests and how reformers priced contributions to society. The new commercial order benefited from cheap grain made possible by limited grain markets and stiff competition from oversea suppliers. This allowed businessmen to pay low wages thus maximizing profits that might otherwise vanish as populations and prices grew. But keeping the price of grain high was in the farmers’ interest. So were sufficient outlets for mass production. Notably, by the early 1800s, distilleries and breweries throughout the western world already had a reputation of “devouring vast quantities of grain” in a manner that could elevate grain prices when prices for grain were in decline.\textsuperscript{370} This connection was not lost to farmers or temperance advocates. The English teetotaler movement, which was inspired by American temperance societies, and which exchanged


\textsuperscript{370} For information on western grain markets and influence of Dutch distilleries see Milja van Tielhof, \textit{The ‘Mother of all Trades’: The Baltic Grain Trade in Amsterdam from the Late 16\textsuperscript{th} to the Early 19\textsuperscript{th} Century} (Brill Academic Publishing, 2002), 58.
publications with its American counterparts throughout the nineteenth century, was led, in part, by activist Joseph Livesey who was also a staunch opponent of the Corn Laws (import duties that protected English farmers from inexpensive foreign grain imports) and the English Beer Act of 1830, legislation that loosened licensing requirements for producers and sellers to create an outlet for surplus grain. Notably, the US lacked similar legislation, thus American farmers were even more vulnerable to market forces.

Temperance narratives couched state support for manufactures as the working of a treacherous and unenlightened monarchy. According to temperance ideology, the refusal of monarchs to eliminate drink was self-serving out to the belief that drink functioned as the conspiratorial tool which, as P.T. Winskill’s *The Temperance Movement and its Workers* (1891) claims, was “wickedly employed for the destruction of the morals and independence of the people.” According to Winskill, drink served old monarchs by curtailing insolence through its incapacitating effect on the masses while “providing, as it were, OF SOME SEWERS OR CHANNELS TO DRAW OR SUCK FROM THEM THEIR MONEY BY SUBTLE AND INDIRECT MEANS.” State protection for grain markets and licensing of ale houses were the medium by which people would be parted with their money. Simultaneously, the likes of Winskill argued that pubs, “the very stock and sty of false thieves and vagabonds” endeared the peasantry, past and present, to sympathetic members of the gentry, powerful individuals that commoners called on for protection when local lords launched measures of enclosure and


Opponents of enclosure did hold demonstrative assemblies to appeal to the crown for protection, but this tactic proved largely ineffective over time. As the commoners fell in significance as a source of state revenue, sympathy from higher levels waned and by the 1800s, resistance was localized.374 If anything, the state continued to support alcohol as an industry because surplus grain needed an outlet and because of the financial power of manufacturers. The scandalous notion of royal sympathizers poisoning the population against development nevertheless helped sell a narrative. The very idea tapped into what many suspected: that some hidden influence was gleaning wealth from the people. But neither the squandering of wages on alcohol nor the old economy spirits represented could, broadly speaking, be to blame for widespread rising inequity in the Victorian era. Rather, the guilty party was the magic of capital. Workers “freed” from control of the means of production were forced to seek work in the labor market where the value of their labor was systematically depressed by the unequal power relationship of employer and employee and because the value of labor power was set by the value of commodities needed to support the laborer at a given standard of living, not to the actual use value of their labor. As Marx detailed, the use value of that labor being higher than the exchange value with which it is equated allows the employer to claim the surplus value of labor.375 This is the alchemy of capitalism, the hidden channel that siphoned wealth from one class to another. That said, the movement did fear monarchy but not

373 Winskill, *The Temperance Movement*, xx. All capitals his.


because of a distaste for despotism. The primary concern was potential interference by
government, which the crown had come to represent, with the unity of the process—the
circuitry of money and commodities that allowed the capitalist relationship to continue.

In the US, teetotalers found in alcohol a handy scapegoat for another element that
kept grain prices high: speculation. In response to common outcry over cost and
availability of food, the *Journal of the American Temperance Union* exclaimed,

> It is high time that the suffering community, the working class, should speak out.
> But let them speak right. Let them direct their indignation at the source of the evil,
> not at a spirit of speculation, but of distillation; and let them show their
> indignation, not by mobs, but by dashing the cup for ever from their lips, and
> compelling the distiller to abandon his business.\(^\text{376}\)

Thus the paper resolved, as if the magic of words made its stance reality, “That the
present exorbitantly high price of bread stuff,—and the sufferings of most of our poor, are
in consequence of manufacturing, vending, and drinking ardent spirits.”\(^\text{377}\)

There is, of course, another element to this equation which goes to the heart of the
transition in modes of production and its social ramifications. Early economists from
Adam Smith to Thomas Malthus maintained that high-priced grain was to blame for
worker depravation. Temperance thinkers took these claims another step by implicating
the manufacture of drink in elevated grain prices and thus hunger. But as Karl Marx’s
*Capital* (1867) disclosed, the real determinant of poverty was wages and capitalism’s
reliance on an industrial reserve army of hungry, unemployed persons as the optimal
means for breaking labor power. Enclosure, aside from depriving people of their means

\(^\text{376}\) “High Price of Breadstuff,” *Journal of the American Temperance Union* 1, no. 3 (Mar. 1837), 35,

\(^\text{377}\) “High Price of Breadstuff,” 36.
of subsistence, had generated a “nomadic population …a group of people whose origin is rural” as a reserve army for industry.\textsuperscript{378}

In terms of the popular backlash against the consumption of alcohol, Joel Bernard has also argued that the foundation for temperance can be found in a strain of superstitious beliefs and practices that cast “natural events … and social occurrences, such as wars and economic depressions, as divinely ordained.”\textsuperscript{379} Reformers who embraced the new economic order and its associations with rational thought and progress nevertheless harbored strongly held religious convictions that informed their understanding of the world. Christians of a Calvinistic mindset who happened to be living in New England, when anxious about social change sought lifestyle prescriptions that fit within existing practices of fasting and abstaining as a form of communal atonement for sins. In addition, Bernard notes that by the end of the 1700s, Protestants were already conflating the vocabulary of politics with Christian notions of sin, making redemption a function of popular government as evident in various laws against Sabbath breaking and obscenity. These trends, popularized by evangelical revival and various social organizations that bridged the religious and the secular simultaneously made temperance the primary focus of societal “re-orientation.”\textsuperscript{380} We can say that this re-orientation applied to production, especially in light of the Calvinistic view that human nature,
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defined as inherently weak, required community and familial discipline. If people could not resist the temptation of alcohol, then production would have to be eliminated. Moreover, because alcohol was an integral part of an older, land-based economy it served as the perfect target for the apologists of the new commercial order, which, despite its Enlightenment supporters, was not all that orderly, rational, or progressive. Notably, subsistence did not register as “productive” in the quest for capital. Because alcohol once inhabited the seat of exchange in subsistence economies, it should come to no surprise that the likes of Edwards, who valorized capital, would set their sights on its premodern rival.

But of course, spirituous drink was more than just a form of currency for past populations, just as capital was more than just money. And needless to say, the concerns of temperance went beyond the effects of drink or its moral associations. The colonists had lived with alcohol and found it useful. New concerns were with culture that began with the cultivation of the land, the planting of a seed and perpetuation of cycles. As Lefebvre notes, agricultural space functions as “Ur” space—foundational spaces for production systems. To culture is to cultivate, be it yeast in a bottle or seed in the soil. If alcohol is the spirit of crops, the eradication of alcohol reflected something more than the removal of the substance from society—it meant the elimination of its associated culture. The culture temperance groups identified with alcohol was one that blended work with play and fostered leisure, rootedness, interdependence and relationships defined by mutual obligations, in other words, the culture of the subsistence and its moral economy.

381 Lefebvre, Production of Space, 163.
This is not to say that American farms were even a close equivalent to the medieval village or that commercial farmers saw themselves as anything but petty commodity producers responding to supply and demand. Rather, reformers, operating from a Protestant religious mindset, saw what they believed to be lingering remnants of the manor in their midst. Thus they felt inclined to purge the old culture and economy of alcohol in birthing a new culture and economy of capital.

To these ends, we should return to Edward’s argument and its casual acceptance of capital’s primacy in wealth creation. As economic historian Karl Polanyi elaborates in *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, land, labor and capital are “fictitious commodities” in the sense that their production does not conform to production as an interaction of men and nature as with other commodities. As noted by Polanyi, through the commercial revolution labor and land were divided and “brought into the orbit” of the market so they might be “dealt with as commodities, as goods produced for sale.” States Polyani:

> Man under the name of labor, nature under the name of land, were made available for sale; the use of labor power could be universally bought and sold at a price called wages, and the use of land could be negotiated for a price called rent.\(^{382}\)

This move defined the value of people and nature only by their market utility and exchange value, erasing all previous forms of valuing, whether spiritual, social, or cultural in nature. Moreover, capital in the money form states Polanyi, the factor used to

\(^{382}\) Polanyi, *The Great Transformation*, 136-137.
harvest land and labor for production, is particularly fictitious in that it is called into existence and allocated by banks.  

Capital is not simply money, nor is capitalism strictly speaking the production of commodities since both money and commodity production preceded capitalism. Rather, capitalism is a system of social relations and circuits of exchange for the generation of surplus value, a way to seemingly breeding money from money. In reality, natural capital, including land, is of limited supply while capital is boundless. Thus the market is always in search of new sources of natural capital to mine for its needs. As Marx details in the second volume of Capital, capitalism can only exist in the context of the following conditions: One, systems of production in which laborers produce more than needed to live by; two, a class of wage laborers who, lacking the means of subsistence, must sell their labor; and three, a class of capitalists who own and control the means of production.

Capital, at the system’s heart, is a shape shifter, changing from one form to another in the process of capitalist circulation. In the abstract, political economists such as Smith presumed capitalism would be a perfectly functioning system in which values don’t shift in the process of capital’s transformation. But capital in the form of money, labor, and commodities in the production and sale of commodities within the above historical context, generates surplus value—the value labor performed beyond the value paid in wages which is realized in the sale of commodities. It is this surplus value that the
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capitalist subtly gleans as profits through the coercive nature of class relations and behind the veil of exchange.

For Marx, the “metamorphosis” of capital generated the illusion that money performed work. Thus, under capitalism, money becomes the ultimate fetish.\textsuperscript{385} It is worth noting that temperance theorists were correct in that the subsistence economy and its relationship with alcohol could not match capital in this respect. The simple exchange of products, for instance, the swapping whiskey for eggs, or even selling whiskey for cash to purchase eggs or pay one’s taxes were not capitalist forms of exchange and did not result in the accumulation of money from the theft of labor. In this sense, the transmogrification of capital differed from that of barleycorn. Sir John’s many incarnations were celebrated for their role in joining farmer and craftsmen in the cooperative and transparent subsistence economy. John’s thievery, like that of Robin Hood, was in the interest of balancing the books, i.e. keeping individuals from claiming more than their share.

Likewise, it is worth noting that as currency, capital has no intrinsic value unlike alcohol which could be drank, or used in medicine, or as a fuel for lamps, or as social lubricant in cooperative labor. Money is also distributed according to the priorities of the banking sector. Capital’s mystique and its power lay, as Polanyi points out, in its ability to “disembody” the economy from politics, environmental limits, and religion and social obligations.\textsuperscript{386} For the individual and society suffering from the effects of an economy

\textsuperscript{385} Marx, \textit{Capital}, 2:Part 1, Chapter 1.

disentangled from longstanding coping mechanisms and safety nets, Edwards offers up alcohol as the devilish scapegoat or “incubus” and temperance as the substitute guarantor of security and success.

In step with Edwards, other temperance theorists forged a land ethic centered on the sober petty commodity producer as the frontline in the battle against what was perceived as an assault on the young republic by a surviving elements of the old order. The work of Rev. Albert Barnes, a temperance celebrity of Philadelphia who toured and spoke internationally on the subject of temperance contributed much to its ideological base. In an oration delivered on July 4, 1835 at the Mechanics and Workingmen’s Temperance Society in Philadelphia, Barnes linked the temperance cause to the preservation of Republican liberty which he feared was under assault by “ancient dynasties” that would like nothing better than to see “the temple of freedom reared in the new world… tumble into ruins.”

Calling for renewed vigor in the temperance reformation, Barnes weaves a narrative of revolution and the unleashing of enterprise previously “shut up within the comparatively narrow limits of the Atlantic States.” But an enduring and expanding source of danger threaten progress via an onslaught of foreign immigrants “bred …with other feelings than those of republican liberty,” in the “prevalence of intemperance” as a vice rooted in “custom” and “festivities,” and in the existence of a southern plantocracy whose vast holdings and slave labor aroused

---


comparisons with the old feudal barons. Barnes imagines “capital and credit in embryo” at the formation of the union and a time “when public virtue was comparatively pure, with solid foundations laid by the social compact of Plymouth, “that rock” on which the colony landed, as ordered by “Divine Providence.” Freedom took form in land to be had. “God spread out this vast, this fair, this rich land,” states Barnes. “He [God] bade them cross the ocean,” calling men to come and “take possession of it all, for freedom.” Conversely, any barrier to proprietorship over the land was according to Barnes, a form of slavery.

This is not a call for a right to subsistence, but rather, free ownership so settlers might “summon forth the spirit of enterprise” for “An industrious man, in any honest calling, is the friend of the republic.” This was not the freedom of the “sons of idleness for liberty could not be “nourished”, claimed Barnes, “by suffering a race of men to swarm upon the land without a profession, without a plan of life; without disposition to labor; without honesty, honor, or religion.” Nor was it freedom from industry through amassed wealth, “pomp,” “idleness” and “effeminacy.” The freedom of the republic was the hard working male freeholder and petty commodity producer. This differed from the Jeffersonian ideal which located liberty in subsistence, i.e. independence from

markets. “Dependence,” notes Jefferson “begets subservience.” For Barnes, however, alcohol linked two remnants of feudalism: the idle poor and the idle rich. He imagined both colluding to corrupt politics so as to deprive men of their quest for property. Ignoring chattel slavery, for the most part, he implicates traffic in spirits in the loss of land and slavery of what are presumably Anglo-Americans. Only the temperate man of abstinence could ensure free elections and the possession of the land in the manner necessary to retain liberty. Explains Barnes,

> Our liberty depends on the exclusive possession by the people of the fee simple to the soil. Yet who can long be secure of this, but the men of temperance? Is it not every where [sic] known that the habits of intemperance tend to the loss of that right; and that an intemperate man soon ceases to be a freeholder? Do not titles, and deeds, pass soon into the hands of others, when this vice seizes with a giant’s force a man? And does not many a farm, cleared and cultivated when the man was a sober man, many a farm necessary to the welfare of the man and his family, pass every day from the hands of the drunkard into the hands of the already rich.

Quite simply, freedom rested on a personal property, industrious labor and crops for market with the assumption that loss of land necessarily stemmed from drunkenness which serves as coded language for the unfortunate dispossession of a certain class of farmer.

In sum, the temperance discourse of the 1830s composed important ideological pretexts for prohibition. Drink spelled the following: the loss of time, health, productivity of land, labor, and capital, in addition to the cost, in taxes, of prisons and almshouses to accommodate criminality and poverty for which alcohol was blamed. These losses and


costs compounded spelled the destruction of the nation, leading to Edwards’ logical
denouement: that political action was needed to ensure industrious production and proper
consumer habits. As Puritans had sought to purify religion, the temperance crusade would
now purify the economy. The defeat of moderates and rise of abstinence, for Edwards
spelled the first victory.\textsuperscript{396} The next big battle was legislation against the legal sanction of
production. Towards this purpose, Edwards called on farmers to join the cause: “Let all
farmers use their grains to increase the number and value of their horses, cattle and hogs;
not to diminish the number and value of men, and they will find it to be, to themselves
and their country, great gain.”\textsuperscript{397}

Likewise, as a form of uplift the assault on spirits congealed in the name of
provisioning the dispossessed and proletarianized. Curiously enough, the movement
evoked older feudal responses to deprivation but in a manner that reveals the movement’s
failure to recognize a core contradiction of capitalism at work in their society; namely,
how use value becomes captive to exchange value in a market system.\textsuperscript{398} In the pre-
capitalist past, people went hungry because of failed crops or due to a shortage of land as
a consequence of population growth. The cause of hunger was obvious, so were its
remedies. To keep the peace during famine, lords and kings lowered dues, redistributed
food, banned exports, and restricted brewing so grain could be saved for bread. The
Count of Flanders, Charles the Good, forbade brewing during the 1125 famine. So too

\begin{footnotes}
\item[396] Edwards, “Laws which Authorize,” (1836), 60.
\item[397] Edwards, “Laws which Authorize,” (1836), 66.
\item[398] For an explanation of this contradiction see Harvey, “The Seventeen Contradictions.”
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did the Archbishop of Cologne in 1220, and Magnus the Law-Mender, king of Norway, in late thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{399} During the Great Famine of 1315-1317, King Edward II shifted grain from unaffected Cornwall to areas most affected by the crisis. The export of grain and other foodstuff was prohibited and price controls were placed on brewing to safeguard grain for the making of bread.\textsuperscript{400} But under the new commercial order hunger swelled, quite perplexingly, alongside abundance. Eliminating the so-called traffic in spirits might make grain more abundant and thus, cheaper, but could not insure fair distribution according to need because in a market-driven economy exchange value is prioritized over use value.

The Great Potato Famine (1845-1852) offers a graphic example of how unequal distribution could result in mass starvation. The temperance response to this calamity was chilling. Crusaders agreed that all victuals should ideally go to the purposes of food at times of famine, but offered no mechanism for its distribution other than laissez-faire; namely, the repeal of the Corn Laws and indeed the crisis was used to push their repeal in 1846.\textsuperscript{401} The movement’s enthusiasm for free trade came with one clear exception. Crusaders recalled temporary closures of breweries and distilleries during famine in the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{399} Unger, \textit{Beer in the Middle Ages}, 134.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{401} For instance see “Food,—Its Nature and Waste,” in \textit{The Temperance Handbook: Consisting of Choice Extracts from the Writings, Speeches, and Lectures of Distinguished Persons}, ed. John William Kirton (London: Smart and Allen, 1874), 479. This handbook contains an assortment of items dated from 1841-1849 on the famine.}
past and called for their more permanent end. Others found solace in the fact that famine might further their political agenda. States Frederic Richard Lees, author of the *Text-Book of Temperance* (1869), “In Ireland, failure of crops has several times proved a blessing, by leading to the suppression of distilling.” The intemperance of the lower orders and manufacturers of drink took the blame in other temperance publications, which equally failed to recognize the market failure in addressing the crisis. States the *Bristol Temperance Herald*: “at a time when owing to the potato blight, thousands have died of famine, and tens of thousands have left their country for foreign lands, is an evil which, but for the infatuation of the drinking system, would in no wise be tolerated.” Notwithstanding these statements, this particular famine was thoroughly modern. Marginalized peasants, pushed into potato monoculture lost their crops to the spread of *Phytophthora infestans*, a micro-organism that traveled with global trade routes and the Columbian Exchange from its place of origin in Central America. When crops failed, suffering fell hardest on those with nothing to offer the market. Notes historian John Douglas Bishop,


Ireland continued to export grain to England because the English gentry could afford to outbid Irish peasants for the grain. The result was well-fed horses for the pleasure of the gentry and mass starvation for those without entitlements.  

While it may be true that some squandered pay on alcohol, deprivation in the largest sense was a consequence of the economic system, not the production of spirits. Only public intervention, the redistribution of wealth and food with the tax dollars and almshouses, i.e. the very remedies the movement abhorred, could ameliorate both famine and what had become endemic poverty.

---

Chapter 3:
John Barleycorn

If, then, I am become the victim of avaricious men, I crave, my Lord, the clemency of a merciful court, into whose hands I now commit myself.
--John Barleycorn’s defense, *The Trial of John Barleycorn, Alias Strong Drink* (1840)\(^{407}\)

Neal Dow was a gentle man until
He’d seen John Barleycorn kill and kill,
Then he hit the smoking trail
That leads to madness or to jail.
--Robert Peter Tristram Coffin\(^{408}\)

The figure of John Barleycorn became the primary metaphorical embodiment of the temperance nemesis within the transatlantic print culture of the antebellum period. As metaphors go, Barleycorn was attractive because of his history as an established icon and his pertinence in debates over the nature and direction of farming. Due to his popular associations, temperance writers found in Barleycorn a figurative bridge linking the presumed criminal nature of commoners to displaced farmers and laborers. In turn, America’s underclass would find in Barleycorn a simple of honest poverty and the dignity of village life. These opposing sentiments ultimately carried Barleycorn deeper into the political arena of American Antebellum politics.

The Trial of John Barleycorn

A recalcitrant agrarian element existed in both the American and English settings.

The English temperance movement ran up against resistance among farmers, which


found expression in the penny dialogue of their day. “Lancashire Fun” communicated a growing rebellious disposition to on-going Improvement Movement:

… a new landlord had come upon the scene, and a change for the better was to be inaugurated. Farms were to be put in order, and made more fertile than they had hitherto been. Tumble-down buildings were to be renovated, old-fashioned notions of husbandry were to be superseded by the newest of all improvements, and the ridding-up of fences, and the introduction of draining tiles staggered the ‘slow-coaches,’ who had been content with thin crops and low rents,--enjoying their pipe and their home-brew in peace, not caring for the go-aheadedness of the world without. It was quite natural that these innovations would interfere with the prejudices of a class of people who have always been known to harbour strong ones. ‘Hodge’ scratched his head, and exhibited a state of bewilderment at these changes that showed he was far from being prepared to accept them. The mutterings of a rebellious disposition grew to growlings, and the taproom of the ‘Bell’… nightly rang with the denunciation of all new-fangled ideas of land cultivation.

The English temperance leader Rev. Francis Beardsall, pastor of the General Baptist Church of Manchester England, responded to those mutterings with his *The Trial of John Barleycorn, Alias Strong Drink* (1840), a pamphlet that also served as a retort to the old anti-Puritan chapbook of the seventeenth century. The pamphlet’s publication was initially limited to England, but it nevertheless gained exposure through international temperance meetings such as the World Temperance Conference, first held in London (1846) which brought delegates of “Old England” and “New England” together in the common battle of the “English Race” and “Christian enlightenment” against “pagan

---


410 The original edition was produced in 1840 in Manchester by Rev. Francis Beardsall of Sheffield, England, who studied theology and worked with the General Baptists of Manchester and started a temperance society there. For more on the life of Beardsall see Jabez Inwards, *Memorials of Temperance Workers* (London: S.W. Partridge & Co., 1879), 31-33.

The main character of \textit{The Trial of John Barleycorn, Alias Strong Drink} deserves scrutiny because its agricultural associations stand out in the flush of allegorical embodiments, all of which failed to capture popular imagination to the same degree. Temperance writers frequently relied on colorful metaphors to stress the gravity of their cause. The range of sermons and tracts compared the danger of alcohol to the bite of the serpent, virulence of a plague, devastation of Noah’s flood, and destructive force of Mt. Vesuvius. Equally so, alcohol took the form of monsters, demons, tigers, and assassins. But it was John Barleycorn that media and crusaders seized with the greatest enthusiasm.

By design \textit{The Trial} was a superior piece of propaganda. It was short, accessible, and entertaining, and though not factually correct, it clearly stated the movement’s assertions as facts and did so in a manner that was persuasive without getting bogged down in convoluted and often contradictory lines of logic. Rhetorically, the pamphlet made several important moves that served the English and American temperance agenda well. For one, in disclosing John Barleycorn’s proper identity as “Strong Drink” or “Inebriating Drink,” it bypassed his traditional association with barley culture and fused a
plurality of drinking cultures-- usquebaugh, Bacchus, Barleycorn and the cider apple, into the singular entity of John Barleycorn. Indeed, Barleycorn bore all charges made against his accomplices, the various incarnations of alcohol including Peter Porter, Delilah Wine, and Ardent spirits.

Second, this literary mock trial targeted producers, including farmers, for their contribution to the woeful state of society. The plot begins with John Barleycorn who is arrested and taken before the bar to answer for his crimes, the first and most egregious of which charged that he had:

annually, to an almost incredible extent, destroyed good and wholesome grain, given by a beneficent Providence for food, by converting it into an unwholesome beverage, which he has sold to the people for ‘liquid bread,’ to the great injury of the health and morals of the community.\(^{412}\)

Other charges against Sir John included other common temperance indictments against alcohol: breaking the Sabbath, instigating riots, practicing quackery, disrupting domestic peace, corrupting the youth, causing workers to neglect their labor, impoverishing families, causing crime, destroying property, and leading people astray from religion. Notably, all of these charges stem from the decisions of farmers and an evil cast of manufacturers.

The trial’s characters include a telling cast. There is the negligent Farmer Hodge who relinquishes his crops without question to Barleycorn to be transformed into destructive draughts. Hodge serves as a foil to the figures of John Providence and John Speedplough who represent model temperance farmers. John Providence testifies that the

\(^{412}\) Beardsall, *Trial of John Barleycorn*, 3.
shadowy figure of John Barleycorn had been spotted buying barley from Farmer Hodge and this barley was delivered to Mr. Spoilgood, the Malster, and then to “Sin Brewery” where it was converted into “poison.” Thus God’s gift of grain was much abused, taxed and sold to an unwary public in what Providence proclaimed a clear form of theft. Consequently, Providence “resolved …that I will not grow another grain of barley to supply the purposes of the prisoner. I would see my land laid waste, and beg my bread before I would encourage such iniquitous practices.”

The message conveyed is clear: the threat of alcohol is so abhorrent that farmers, in emulation of Providence, should willing sacrifice their land, income, and sustenance to eliminate this scourge.

Luckily the farmer need not be so godly in nature. John Speedplough of “Breadhill,” as other temperance farmers, found success by hiring sober laborers and producing grain for bread. The notion that temperance could guarantee economic success was reiterated in further testimony that temperate moderns were by far debt-free, independent, landholders. They were healthy and productive members of society. The results could be seen in the life of John Hockings, blacksmith, who rejected John Barleycorn and subsequently purchased a “Temperance Villa”-- a fine house with a garden and grazing land for his cows. He had saved enough money from abstinence to be a freeholder. Once a debtor to Barleycorn, he had become his own master.

This narrative of success and failure as determined by one’s association with the defendant is heightened by the author’s refashioning of John Barleycorn along the lines

413 Beardsall, Trial of John Barleycorn, 6.

of other Victorian literary persona. In place of the unified benefactor and impish prankster, Beardsall gives us a character whose two sides are significantly divided. As a childlike plant in the field, Barleycorn appears pure and innocent, but as an adult he lives the life of a shadowy criminal involved in a matrix of intrigue. In the form of alcohol, Barleycorn emerges not as grain’s most powerful spirit, but as its evil twin, a devilish doppelganger that pursues his unfortunate victims to ruin and even death. He strikes Mr. Poverty dead and drives Miss Suicide, well… to suicide. He provides Mr. Cutthroat with the “fatal draught” and drags down Mr. Melancholy to the depths of despair.\(^{415}\)

His functions disaggregated, Barleycorn leads a bisected life. So too, the landscape is split between all that is fair and good—temperance hotels, societies, teetotaler homes and churches, that are intended to contrast sharply with the edifices of evil—untended fields, inns, malt-kilns, brewhouses, and beer-houses. Likewise, the countryside seems divided, leaning at time towards redemption, but also often towards perdition.

Unlike the playful satire of the seventeenth century which utilized Barleycorn’s defense to explore the flaws of society and its institutions, a process that leads to Barleycorn’s release, this trial ends on a severe note. Barleycorn’s life is revealed to mirror that of many workers. Displaced from the countryside, he is forced to make his living by any means possible and often in the employment of vice. On these grounds he begs clemency, but the judge shows no mercy. Barleycorn is declared guilty, sentenced to

\(^{415}\) Beardsall, Trial of John Barleycorn, 29.
death, and all property of malters, brewers and inn-keepers confiscated so it might be
reallocated to the Temperance Society and nation, as payment for his crimes.

Of course, the central point here is that this temperance version of the trial failed,
in many ways, to engage or explore the flaws of society and its institutions. Indeed, by
avoiding that very task the tract offers up a scapegoat—a spirituous sacrifice of another
kind. As Clifford Geertz notes that “we all need our opponents” and thus find “some way
of synthesizing them.”416 With drunkenness situated as the source of poverty, Beardsall
turned Barleycorn, once celebrated as the symbol of a premodern culture that predictably
provided food, shelter, community and a source of spirituality, into the source of growing
economic disparity in a modern economic system that fostered social instability.
Beardsall could only achieve this transference by naturalizing a Victorian bifurcation of
good and evil. Once dissociated from the bounty of the earth and respectable society,
Barleycorn, reduced to deviltry and criminality, is subject to elimination. This likeness,
needless to say, reflected a marked attitude toward displaced farmers and working-class
persons who had long been blamed for their own poverty. Likewise, those guilty by
association with alcohol—producers and sellers, could then be subject to asset forfeiture,
a form of punishment that was ultimately applied to prohibition violations under some
state laws and Volstead Act, and the latter war on drugs.

Notably, John Barleycorn remained a figure of high esteem in the lower orders
that reformers sought to control. As noted by Roy Rosenzweig, the early temperance

movement displayed remarkable continuity as a movement composed of mechanics and manufacturers and these people, as the industrial heirs of the new economy, “carried the battle forward.”\textsuperscript{417} Whether local displaced subsistence farmer or recent emigrant, the commercial class viewed their workers as cut from the same cloth—as “the idlers and paupers of Europe, ‘the degraded, starved and miserable dregs of a redundant population’… turned out of jails and poor-houses and shipped by public authorities, that they might be rid of them.”\textsuperscript{418}

City elites dominated temperance movement and employers sponsored pledges and anti-saloon petitions that workers were expected to abide. In Worcester, Massachusetts, the focus of Rosenzweig’s work, reformers targeted immigrants who were more likely than not to view the battle over the saloon as a class battle with temperance advocates protecting drink as a luxury withheld from the laborers. As proletarianized peasants, immigrants disputed the temperance promise and validity of commercial goals. As Rosenzweig notes “saloongoers implicitly question and sometimes explicitly reject the goals and values of industrial society, such as home-ownership, thrift, social mobility, and punctuality.”\textsuperscript{419}

In many ways, immigrants who provided labor for the market revolution were targeted as recalcitrant, backward element in need of modernization. Apart from the efforts of local societies, the northeast temperance organizations hosted British


\textsuperscript{419} Rosenzweig, \textit{Eight Hours}, 62, 93, 111.
counterparts such as Irish Fr. Theobald Mathew whose open air meetings in Ireland over
the 1830s to 1840s were purported to have convinced many to take the abstinence pledge.
Mathew toured New England in the late 1840s, winning a small following which rapidly
dwindled in the difficult times of the late 1850s.\textsuperscript{420} Mathew’s tactics included integrating
pledges into the communal ritual of the Catholic mass and performances of \textit{Father
Mathew and Sir John Barleycorn; A Temperance Dialogue, for the peasantry} (1843), a
choreographed debate that blamed drink for the rural poverty of Ireland.\textsuperscript{421} It is difficult
to say how, exactly, this performance was received, but the limited impact of Mathew’s
visit suggests that many did not appreciate the implication that their displacement was
caused by alcohol and not the process of accumulation by dispossession.

As a Catholic priest, Mathew’s temperance call was often at odds with his fellow
clergymen and the Catholic Church, which did not endorse strict commitment to
teetotaler pledges and disapproved of his protestant associations.\textsuperscript{422} Neither did his
experience across the Atlantic win Mathew much favor. Aside from inspiring the
formation of a few Father Mathew societies, he appears to have faced “indifference” in
New York and dwindling enthusiasm elsewhere due to mixed sentiments regarding his

\textsuperscript{420} Rosenzweig, \textit{Eight Hours}, 104.

\textsuperscript{421} Theobald Mathew, \textit{Father Mathew and Sir John Barleycorn; A Temperance Dialogue, for the peasantry}
(W.H. Cox, 1843).

\textsuperscript{422} See Elizabeth Malcolm, “The Catholic Church and the Irish Temperance Movement, 1838-1901,” \textit{Irish
Historical Studies} 23, no. 89 (May 1982), 1-16.
goals and his assumption that his audience would support him financially during his sojourn.\footnote{423}{“Our Weekly Gossip,” *The Athenaeum: Journal of Literature, Science and the Fine Arts*, July 28, 1849, 768.}


As historian Susan Manning has shown, Burns enjoyed a “transatlantic afterlife” in “the writing of emigrants who may have carried copies of the poet amongst their...
precious and scant possessions,” or who managed to purchase prints in the Americas, or caught wind of his verse in some other fashion.\footnote{Susan Manning, “Robert Burns’s Transatlantic Afterlives,” in Sharon Alker, Leith Davis and Holly Faith Nelson eds., Robert Burns and Transatlantic Culture (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2012), 152.} And, in reading their experience through the lens of Burn’s life and poetry, immigrants fused the two.\footnote{Manning, “Robert Burns’s Transatlantic Afterlives,” 158.} Burns’ centenary featured 872 festivals across the western world; sixty-one held in the US alone.\footnote{Leith Davis, “The Robert Burns 1859 Centenary: Mapping Transatlantic (Dis)location,” in Robert Burns and Transatlantic Culture, eds. Sharon Alker, Leith Davis and Holly Faith Nelson (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2012), 191.} The sentiment of these celebrations centered on Burns’ “perseverance as a Scottish ‘peasant poet,’” a “bright creation of the sons of toil.”\footnote{Davis, “Robert Burns 1859 Centenary,” 192.} The result was the forging of geographic connections: the association of Burns and what he represented with far flung areas and a dispersed material culture, including many Burns’ “relics”: locks of hair, carvings from his farm, and even a haggis from his cottage in Ayrshire.\footnote{Davis, “Robert Burns 1859 Centenary,” 188, 192.} Meanwhile, in Scotland, the revival turned the ale house and fields of Ayrshire into pilgrimage sites.\footnote{As expressed in “Robert Burns,” Fayetteville Observer (Fayetteville, North Carolina) 1940, Aug. 7, 1854, col. F. 19th Century U.S. Newspapers. More importantly, in claiming Burns as a poet that belonged to all humanity, Americans imagined their own spaces—the “banks of the Ohio or Mississippi,” or Lake Michigan as an equivalent to the “quiet ‘banks of Ayr’”. He was, according to one newspaper correspondence,}
…the mirror in which all scenes and all passions glassed themselves, with a perfect similitude. He was the ‘medium’… by which those ‘spiritual things’ called thoughts and feelings, which ‘now in the common breast of humanity, were made audible and intelligent to all men.’

Burns’ understanding as “primitive bard” informed a variety of interpretations of the poet. For some, the poet stood for an “unchanging” or “natural” essence at the heart of nature which inspired the transcendentalism of Ralph Waldo Emerson, one notable member of the Boston Burns Club. For others, Burns reflected the energy and genius of Scottish nationalism or reach of British imperialism. Indeed, members of the Boston club identified Burns as Anglo-Saxon of “universal” influence whose work spread “Wherever the Anglo-Saxon race had gone,” a claim that positioned “the humble ploughman at the heart of empire.” This figure was “a right merry, good-hearted, quick-witted fellow, ready for a song, a joke, or a wee drap of dew from the land he prizes so well.” But this understanding existed in tension with devotion of another sort. Though ambitious, Burns died a debtor and much of his poetry mourned the compromises people were forced to make to survive the contradictory demands of modern society. Thomas Gill of the Boston Post gave voice to this reality at the Boston Centenary, by countering attempt to inflate Burns into an icon of American success-ethic with an oration of “To a Mouse,” one of Burns’ most widely cited pieces. “[Y]our own


435 “Boston Burns Club,” col. E.
Burns,” Gill stated, “has put forth a caution to all who rely on human plans, when he
said,--

The best laid schemes o’ mice and men,
Gang aft agley,
And leave us naught but grief and pain
From promised joy.  

Enthusiastic celebrations of Burns’ centenary took several forms in the US. In
some American cities local “gentlemen” ensured “sober, rational, and refined enjoyment”
of the event, but many celebrations were less restrained, marked by feasting, oration, and
lads and lassies dancing the Scottish Reel late into the night. The date also evoked, in
areas with no formal celebrations, wistful melancholy for something lost—nostalgia that
reflects a problematic of space that translated into what Lefebvre identified as “the
West’s infatuation with village life.” Whereas the medieval village expressed an
organic unity and intimacy in integrated streets, houses, fields and town, the new mode of
industrial growth materialized the compartmentalization of home and work, people and
things. The factory towns that sprang up and the camps of workers housed cheap labor
alienated mill girls from the home economy, and increasingly, immigrant workmen from
the land. It was enough to inspire a correspondent of the Fayetteville Observer and an
émigré from Ayrshire, to mourned on the centenary the leveling of Burns’ mud cottage of
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his birth and his death from “poverty and dread of debt” at age 37.\textsuperscript{440} The author was seized by memories that seemed “centuries” old and that “call[ed] up” a physical geography on which he, for a moment, “feasted” scenes the Village School, barns, bridges, his “sainted mother at the spinning wheel,” and father singing “Rigs O’Barley.” Burns was a tragic hero of sorts, the “bearer of her [Scotland’s] standard” as she “marche[d] down the dim distance to the future.” As “a genuine poet in the meaning of ancient times” … not of flowery prose, but “the expounder of great truths,” Burns’ seemed to “vindicate[e] the dignity of the human soul in the teeth of all considerations of rank and wealth,” revealing the survival of the “generous and soft” heart in modern times.\textsuperscript{441} Indeed, frequent reprints of Burns’ “A Man’s a Man for A`That,” a poem that expressed Burns’ sympathy for the French Revolution, praises “honest poverty” and rages against the arrogance of wealth and desire for a future of greater dignity and equality suggest anything but the rein of the confident self-made man.\textsuperscript{442} Similar sentiments came through in circulated stories about Burns, prominent among which was the story of the drowning merchant. According to the tale, Burns happened to be standing on the pier of Greenock when a wealthy merchant fell into the harbor. A passing sailor dived in and rescued the man and the “Greenock merchant, upon recovering a little from his fright, put his hand into his pocket and generously presented the sailor with a
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shilling.” The crowd that had since assembled protested “the contemptible insignificance of the sum; and Burns, with a smile … entreated them to restrain their clamor, ‘for,’ he said, ‘the gentleman is the best judge of the value of his own life.’”

Temperance writers used the folk revival as an opportunity to turn Burns’ short impoverished life into a morality tale. His struggle as a poor farmer, depression, failing health, and premature death became a “salutary lesson” of missed opportunities and deep drinking. The *New York Spectator* and *New Hampshire Statesman and Concord Register* ran reprints of an article that proposed that no amount of talent or genius…

... can gain for their possessors respect, and secure happiness to themselves and their families, unless associated with the unostentious virtues of prudence and temperance, virtues though homely, which no endowments, however splendid, no situation, however exalted, can ever dispense with. Of course, none of these “homely” virtues would have won Burns the following he achieved. The reality was exactly the opposite. Burns was no teetotaler and his poetic treatment of drink and farm life only seemed to enhance his humanity in the broader American arena. Indeed, an editorial in the *Boston Investigator* pointed out that temperance attacks on Burns were counterproductive, as stated:

Those who make it a rule to cite such men as Burns, to make drunkenness hideous, would do well to consider whether they are not consuming the very end they aim at. In thus picking from the ranks of dissipation instances of individuals pre-eminently attractive, the allurement becomes powerful in the very illustration, and goes for worse than nothing.

---


444 “Robert Burns and Lord Byron,” *New Hampshire Statesman and Concord Register* 1, no. 43. Mar. 18, 1826, 19th Century U.S. Newspapers. This article is identified as a reprint from the *New York Spectator* which printed the article from another, unnamed source. For similar criticisms of Burns’ relationship with John Barleycorn see Inwards, *Temperance Reminiscences*, 68.

As a poet who “‘Lisp[ed] his native wood-notes wild’ at the plough,” Burns drew inspiration from folk songs that he transcribed and altered. In turn, these songs were revived and grew in popularity in the face of the temperance assault on Burns. “John Barleycorn” was one such song, transcribed and reworked by Burns in 1782. Defenders of Burns found in Burns’ poetic love of drink an endearing human frailty and link to another time. As stated, his muse “lent her charms to some of the weaknesses of our common nature” and equally so that the vice of some was inspiration for others, as stated in poetic verse: “Inspiring, bold John Barleycorn, To him, the ‘bowl’ was inspiration.”

Equally so, the Burns centenary stirred endearing feelings for the rhythmic cycles of nature associated with John Barleycorn in the hard times of the late 1850s. Following the festivities, even the stodgy old New England Farmer waxed poetically over the “high noon of summer” when hay, oats, rye and barley, ripe in the field would “soon be ready for the sickle or the scythe.” Evoking resurrection, the editorial states, “We could have shown no reason why these dead and buried seeds should spring up to a fresher and fuller life. But here they are, and summer after summer we have seen the miracle repeated,” a sentiment the paper also put to verse:

They took a plow and plowed him down,
Put clods upon his head,
An they ha’ sworn a solemn oath,
John Barleycorn was dead.

But the cheerful spring came kingly on,
And showers began to fall--

---

John Barley-corn got up again,  
And sore surprised them all.\textsuperscript{447}

This direct reference to Burns and Barleycorn is intriguing because it would have carried by the 1850s a bundle of connotations: old modes of production, festival, drink, and the regenerative power of nature, not to mention opposition to temperance.

In the transatlantic temperance debate, Burns and John Barleycorn inspired contemplative comparisons of the age of teetotalism and an older ethos. A writer for \textit{Bentley’s Miscellany} known only as “A Bacchanalian” took to task the “singular conceit” in “identifying an age of water with an age of gold.” Fr. Mathews, in this instance, provided a fitting example of the mischief of cultural hegemony. For the author, Mathews and other temperance agitators were:

\begin{quote}
…ready at any given moment, like Undine’s mischievous uncle, to condense into a destroying stream, whirling along with its mad eddies, wine-press and vat, --the fruits of vineyard and orchard, together with the mingled fragments of malt-house and brewery, in a word, with the wreck and garniture of a brave world, once under the hallowed patronage of antique Bacchus, and our own Sir John Barleycorn.\textsuperscript{448}
\end{quote}

This was no simple elegy to drink. Socialism and Chartism Mr. Baccanalian could comprehend and abide, but not teetotalism for the simple reason that even the worst despots of old recognized their obligation to something greater than bare subsistence.

Only the jailer, notes the author, reduces men to “bread and water.” In this logic, drink meant more than simple libation when obliged by the hierarchy. Indeed, the author claims

\begin{footnotesize}

\end{footnotesize}
“inebriety… checked the excesses of power.” Any ruler that valued the throne secured feasting and drinking or risked the consequences of social disorder. This idea congeals with another strain of thought, that of the preserving qualities of brandy and wine in a social sense. What distinguished old and new “monarchs” could be summed up thusly: the old monarch would not convert his subjects “into the luscious berries of the grape, his screw of government into a wine-press, and his exchequer-office into a Heidleberg tun!” New states, however, were debauched—caught up in the “tipsy orgies of another sovereign.” This graphic rendering captured very poignantly the revolutionary changes afoot in the new commercial order in which capital had replaced Barleycorn and Bacchus. Whereas the fruit of the land had, even under the workings of a feudal hierarchy, previously provisioned people and ensured festivity and “social joy,” but humanity itself had become the grist of capitalist enterprise. The notion of social or national joy would be repeated by the opposition through the life of the temperance movement as people pondered the simple question: what is the purpose of production if it does not ensure the contentment of all members of society?

Burns was loved because he was, as the Vermont Patriot asserted, “the poet of the people.” His work contrasted with the bourgeois perception of the individual as a reflection of goods and property and of the proper life as defined by industriousness.

---

Poetry and song, in this instance, offered a way of questioning the contradictory “spirits” of capitalist existence, that is, the conflict between “the coexisting needs of enjoyment and accumulation.”\textsuperscript{453}

With the assault on drink figured in as the latest demand of a dreary, mechanical, and “inauthentic” life of wage labor, Burns appealed to a lost sense of congruence we hear in Lefebvre’s understanding that “[m]an must be everyday, or he will not be at all.”\textsuperscript{454} The quest for the authentic was a quest for a way of living that reconciled thought and life, and offered some element of control over time and space. Burns’ readers delighted in the significance he placed on the ordinary, humble, and solid. Thus Burns’ appeal lay in his perceived relationship to the material world which was compassionate and that found beauty in all things poor and common. As the writer Andrew O’Hagan notes, he was a poet “so well tuned as to the inner dignity of things that he [could] politicize the plight of a mouse caught in the rain.”\textsuperscript{455} For those touched by these lines, Burns’ flaws revealed him as more deeply human than those that sought to negate him. And in its absence of control over the realm of labor, liberation could be found in holidays and those spaces set aside from work. We can also say that, as modernity’s alienated daily life from the simple, trivial and pleasant, and when its promise of change
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failed to alter social relations for the better, people sought in festival, as they had for many generations, “a break in everyday life and a rehabilitation of the everyday.”

Antebellum Politics

Impelled by a fervent belief, members of the temperance movement promoted their cause from the pulpit and in print, stage and politics, ultimately creating temperance policies and narratives of lasting influence. Early political endeavors and battles included the reform of existing licensing laws for producers and sellers. The state of Maine took the lead in temperance reform politics under the leadership of Neal Dow who entered politics as a temperance Whig and whose unremitting efforts for temperance legislation earned him the title, the “Napoleon of Temperance” and “Father of Prohibition.” Dow made eliminating the traffic of liquor his life-long goal and used force of character and political office as the now wealthy Mayor of Portland, Maine, to turn this goal into a reality. Longing for more severe punishments for illicit sales and ultimately a complete ban, Dow decided Maine’s state law requirement that licensees be of “sober life and conversation” was too accommodating of the liquor interests. With the aid of the organizing skills of temperance societies, Dow pushed for increased licensing fees and fines for violations, as well as a long list of prohibitions to be upheld by the seller: on parties, gambling, election day sales, “excess” and “idleness,” as well as sales to minors and college students. On the political agenda were also local-option laws that allowed towns to withhold the granting of licensing so as to chip away geographically at the
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landscape of beverage manufacturers and sellers. Dow’s and the movement’s ultimate goal, however, went beyond the limiting of sales. Dow personally sought to simultaneously alter public sentiment that viewed production and sales as a reputable endeavor consistent with good citizenship. Towards these ends this statesmen tried to expose the reprehensible nature of such businesses and to detach them from other forms of commerce as well as “charitable and religious work.”458 In addition, Dow and his associated temperance leaders promoted the formation of temperance societies in every locale, the organization of quarterly conventions, and within societies, the pushing of members toward total abstinence using teetotaler pledges, a tactic devised by William King, Maine Governor and president of the August temperance society. A long litany of prominent businessmen, judges, educators, and clergymen legitimatized these efforts, some of whose political careers, like that of Dow himself, rose with the temperance star.459

The one element that linked the lot was Edwards’ “Laws…” which was picked up by ministers, politicians, judges, educators in political fight against licensing of producers. As recorded in the American Temperance Union, Annual Report (1845), numerous civic leaders either quoted or referenced “Laws.” The lengthy list included President of Wesleyan University; Hon. George Sullivan, Attorney General of New Hampshire; Rev. Heman Humphrey, D.D. President of Amherst College; Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, New Jersey Senator; and Hon. David Daggett, Chief Justice of the State

of Connecticut. Rev. Francis Wayland, the president of Brown University referenced Edwards’ essay with the added flourish that the traffic of spirits qualified as a “slave trade” that was holding back American society, keeping it from realizing its full potential. Thus Wayland evoked other reform agendas of the time, namely, abolition, and in riding coattails associated temperance with grander themes of liberty.

On the political end of things, as the middle class grew and temperance followings grew with it, temperance became a political wedge issue. The Whigs, as the party of modernization, had, beginning in the late 1830s championed temperance legislation, such as Massachusetts’s Fifteen Gallon Law (1838), a blatantly discriminatory measure in its restriction of alcohol sales to large quantities only affordable by the wealthy. The controversial law was defended by temperance supporters as a guardian of industry and all gains made to date by the movement and through which orderly society hung in the balance. Speaking in favor of the law a Mr. R. Hildreth, Esq. and officer of the Young Men’s Temperance Society of Boston claimed the Commonwealth had everything to lose and everything to gain by the ban. Without the law, states Hildreth:

The friends of temperance must give up the Commonwealth to be strewed broadcast with grog shops, retire to the frontier, and commence the war anew. It would be a hard and desperate war. Our opponents, made wise by past experience, will not as hitherto, relinquish the grog shop and petty rum shops an easy conquest to our arms. They have learned that these establishments are a necessary rampart of defense to their interests. They will scatter them as thick and as fearful through the Commonwealth, as ever feudal castles were scattered through Germany in the middle ages. Each will stand a siege, and require to be carried by assault; and

---

when perhaps, at the end of a ten years’ campaign, we have signalized our victory, and secured the permanency of our conquest, by the re-enactment of the very law which is now proposed to repeal, as we march along exulting in this great triumph of patriotism and humanity, our triumphal march will lead us—Oh! Horror!—amid the mouldering skeletons, and over the slaughtered bodies of fifty thousand of our fellow citizens!  

For Hildreth, commercial alcohol stood as an enduring “frontier” threat, a “rampart” like so many medieval “castles” standing in the midst of the Commonwealth and threatening to undo its existence. This lingering element of the past he associated with the political opposition, the radical Democrats. According to Hildreth, the victorious Whigs had gained important territory against factions of radical Democrats but dissension endangered those gains, opening the gates to a renewed battle with a the past that evoked both the extended American Revolution and broader contests against old world traditions. In this battle each tavern stood as an impregnable bulwark in a feudal landscape—holding ground for the forces of alcohol. Hyperbole, however, was no match for popular pressure that ensured the law’s repeal two years later.

Fanciful visions aside, the Democrats – the party of Jefferson, yeoman farmers, tavern and storekeepers, distillers, and laborers, increasingly became the anti-temperance party, though members of both parties used the issue according to what was politically expedient at any given moment. The ongoing political battle for the vote of the common man effectively turned the presidential election of 1840 into a convoluted “drinking contest” between William Henry Harrison with his backwood barrel of hard-
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cider and Martin Van Buren, the candidate of sober middle-class industriousness, cast by his detractors as a closet champagne drinker. Democrat victories and repeal of the Fifteen Gallon Law in 1839 revealed enduring Democratic Party power in the northeast, but the passage of Dow’s brainchild— the Maine Law (1851) as the first statewide measure prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks, signaled the political power and ascendancy of the urban middle class in the region.463

The 1850s saw the passage of Maine Laws in thirteen states, largely in the Northeast.464 This wave of Maine-Lawism occurred at a formative moment. As historian Eric Foner notes, temperance became part of the political upheaval associated with the collapse of the second American party system. By fusing with Know-Nothing nativism and anti-slavery fervor, “with the properties of mixture varying from state to state and locality to locality,” this side-issue was capable of making notable legislative gains.465 Much like abolitionism, temperance expanded through the power of print. Couched as a fight from freedom from alcohol, foreign elements and corrupt business, temperance reinvented, on its own terms, the meaning of abolition. On one hand, temperance offered liberty to consumers who seemed unable to resist the pleasure of the rum bottle and whose “slavery” to drink “often eclips[ed] that of the chattel slavers whose labor they


464 Legislation was passed in the following order: Maine, Delaware, Massachusetts, Vermont, Connecticut, Indiana, Michigan, Texas, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Iowa and New Hampshire. The Texas legislation limited sales to quantities one pint and over. For the most part, these laws proved unenforceable and lingered as dead-letter laws until new laws replace in the post-Civil War era.

were addictively consuming.”

On the other hand, temperance dogma envisioned rum and slavery as “two monstrous vices” that were “twins at birth” within an archaic economy of alcohol in which spirits served as a “circulating medium of all human flesh markets.” The first narrative twist was not new. The American Revolution, fought in the name of liberating colonists from monarchal tyranny, also protected the American institution of slavery from British abolitionists. The second vision of alcohol and slavery as two pre-modern holdovers was equally specious. Arguably, both commercial alcohol and slavery drove the modernization of the United States. Moreover, the relationship between the alcohol and slavery was often misconstrued. Africans, like Native Americans, were portrayed as incapable of resisting rum, the craving of which so impassioned these “savages,” that they came to trade their own people to acquire the drink. These claims were a stretch at best. While rum played a part in the slave trade, its role was not as large as temperance advocates made it out to be. West African societies had their own drinking cultures that included wine, beers and distilled items. As with Europeans, people of all ages drank and production of fermented libations was a collective activity regulated by rules of etiquette and reciprocity. Rum is estimated to have been used in the purchase of only 5% of West African slaves and the rum trade
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appears to have been limited to the coastal regions.\textsuperscript{469} Other mediums of trade and products of slavery, including cotton that fed northern textile mills and the sugar that sweetened the tea and coffee favored by temperance advocates, failed to register a comparable degree of fiery indignation.

A middle-class print culture contributed as well to the spread of Maine Lawism. For a prime example one need look no further than Timothy Shay Arthur’s novel, \textit{Ten Nights in a Bar-room and What I Saw There} (1854). A prolific writer and publisher of histories, temperance treatises, and novels, in addition to numerous articles for to \textit{Godey’s Lady’s Book}, the Washingtonian Temperance Society, and \textit{Graham’s Magazine}, among others, Arthur’s legacy would ultimately situate him as a disseminator of nascent middle-class sensibilities in the antebellum period and across the divide of the Civil War.

The storyline of \textit{Ten Nights} reiterated temperance arguments concerning farming as the nineteenth century proceeded. The main character, an unnamed traveler and representative of upright, temperate middle-class America, arrives by stagecoach at a newly constructed tavern named the “Sickle and Sheaf” in Cedarville, a rural community that was “going to seed.”\textsuperscript{470} Simon Slade, the inn-keeper, had abandoned the arduous but honest work of a miller and sold his gristmill to another town resident, Judge Hammond. The judge, as was the fashion on the times, added a distillery to the mill. The farmers in this “fine grain growing country” were pleased with these developments because grain


prices had been low.\textsuperscript{471} The hope was that the combined tavern and distillery would purchase local grain and thus resuscitate the countryside.

Through the eyes of the traveler who returns to Cedarville ten times over the course of ten years, readers bear witness to the degradation of the tavern and with it the ruin of the town. Equally important, in identifying with the traveler, readers were called to sympathize with Arthur’s evaluation of Cedarville’s demise. The problem, the traveler explains, lay in Slade’s “love of money” and “the slow process of accumulation” that caused Slade to prey upon the “depraved appetites of men.”\textsuperscript{472} Like so many temperance acolytes, Arthur implicates reckless financial gain as a social problem, but rather than targeting the economic framework, Arthur directs attention to alcohol and the space it inhabits (the barroom), as the embodiment of evil guilty of razing farm communities. In the course of time, the land suffers neglect and “the hand of cultivation [is] stayed.”\textsuperscript{473} The women were reduced to drudges and tavern becomes a magnet for suspicious Irish immigrants and other “loungers.” Indeed, while the tavern “made some men richer,” it made most men poorer.\textsuperscript{474} The traveler explains why this is so:

\begin{quote}
He [Slade] does not add to the general wealth. He produces nothing. He takes money from his customers, but gives them no article of value in return—nothing that can be called property, personal or real. He is just so much richer and they just so much poorer for the exchange.\textsuperscript{475}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{471} Arthur, \textit{Ten Nights}, 20.
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Ten Nights effectively situated alcohol as a problem in two settings: the tavern and rural America, although Cedarville can also be read as the nation writ small. The location of one in the other associated the tavern, and later the saloon, with agricultural decline and the combined temptations of custom and commercial alcohol production for the farmer class. As a representation of space converted to the stage in 1858, Ten Nights turned numerous towns across the US into Cedarville, if only for a night. This type of ideological occupation of space would help the antebellum temperance ideology endure and spread. For Ten Nights also offered up prescriptions for principled renewal in the concluding scenes. Through performance, the character of the traveler and members of Cedarville rehearsed for the audience the talking points for political action leading to prohibition measures.\footnote{Gately, Drink: A Cultural History, 309.}

Given the background of its author, medium (novel), and initial audience (middle-class consumers of such literature), these talking points should be read as propaganda and defense of a middle-class vision and its legislative endeavors against common arguments for the allowance of drink that cycled around tradition, economic need, personal responsibility, and civil liberties.

Beyond this reiteration of Edwards’ “Laws” and its depiction of alcohol as “waste,” the novel blamed patronage for impoverishing the people who visited the bar in a manner that evoked the specter of premodern economies and immigrant “graft” and implicated farmers in their function.\footnote{There was a link between graft and alcohol interests as of 1854. Tammany Hall controlled of New York City politics and its affiliate, the Democratic Party. Tammany Hall grew in power with Irish immigration.} Judge Hammond, owner of the mill and distillery, was both culprit and victim of this practice. As a supporter of the tavern, Hammond

\footnote{Gately, Drink: A Cultural History, 309.}
encouraged others to give the establishment their business and he himself comes to drink at this “man trap.” In following Hammond’s lead, his associate, Judge Lyman, becomes a “pompous drunk” and corrupt “rum candidate” that ran on an anti-temperance ticket, winning a “very handsome majority” by promising tramps that he would not do away with the tavern or the poor houses they depend on for food.

As evident in the novel’s storyline, the repercussions of the economy of alcohol pervaded every aspect of life. By “sowing in the wind,” Cedarville was visibly degraded; the homesteads dilapidated, weedy and disheveled with gardens “lying waste.” Young men, who otherwise belonged on the farm, are unable to steer clear of barrooms that proliferate everywhere. Indeed, “disease, ruin, and death, [was] broadcast over the land.” Yet the story ends with a ray of hope and instruction. Having effectively arguing against these lines of defense, the traveler convinces the town to vote for the Maine Law. The town drunk, Joe Morgan, cleans up his act, becomes “sober and industrious” and returns the mill to “its old and better work of grinding corn and wheat for bread.” And, having lived the evils of drinking, the villagers gather at the Sickle and Sheath, declare an end to the oppressive liquor traffic, and tear the building down.

Dow’s law, however, could promise no such happy ending. Shortly after its passage, the contentious Maine Law proved unenforceable. Dow himself, led liquor raids
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but no amount of policing could eradicate alcohol from the terrain. What’s more, prohibition and Maine’s lengthy open coastline inspired a healthy black market which managed to smuggle John Barleycorn into the state via coffins and barrels labeled “sugar” and “flour”.\footnote{Prohibition, directed by Ken Burns and Lynn Novick (2011; Washington, D.C.: Florentine Films and WETA, 2011). DVD.} Popular sentiment also surged against the law, coming to a violent climax with the Portland Rum Riot, June 2, 1855. A crowd of three thousand gathered in protest when word got out that Dow had tucked away $1600 of illegally purchased booze in the vaults of city hall. The alcohol was, in fact, present and awaiting distribution to pharmacists and doctors according to an exception built into the law. Dow had not, however, received authorization for the purchase. The outraged protestors, including many immigrants that viewed the law as an assault on their culture, became rancorous-- jostling and throwing stones when police refused to relinquish the goods. In response, Dow ordered the militia to fire into the crowd, killing a sailor named John Robbins, and injuring seven others. Dow was put on trial for violating his own law only to be acquitted. Rather, the consequence of the incident fell on the law itself which was repealed the following year.\footnote{For an overview of the incident see Matthew P. Mayo, Speaking Ill of the Dead: Jerks in New England History (Guilford: Morris Book Publishing, 2013), 117-119.}

The end of the Maine Law, however, would not be the end of the temperance movement. First wave temperance fell to the wayside as the consequence of Maine Law failures, the economic crises of the 1850s, and rapidly approaching clouds of civil war. But Dow and his breed of reformers would weather these storms and live to fight the
temperance battle anew. Indeed, their acolytes were already on the march in the name of securing new frontiers for the temperance cause.
Section 2: New Frontiers

Introduction

The peasant in his lowly cot,
The knight in his old hall,
Have felt the same that’s brought about
By old John Barleycorn.
He’s stained the name of England,
And widows left to mourn,
That e’er there was a thing on earth,
Like old John Barleycorn.
--Capper’s Temperance Melodist 485

For my flesh is true food, and my blood is true drink.
Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me, and I in him.
--John 6:55-56

May 1, 1860, Edward Cornelius Delavan, Esq., of Albany, New York, posted a letter to Dr. Eliphalet Nott, LL.D., president of Union College in Schenectady. Delevan, famed president of the New York State Temperance Society and the Executive of the United Kingdom Alliance for the Suppression of the Traffic of All Intoxicating Liquors—a prohibitionary organization founded in 1853 by temperance and anti-Corn Law activists inspired by Dow’s Maine Law—conveyed his grave evaluation of the state of European law and politics. England’s Chancellor of the Exchequer had recently voiced support for the import of cheap wine in the name of temperance—wine being lighter and presumably less intoxicating than ardent spirits. This was a terrible development, asserted Delavan. His letter, penned in Paris, explained why. 486

Delavan had been traveling Europe as a temperance emissary since the 1830s and his tours of the continent informed what came to be a complex vision of alcohol’s

485 S. Capper, Capper’s Temperance Melodist, etc. (London: Haywood & Co., 1869), 48.

pernicious role in the ruination of countries taking their first steps toward modernization. From the writing of many Enlightenment thinkers, including Sir Henry Holland, Sir Francis Bacon, and John Milton, this American lawyer and champion of temperance came to understand the commerce of spirits as an evil not to be tolerated. Drink, its manufacture, trade, and consumption was an “odious vice” that threatened the health and well-being of the capitalist state.  

But how might one square the prohibition of the traffic with the hallowed doctrine of free trade? Delavan had the answer. He recalled advice given to the Cretan commander Idomeneus of the Trojan War. Idomeneus advised authorities not to allow “wine to become too common” or grapes to be planted too abundantly. According to this ancient sage, where “too many vines are planted, they must be rooted up.”  

The consequences of ignoring this counsel, claimed the missive, was evident in France. In 1838, upon request Delavan consulted King Louis Philippe regarding the nation’s wine districts. As Delavan recalled, rural commoners of the districts drank wine freely, lived in the “greatest wretchedness” and made “the most frequent appeals to Government for aid.” It was also where “so large a proportion of the soil was now cultivated for wine, that the raising of stock and grain was diminished to an alarming extent.” At the time, Louis Philippe expressed hope that “the fields of France might be cultivated to greater advantage to produce more abundant food and clothing for the people.” But this was not a
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call for the right to subsistence. The crown, in fact, intended to promote silk worm cultivation, silk being a valuable consumer luxury worth 100 million francs annually in imports alone. But first the soil “monopolised [sic] to so great a degree by the vine” needed liberation.490

Wine posed another problem. According to Delavan, the weak wine of the peasantry poured forth from the districts into cities like Paris where it became “heady” and more intoxicating as it was presumably mixed it with herbs, drugs, and stronger spirits. Thus, from the mildly “poisonous” wine of the peasantry emerged an even more injurious brew, quaffed by workers in a proliferating landscape of wine houses where wages were squandered and talk turned quarrelsome. “Government [was] villified [sic]” claimed Delavan, as drunken tongues wagged. Linked via alcohol, the peasantry of the wine districts and potentially mutinous urban laborers placed France in a “state of disease”-- a “state of inflammation.”491 The prosperity and survival of the country, explained Delavan, were imperiled. The vineyard and wine shop and their votaries, men and women “of the lowest grade” once assembled, “furnish[ed] the material for riot and revolution.”492

With the uprisings of 1848, Louis Philippe abdicated the thrown. To England he fled, leaving behind what would become the Second Republic. All in all, Delavan’s insinuation is clear: when given the chance Louis Philippe had failed to extinguish the
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problem at the root; he had failed to tear out the vineyards. Delavan assured Nott that to license was to make “the intolerable nuisance” of alcohol respectable, opening government and law to questioning. As for trade, unleashing a deluge of wine or beer on another was nothing less than “malicious” and more comparable to an act of war than commerce. From this logic Delavan questioned France’s “designs against England” as well as England’s incomprehension of the dire threat posed by importing “weak” and “cheap” French vintage—the Trojan Horse of revolution.

Delevan was not alone in using spirits as a yardstick in measuring the health of modern society. Nor were his letters the final say in the delineation of alcohol’s role in the construction of the modern world. In approximately the same timeframe, another set of letters had crossed the Atlantic in the opposite direction. This set came from Gottfried Duden-- a civil servant from the Duchy of Berg (now part of modern Germany), who had ventured into the frontier region of the Missouri-Mississippi valley in search of the ideal destination for Europe’s downtrodden emigrants.

Born in Remscheid, in 1785, this son of the town apothecary studied law and medicine and went to work in civil service as a court auditor. In 1813, Duden also served as a military officer for the Second Bergian Infantry against Napoleon’s invading armies. As a civil servant and resident of the Rhine valley, Duden pondered the state of Germanic society—it’s unprecedented population growth, unemployment, and the changes that came with Prussian rule. Napoleon’s conquests had eliminated the feudal order,
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consolidating hundreds of small states into the German Confederation. In the name of agricultural reform and industrialization, the confederation abolished the peasantry and regulations of medieval craft guilds. Displaced peasants and craftsmen were set adrift.

In time Duden became a justice of the peace in Mülheim where he encountered first-hand the massive social and economic dislocation associated with developing industrialization and rapid demographic growth. Emigrants seeking refuge in the Netherlands or Russian lands to the east channeled through the Rhine valley, and frequently Duden’s court.\textsuperscript{495} Conditions were untenable. Poverty and crime were rampant, but Germany’s rulers seemed uninterested and incapable of addressing the social problems that came with rapid change. States historian Dorris Keeven-Franke, “The scene of battle had become the courtroom, where the people pleaded with their rulers for help instead of taxes, yet only received silence.”\textsuperscript{496}

Having pondered the debates of Thomas Malthus, William Godwin and Hans. C. E. von Gagern on human nature and the liberal state, Duden concluded that a combination of overly rapid development and population growth had corrupted the political foundations of states evident in an excessive number of people of poor circumstance, the oppression of that majority, and their systematic reduction to the

\textsuperscript{495} James W. Goodrich, Editor’s Introduction to \textit{Report on a Journey to the Western States of North America} by Gottfried Duden (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1980), ix-x.

condition of “beasts of burden.” Oppression was deplorable, but rebellion ran counter to Duden’s brand of liberal nationalism. Emigration, however, offering renewal for all. It meant a potential new Germania that could, in turn, revive the old.

Duden’s goal was not a simple transplantation and reproduction of modern European society. Like many Europeans at the time, Duden was heavily influenced by Romanticism and its deep disappointment with failed bourgeois promises that a better world awaited humankind on the other side of the liberal capitalist revolution. This “school of disenchantment” as defined by the French novelist Honoré de Balzac, longed for a return to, if not a precapitalist past, “at least to a past in which the modern socioeconomic system was not yet fully developed.” Romantics were particularly inclined to look to nature and the volk—their lives, mythology and artisanal modes of production, as a reference point for their aspirations. The quest for the realization of their ideal, Romantics also sought to transform their immediate surroundings through the creation of communities and utopian experiments. Hence Duden’s sojourn.

From 1824-1827, Duden traveled the western frontier all the while writing in detail about his experience of the land in a series of thirty-six letters. Through his travels Duden quickly concluded that a new Eden awaited migrants, evident in the condition of the unsullied wilderness and farmers he encountered during his excursions. His “Fourteenth Letter,” penned in Montgomery in September, 1825, offered his European


499 Löwy and Sayre, Romanticism Against the Tide, 23.
audience a “true picture of the life of a local farmer” on the frontier. What Duden had encountered was the American subsistence paradigm which he described in glowing terms. This “American” farm folk constructed modest homes of timber, lived “carefree and happy life without any cash,” fulfilling their needs by barter and a neighborly ethic. Nature generously indulged their efforts for, while these farmers kept milk cows and cultivated maize, garden vegetables and flax, hemp, or cotton for homespun, they also had at their disposal the great bounty of the mast: oak trees bearing “acorns as big as small hen eggs” and forests peppered with walnut, pecan, chestnut, plums, maples, mulberry, and persimmon trees, as well as berries and other useful plants. Likewise, there was no shortage of meat for hunting was “entirely free” “in areas where land was not fenced in.” The American west, as far as Duden could surmise, was one massive commons.

Unlike Delavan, Duden interpreted a wide array of alcoholic spirits on the American frontier as evidence of the right sort of prosperity born of healthy terrain and the proper agrarian integration of people with nature. He marveled at wild native “grape vines whose trunks, over a foot thick,” rose “about a hundred feet, free as cables, and then spread out in the crowns of elms” and wild hops growing with equal liberty in the forest. Wilderness, he implied, seemed to invite beer and winemaking as complement

500 Duden, Report on a Journey, 73.
504 Duden, Report on a Journey, 56.
to the “cider and brandies” supplied by “apple and peach orchards found on every farm.”
There was even excellent whiskey too, “as good as the best French brandy” to be had from local stills.505 And if that did not suffice, for the commercially-oriented farmer, there was finance. As mentioned in Duden’s “Eleventh Letter,” existing Swiss settlers in Vevay had purchased land via “extended credit provided they engaged in viniculture.”506
Thus notes Duden, “the farmer lives in a manner that surpasses by far that of a European farmer of the same financial status.”507

The wonders of the west convinced Duden that America was unique in its direction and politics, after all, it offered commoners access to “treasures that Europe had unjustly denied them.”508 Consequently, settlers revealed good moral character, respect for agriculture, lack of rank and little prejudice (though some slavery!). Likewise, it was Duden’s contention that the success of American democracy as compared to European revolutionary experiments, was secured by plentiful land.509 In the new world, settlers could return to the countryside where nature’s benevolence provided economic and social stability lacking in Europe.

Duden and Delavan communicated two antagonistic visions of alcohol which, despite their differences, shared certain points. The travels and worldviews of both men were set in motion by the turmoil of the revolutionary changes of their times. Moreover,

505 Duden, Report on a Journey, 71.
506 Duden, Report on a Journey, 45.
507 Duden, Report on a Journey, 71.
508 Duden, Report on a Journey, 8.
both lawyers understood alcohol as a function of life on the land and a measure of social
health. But most importantly, this transatlantic discourse conveys two different
expressions of the fundamental conflict of bourgeois subjectivity; namely, the tension
between liberal constructs and social reality. Both evinced an underlying sense that the
liberal project had somehow gone awry. For Delavan, the quintessential northeastern
Protestant teetotaler, nascent capitalism was perverted and threatened by an incomplete
conversion of space to industrial prerogatives. The survival of alcohol and its agrarian
roots embodied a failure to purify and reform the landscape and commerce. For Duden,
the restructuring of society had produced surplus population and deprivation, the antidote
for which was emigration for the creation of a new Germania as defined by the proper
land-to-human ratio. In his eyes nature and alcohol provided the gauge of ideal course of
development.

Both sets of letters were publication sensations. Delavan’s correspondences were
reprinted in multiple temperance circulars and by major temperance publications houses
before and after the Civil War, all of which earned Delavan that status of an acclaimed
expert in reading global trends through the lens of temperance ideology.\textsuperscript{510} The sum of

\textsuperscript{510} For examples see \textit{Proceedings of the Temperance Convention, held in Boston on the Twenty-third
September, 1835} (Boston: John Ford, 1836), 9; E. L. Carey and A. Hart, \textit{The Temperance Textbook: A
Collection of Facts and Interesting Anecdotes Illustrating the Evils of Intoxicating Drinks} (Philadelphia:
American Temperance Society} (Boston: American Temperance Society, 1840), 19; Eliphalet Nott, \textit{Lectures
on Temperance} (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 1857), v-vi, accessed June, 2014,
\url{https://books.google.com/books?id=19kcxbpve4C}; “Dr. Lewis C. Beck’s Analysis of Various Wines,”
\textit{The Enquirer} I, no. 1, Dec. 1841, 15. 19th Century U.S. Newspapers; “Medical and Chemical Temperance”
in \textit{The Temperance Reform and Its Great Reformers: An Illustrated History}, ed. William Haven Daniels
(New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1879), 591; George Washington Bungay, \textit{Temperance Anecdotes: Original
and Selected} (New York: National Temperance Society and Publication House, 1879), 236, accessed June,
Duden’s endeavors was initially published in his hometown at the author’s expense as *Bericht über eind Reise nach den westlichen Staaten Nordamerika* (Report on a Journey to the Western States of North America) (1829) before being widely distributed throughout Europe, whence it, and similar works, became “a catalyst that precipitated the great chain of migration.” Little did either know that thanks to their writings and similar works, a collision of two ideological worlds was already in the make.
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Chapter 4: 
The Shape of Things and Patterns of Settlement

…it [watchfulness] proves to us the deep-seated malady [intemperance] in the moral system; it evidences the power of this gigantick [sic] hydra, and the fearful tenacity of its demoniack [sic] grasp upon our country.  
--The Family Magazine (1843)\textsuperscript{512}

You [wine] move with soft compulsion the mind that is often so dull; you restore hope to hearts distressed, give strength and horns to the poor man. Filled with you he trembles not at the truculence of kings or the soldiers’ weapons.  
-- The Hymn of Horace 3.21\textsuperscript{513}

If bread is the staff of life, wine is life itself.  
--Anon\textsuperscript{514}

The mid-nineteenth century western world was in disarray. The European continent erupted in an upwelling of revolutionary fervor against the monarchies that formed after the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte. While circumstances across Europe varied, shared conditions provided the common tinder for revolt. Population growth, a decade of failed harvests, the move to market-oriented agriculture, and the elimination of customary land rights fed rural unrest. Rural misery was matched by rapid industrialization that birthed an explosive proletariat in cities such as Prague, Paris, Berlin and Naples. This European tinderbox was aggravated by economic recession and bank panics of the late 1840s and


\textsuperscript{514} This common saying has many variations, some of which substitute beer for wine. The original saying seems to come from Charles Brockton Brown’s novel, Ormond; or the Secret Witness (London: J. Cunningham, 1799), 108, in which the character, Bryan, was charged with procuring “bread, the staff of life, and wine,” that served as “life itself.” Wine, in this gothic novel, served a spiritual purpose as a means to “converse with nature” and with God, through the simple pleasures of food.
the general failure of governments to address the needs of their people.\textsuperscript{515} As in Britain, the transition to market economies was a wrenching revolution of the rich against the poor. The ongoing process of enclosure deprived the majority of their share of the commons as lords laid claim to land rights and nobles dismantled social obligations, welfare mechanisms, and protective laws.\textsuperscript{516} The result: yawning inequalities and a top-heavy rentier economy that typify a classic crisis of capitalism. Once ignited, revolt in France quickly spread through Europe into Switzerland, Italian, German states and Hapsburg Empire. Most of the rebellions ultimately failed, but the sudden and dramatic course of events, the emergence of June Day socialists, and surge of the lower orders against authoritarian rule resurrected, for many Americans, the specter of a Revolutionary Atlantic where mutinies, slave revolts and whiskey rebels posed a heterogeneous threat to the building of state, empire, and capitalism.\textsuperscript{517}

It is important to note that changes in production and economic relations had altered the dynamic of poverty. Historian Sandra Halperin offers an apt explanation for changes afoot:

Poverty in earlier periods had been ‘poverty of the unfortunate—the old, sick, lame, widowed, orphaned, demented, or temporary victims of local harvest or employment problems.’ But the reorganization of economic relations at the end of


\textsuperscript{516} Polanyi, \textit{The Great Transformation}, 37.

\textsuperscript{517} Roberts, \textit{Distant Revolutions}, 4 -7. Roberts notes how Revolutions of 1848 specifically raised the specter of the Haitian Revolution. In turn, we should note what the Haitian Revolution evoked; namely, widespread resistance to the construction of global systems of labor.
the eighteenth century ‘created a permanent group of able-bodied individuals who were destitute because they were unable to find work or to make a living wage.’ … Moreover, unlike past ages, the mass misery of nineteenth-century Europe arose within societies capable of producing an unlimited quantity of goods. The problem thus, was not of production but of distribution.\textsuperscript{518}

And as Halperin notes, this change found form in “the timing and geographic spread of radical activity” that ranged from older forms of agrarian protest to organized union activity.\textsuperscript{519}

The US at midcentury, also existed in a state of turmoil, due, in part, to rapid territorial expansion. In less than a century, the country had gone from a string of colonies on the Atlantic coast to a vast continental empire. Jefferson’s 1803 Louisiana Purchase of the French-held interior doubled the nation’s holdings. The loss of Spanish and French control in Latin America also provided, in time, an opening for the US to take possession of independent Mexico’s northern lands. Each territorial acquisition agitated internal debates over the course of slavery and development until the country was nearly torn in two by a civil war that heightened nativist and class tensions while straining resources. War, in turn, unleashed draft and bread riots that evoked images of revolutionary Europe.\textsuperscript{520}

At civil war’s end the nation was a collection of disparate regions: the industrial Northeast, the conquered South, the expansive frontier to the west into which poured


\textsuperscript{519} Halperin, \textit{War and Social Change}, 126.

\textsuperscript{520} Roberts, \textit{Distant Revolutions}, 7.
enterprising Yankees, subsistence farmers, southern freedmen, and Europe’s castaways.
All spelled potential promise and peril for the temperance reformer.

Meanwhile the temperance movement suffered setbacks, which, for the true believer only reinforced the sense that the modern world hung in the balance. The Maine Laws proved unenforceable and had unintentional and unforeseen consequences; namely, shadowy and profitable black markets and heated class conflict. But most importantly, the Portland Rum Riot made clear that legislated morality would not presage a golden age of social harmony. As noted in the epigraph above, the alcohol’s lingering presence signified a malady in the “moral system” reformers tried to construct alongside the capitalist economic system. After the riot, it would be almost twenty years before the passage of new state prohibitory legislation. In addition, the exigencies of war directed energies towards more pressing issues while war’s harsh realities inspired alcoholic indulgence. The expense of the Civil War did rouse the Union to revive the whiskey excise with various other “sin” taxes under the Revenue Act of July 1, 1862, resulting in a dramatic reduction in the number of distilleries that had emerged in previous decades. But as temperance measures go, the excise would have serious unintended consequences. More on that later...

Immediately following the war, temperance reformers regrouped and made some of its greatest gains in the South with Republican Party political dominance, missionary work associated with the Freedmen’s Bureau and industrial schools, and the spread the

521 Edward Dana Durand and William Julius Iarris, Manufactures 1909: General Report and Analysis (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913), 440. According to this report, in 1859 there were 1,193 distilleries. The number dropped to 719 by 1869 as the expense of the excise eliminated many small distilleries—nearly a 39% reduction in distilleries.
societies and associations favored by the middle class, which grew in small southern
towns. In the short run, this proved frustrating for reformers, but in the end, formidable conditions forced the movement to hone its strategies; namely, the ability to capture territory via seemingly benign legislation such as zoning laws that prohibited sales near schools and local option laws that allowed towns and cities to withhold licenses. Thus one paper claimed temperance advocates were able to force, in a piecemeal fashion, “John Barleycorn … to seek new fields.”

In addition to stubborn rural resistance in the South, for many temperance diehards, the great challenge of the post-war era lay in the West. As noted, seemingly boundless lands beyond the Appalachian Mountains encouraged migration. New World territorial abundance had long conjured images of America as the promised land, a Biblical equivalent of Israel-- a “land flowing with milk and honey,” synonymous with

---

522 Johnson, John Barleycorn Must Die, 9-11, 22. Meacham, Every Home a Distillery, also notes that small numbers of the upper and middling sort were voicing concern over alcohol consumption as early as the 1760s as coffee and tea slowly filtered into the Chesapeake and as small farmers gained access to inexpensive stills. See chapter 7.


agricultural bounty. But the great national blessing came with the temptation of languid drunkenness and general reluctance of frontier settlers to participate in the new commercial order. Accordingly, the movement upheld the notion that the wasted bodies of the intemperate were fated for removal by better men, as described by the Boston American Temperance Society in 1831:

Those who drink, and those who distil, or manufacture the poison,… their bodies will soon fall in the wilderness, where they have tempted God, and their fellow men; a new generation, who have not been slaves in Egypt, will rise up and enter a land flowing with what is better than milk and honey—*with water*, pure and refreshing.

Progress, accordingly, required a “class of abstainers.” Drinkers (“slaves” in this instance) were not fit for the challenge of converting wilderness into a Holy Land. Dry crusaders offered something better and ironically wetter. They would seek to transform the land with temperance waters, an abstract idea that would take literal form as reformers sculpted western agriculture to their vision of redemption via improvement.

The Rise of the Cider and Beer Districts

Looking west, temperance crusaders perceived three troubling trends that matched previous difficulties and resistance abroad. First and foremost was the continuation of the subsistence regime or “peasantry,” America’s frontier Dionysus where civilization gave way to wild cider orchards and fields of grain that were spent in the whiskey still.

---

525 For instance, see Frederic Richard Lees and James Dawson Burns, *The Temperance Bible Commentary* (London: S.W. Partridge, 1868), 26, which emphasized that God would deliver the chosen to a land of abundance.

Second, reformers noted that when farmers did commercialize they frequently went awry, that is to say, instead of producing meat and wheat, the proper fuel of industrial progress, many farmers directed their efforts towards vine, hop, or barley. Last, but not least, was the growing ranks of manufacturers and vendors of drink, many of which began as farmers or craftsmen knowledgeable in the brewing of beer or vinification. This element carried the “wild” into cities, undoing capital’s reign with a direct assault on its metropolitan heart. Temperance documents configured each worrisome trend geographically as cider, wine and beer “districts” comparable to similar territorial holding of the lingering economy of alcohol in Europe.

The issue of subsistence was the continued issue of temptation and nothing suggested temptation like the tart knobby cider apple. Prolific and engrained in New England culture-- a veritable “serpent” in the garden, early reformers attacked the cider apple with unparalleled vigor.527 The assault continued in the post-war era with unbridled energy. Cider, the symbol of subsistence, was considered so dangerous that temperance publications called on farmers to “discard the newest cider, lest it contain sufficient alcohol to arouse their old appetite and send them back to their cups,” for, claimed reformers, “The very mildest of intoxicating drinks may kindle appetite anew, to burn and rage uncontrollably.”528 This renewed appetite encompassed a desire for far more

---


than drink. Alcohol was the product of wayward colonization and fermentation moved quickly to claim fruit for misrule—a type of independence reformers feared. This is evident in a strident rejection of orchards as signifiers of subsistence. Because damaged apples were typically chosen for the mill (not the market), some advocates of temperance even suggested that fermentation preceded the press. This made even the seemingly innocent mug of new or “sweet” cider unacceptable since the consumption of any ferment would presumably foster, in the course of time, “an appetite for whiskey”—the ferment of frontier rebels. For the good of themselves and others, farmers would have to relinquish cider in all of its incarnations. Additionally, in opposing cider reformers were staking claims over land and future generations of labor.

Cider was the foundation of intemperance and the “cider district” a source of “idleness, dissipation, and crime.” Most cider orchards had been cut in New England by the 1840s, but new “districts” burst forth with each inland settlement. Prior to the war the demographic shift west was already underway into the “first colony of the United States”—the Northwest Territory. From there, settlement spilled over into newly acquired lands. In some cases, speculative agents and companies that spurred settlement inadvertently promoted the planting of cider orchards. Ohio company shareholders offered the best land in their new colony for sale and “donation tracts” to subsistence

---

farmers willing to weather native assaults. In addition, the company had gone so far as to require settlers to plant fifty apples trees in promoting rootedness and development of their claims.

War and politics also facilitated waves of migration west despite opposition from northern industrialists who feared losing their workforce to the frontier and southern plantation owners for whom western settlement meant the death knell of slavery and loss of political weight of the south. The opening of land for settlement served as a cheap and expedient way for politicians to gain popular support. And, like so many pawns, settlers served other state needs. Possession being nine-tenths of the law, the federal government recognized the imperative of large scale land distribution to secure each new territorial acquisition. The promise of land encouraged the military service and settlement needed to secure contested regions. In 1842, the Armed Occupation Law granted land to any man willing to fight in the Florida Seminole Wars. Eight years later, Congress offered sizable tracts to homesteaders willing to settle the Oregon territory. Then, in response to growing demand for free land for small, independent farmers, Abraham Lincoln signed into law the Homestead Act of 1862, which opened in a series of waves, 84 million acres of public lands to any citizen or person who intended to become a citizen of the growing nation. Claimants need only pay a filing fee of ten dollars and reside on and cultivate the land continuously for five years. Initial homesteaders made claims in Ohio, Indiana, and

532 Kerrigan, Johnny Appleseed, 68.

Illinois, before advancing into Missouri, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin through the 1870s, and onto the rolling plains thereafter.\textsuperscript{534}

Sociologist Tony Waters points out that the settlement of the North American continent is the story of subsistence farmers “subduing a wilderness while keeping a respectful distance from a marketplace which recurrently attempted to re-order their lives.”\textsuperscript{535} Subsistence farmers who moved into the old northwest continued to grow cider apples, aided in this endeavor by likes of John Chapman (aka Johnny Appleseed) who fled the New England market revolution for new lands in Ohio. Chapman belonged to commercial revolution’s lost generation. Forced to sell their farm to pay their taxes, Chapman’s parents were reduced to tenant farmers during the same post-Revolutionary War tax hikes that fueled Shays’ rebellion. His options limited, Chapman abandoned Pennsylvania for the frontier. By foot, hoof, and canoe Chapman moved west, planting apple seeds along Ohio’s unsettled tributaries. Part subsistence farmer, part entrepreneur Chapman’s endeavors took him from western Pennsylvania to Indiana. All along the way, his nurseries provisioned farmers who lived by hunting and subsistence mixed husbandry. Thanks to Chapman, hopeful homesteader and their precedent--families who carved out irregular frontier farms according to metes and bounds “in defiance of the rationalized grid”-- would suffer no depravation of apples.\textsuperscript{536}


\textsuperscript{535} Waters, \textit{Persistence of Subsistence}, 100.

\textsuperscript{536} Kerrigan, \textit{Johnny Appleseed}, 76.
Likewise, hard liquor, prized for its medicinal properties and many household uses was distilled, traded and sold in western territories.\textsuperscript{537} Compact and valuable, whiskey was easier to transport to market than bulky grain, making it a particularly valuable product for the inhabitants of the Appalachian Mountains and beyond prior to the development of railroads and steam transport. As of 1800, the farmers who inhabited the land on the Ohio River surrounding the nascent city of Cincinnati, produced corn in abundance; however, the plentiful and bulky nature of grain, discouraged long distance transport and sale except to the local distillery or from the farm in its distilled form as whiskey.\textsuperscript{538} Farmers in the old Northwest could, theoretically, float their products down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, but under risk of incurring more cost in transport than covered by unpredictable grain markets in New Orleans.\textsuperscript{539} Numerous legal distilleries were much reduced with the passage of the 1862 excise. But temperance reports reveal frustration with the perpetuation of many “petty stills” -- indiscriminate fruit distillation and a “larger number of illicit or ‘moonshine’ distilleries” wherever grain was cultivated.\textsuperscript{540} As with cider, distilled spirits were manufactured, used, sold, and traded by farmers who took out no licenses and paid no taxes on their product. Payment of wages

\textsuperscript{537} Meacham, \textit{Every Home a Distillery}, 7-11.

\textsuperscript{538} Michael D. Morgan, \textit{Over-The-Rhine: When Beer was King} (Charleston: History Press, 2010), 29.


and debts in alcohol lingered revealing Barleycorn’s continued reign as part of the shifting frontier economy.

The American movement was not unique in its exasperation over the survival of rural agrarian economies in the face of commercial development. At the International Temperance and Prohibition Convention (1862), English reformers also begrudged this remote economy lingering beyond the reach of the state and formal market. Illicit production fostered “notorious houses”—sheds, homes, and other spaces of the “lowest class,” where drink from cider to ardent spirits were freely sold irrespective of day or hour, and often during Sunday services when licensed establishments were typically closed. The illicit cider house, claimed reformers, was a harbor for vice: drinking, gambling, card playing, dominoes and other games of chance. In response, anti-cider house strategies were conceived by the movement on both sides of the Atlantic. In England, temperance galas, out-door meetings, and publications were devised targeting the “Cider System” in agricultural districts. Similarly, in the eastern states of the US, reformers organized “temperance actions”: the onslaught of a region, town or village by missionaries and publications whose purposes were funded by “enterprising merchants.” Western Pennsylvania, the “seat of the whiskey rebellion,” was an early target for this


sort of organized activity.\textsuperscript{543} Farther afield, the task of reform fell on an army of traveling orators-- a new breed of frontier preachers. New England clergymen such as Peter Cartwright engaged the moral crusade of abstinence as circuit riders denouncing all of the evils of their day from gambling to the hard-drinking backwoods preachers on their circuits.\textsuperscript{544} Conversion, however, was not guaranteed. As historian William Kerrigan notes, dwellers beyond the mountains, “freed from the conservative restraints of an established church,” were at liberty to choose from “all kinds of new religious ideas, or none at all, without stigma.”\textsuperscript{545}

Of course, subsistence farmers were not alone in their ventures west. As the nineteenth century proceeded, settlement and rapidly expanding transportation and communication networks continued to pull the land with its natural capital and human residents into the market paradigm. But even when farmers in the West commercialized they were not necessarily inclined toward temperance and frequently contributed grain and other farm products to a burgeoning commercial landscape of spirits that emerged prior to the Civil War and grew with leaps and bounds thereafter. And of course, many immigrants arrived with hopes of profitably using artisanal skills in vineyards and breweries while living on the land. Indeed, the production of ardent spirits, beer, and wine blossomed like flowers along waterways with commerce. Water and land the two


\textsuperscript{544} Alice Felt Tyler, \textit{Freedom’s Ferment: Phases of American Social History to 1860} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1944), 321.

\textsuperscript{545} Kerrigan, \textit{Johnny Appleseed}, 109.
primary resources required for fermentation, offered the basis for production in space where capital and components of heavy industry were limited.

Despite the westward continental migration of old stock Americans, in many ways the West was the domain of the new stock immigrant farmer. After 1830, large numbers of immigrants initiated a century-long period of mass migration into western territories. The first wave ran from 1830 to 1880 was composed of Northwestern Europeans, predominantly peasant farmers as compared to the southern and eastern European landless proletariat that arrived after 1880. The most destitute of these peasant migrants went to work in the east-coast cities where some constituted the opposition to the Maine Law prior to the Civil War. The rest—those with sufficient resources—bypassed eastern cities for the frontier. With loss of status and communal life, these small or middling farmers abandoned their ethnic homelands for the west where cheap land offered new beginnings. Here they hoped to preserve their rural culture and remake their communities by moving in groups and through chain migration. Drawn to rural settlements of the same ethnic background, these migrants forged “rural ethnic islands” that multiplied with time.\textsuperscript{546}

The efforts of new stock immigrants were shaped by travel accounts, immigrant guides, and a wide array of promotional literature disperse through Europe by land agents, railroad and steamship companies, growing states, and emigration and utopian societies. Many also came in response to family dairies, correspondence, hometown clubs

and religious leadership. While some migrants hailed from Ireland, Scandinavian, Britain, or France, the overwhelming majority came from Germany, and thus Germans produced the largest rural immigrant presence. So great were their numbers (more than five million during the nineteenth century) that they would ultimately shape the cultural substrate of the Midwest.\(^{547}\) The first wave of German migrants arrived in conjunction with the 1816-1859 period of land consolidation by the Prussian aristocracy, commonly known as the Junkers. In this timeframe these lords of northeastern Germania eliminated 21,000 peasant holdings. More immigrants followed at midcentury, fleeing the chaos of the 1848 Revolutions and continent-wide potato blight epidemic. A third wave arrived in the 1860s as an influx of cheap American wheat depressed global grain prices and undermined the livelihoods of mid-size German grain farmers.\(^{548}\) Because many of these immigrants hailed from Bavaria, Württemberg and other wine and beer regions of the western provinces, they arrived with an appreciation and at times, a flair for brewing and vinification.\(^{549}\) These immigrants were also unique in how they prioritized the reproduction and growth of their communities. German immigrant land husbandry displayed distinctive patterns of farming defined by the frugal diligence cultivated over centuries of living on the same land. Their ability to survive and maintain subsequent generation of farmers in ethnically uniform communities set them apart from highly


\(^{548}\) *German Immigration to the U.S. in the 1800s* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1977), accessed July 25, 2014, [http://www.home.comcast.net/~owen.rutz_geneology/German_Immigration.htm](http://www.home.comcast.net/~owen.rutz_geneology/German_Immigration.htm)
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mobile Yankee farmers who laid out more money and were less likely to reproduce or expand their settlement before moving on.\textsuperscript{550}

Migrants sought destinations with people, terrain and climate that resembled home. French immigrants preferred Louisiana or the Mediterranean climate of California. Scandinavians drifted towards the cold winters of the US-Canadian border. And Germans looked for a temperate climate reminiscent of the Rhine. Duden’s letter series suggested the Mississippi-Missouri River Valley while directing his countrymen away from the sticky-tropical climate of the South and heavily settled lands of the east coast.\textsuperscript{551} But in their search for a “new” Rhine or the reminiscent sylvan moderate coastal conditions of central Europe, German arrivals also landed along the confluence of the Ohio-Licking River of Cincinnati, the temperate zones around the Great Lakes, and in the countryside of northern California. Thus, the extent of German presence included the west coast and upper central US, from Montana to Wisconsin, stretching down to Kansas.

Each group had its own established drinking culture. Notably, the ethnic composition of many new arrivals fell within religious groupings that had few strict moral proscriptions against drinking, aside from norms for moderation. As historian Paul W. Glad observes, the ethnic mix of Midwest was not only heavily German, but also of Catholic and Lutheran following—churches that differed from Calvinist-Protestantism and its off-branches in regards to the cultural role of alcoholic beverages.\textsuperscript{552}


\textsuperscript{552} Glad, “When John Barleycorn,” 125.
immigrants in Minnesota and surrounding areas posed one notable exception. These populations found in temperance halls space for community gatherings and cultural preservation, especially in the mining town societies of Tower-Soudan and Mesabi.\footnote{June D. Homquist, \textit{They Chose Minnesota: A Survey of the State’s Ethnic Groups} (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 2004), 307-308.}

For Germans, in particular, drink was integral to \textit{gemütlichkeit}—the spirit of festivity and sociability embodied in the communal atmosphere of the beer or wine hall and garden. In the early nineteenth century \textit{gemütlichkeit} carried great weight in German immigrant communities. \textit{Gemült} suggested many things: the non-rational capacities of the soul and the cozy atmosphere of peace, comfort and communion associated with the moderate climate of the central-European homeland. \textit{Gemült} was not an automatic condition; rather, it was understood to be shared, cultivated, and deeply rooted in place. Observes Benno Gammerl, in keeping with the spirit of \textit{gemütlichkeit}, German-American communities exhibited a desire for the “nestling dimensions of gemült” as part of “an increasing significance of interpersonal closeness in relatively small groups.”\footnote{Benno Gammerl, “Felt Distances,” in \textit{Emotional Lexicons: Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling 1700-2000}, eds. Pascal Eitler, Monique Scheer, Bettina Hitzer, Anne Schmidt, Nina Verheyen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 196.}

\textit{Gemütlichkeit} evinced a need for social love that supported community-- a search for “middle ground” between individualism and altruism.\footnote{Gammerl, “Felt Distances,” 195-197.} German-American spaces dedicated to the manufacture of drink customarily linked to \textit{gemütlichkeit} were not just commercial endeavors, nor were they simply a cultural import. They served immigrant
aspirations for community at a time when affectivity was being reduced in a world increasingly defined by capitalist relations.

That said new stock immigrants contributed much to the creation of a vast new American spirituous landscape whose center was the American Midwest. With the settlement of towns, small breweries dotted California, Colorado, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, and Oklahoma. By 1860, 1,269 breweries produced approximately four million barrels of beer annually in the US.\textsuperscript{556} As of 1879, Indiana alone had seventy-nine breweries.\textsuperscript{557} But unlike the British styled ales of the east, western breweries sprung out of the craft of ambitious German immigrants who established hundreds of family firms in rural towns and cities. As with Eastern brewers, many founders had roots in farming. For example, Isaac Leisy of Freidelsheim, Bavaria, migrated to rural Iowa from in the 1850s. Leisy and his two brothers began their first brewery in Keokuk before proceeding to Cleveland in 1873 where their enterprise grew by leaps and bounds. These family-owned breweries evoked artisanal or craft production evident in firm photographs that featured all employees and their tools arranged around the owner in front of the brew house, with occasional child or brewery dog.\textsuperscript{558}

By the 1850s, commercial brewing provided an inexpensive alternative to home brewing, though an attachment to home-brew seems to have endured if only on a limited scale. Temperance writers remained suspicious of any effort to continue or revive


\textsuperscript{558} Robert A. Musson, \textit{Brewing in Cleveland} (Charleston: Arcadia Printing, 2005), 14, 18, 21-23.
household production, out of fear that home-brews reinforced the idea that alcohol was a suitable part of the family diet and taste for alcohol engendered in youth. The danger could, according to temperance ideologues, be even greater than the manufactured drink obtained at the pub or saloon, simply because it was a “subtle enemy.” States The Temperance Cyclopædia, “It will be observed, then, that instead of home-brewed ale promoting temperance, the fact that it is used at home, used by all the members of the family, used not occasionally, like spirits, but as an article of diet, renders it one of the surest means of creating drunkards.”

The emphasis here was the threat of a “domestic” beer—a drinking aesthetic that took root on farms and in kitchens and thus became secured in the landscape. Diet, in this instance, becomes a living metaphor for tastes, a way of feeling and being that fed something reformers did not want.

Aside from kitchen brewing, commercial breweries functioned as a signifiers of civilization and a life well lived. Such ventures appealed to immigrants who longed to return to life on the land—something that was possible in the Americas that wasn’t easily achieved in Europe. Their endeavors linked quality with undefiled nature and tradition as seen in their advertisements. Leonard Schlather’s brewing company of Cleveland suggested the beer was “Pure and Old”, a slogan combined with ornate bucolic scenes of maidens collecting water from clear-running streams.

---


560 See advertisements in reprinted in Musson, Brewing in Cleveland, 16.
My grandparent’s farm community in northwestern Ohio exhibited this history. Their hometown of Ottoville and neighboring Delphos in the region previously known as “Sixteen” (as in Section Sixteen of the canal), were settled by German Catholic families under the leadership of a Catholic priest Fr. John Otto Bredeick, and his brother Ferdinand. Bredeick chose Sixteen as a settlement sight when the Erie and Miami Canal opened in 1845. From land cleared of thick forest and drained swamp rose three monuments to civilization: farm fields stretching as far as the eye could see, the local brewery, and two cathedrals built in the style of the Romanesque revival. The Delphos brewery, established in the 1850s was lengthy brick building with its own ice house, brewing room, barley kiln and 450 barrel capacity malt cellar in traditional style. Most importantly, the brewery utilized local labor and materials. Notes one local paper in the 1870s:

One thing that speaks well for home enterprise is the Company has, in building and manufacturing their casks, patronized home manufacturers and mechanics, thereby doing their share towards promoting prosperity to the town. Half the expense incurred in producing the beer go to the labor they employ.\footnote{Bob Holdgreve, “Window to the Past,” \textit{Delphos Herald}, Dec. 19, 1998, accessed July 12, 2014, \url{http://www.delphos-ohio.com/Holdgreve/christmas_legend.htm}. This article is a compilation of 1870s articles pieced together by Holdgreve, President of the Delphos Historical Society.}

Notably, by “patronizing home manufacturers” the brewery effectively inverted the hierarchy of capital to support home production.

Breweries grew as well within burgeoning cities. The mining towns of Colorado facilitated a beer boom that would give Prussian born, Adolph Coors a place in brewing history with the formation of the Golden Brewery in Golden, Colorado. And Cincinnati’s “Over-the-Rhine” district was home to thousands of Germans and more than a dozen...
breweries. In Chicago, prior to the 1871 fire, housed twelve large “shipping breweries” that made use of Chicago’s centralized railroad hub to access grain and distant markets. No fewer than thirty-four breweries rose from the ashes. In addition, from 1845 to 1858 several major breweries—Blatz, Schlitz, Miller, Pabst, Obermann, Falk (Falk, Jung & Borchert), Beck, Gettlemann—sprouted in Milwaukee where the industry employed the multitude of German immigrants that arrived daily. In the same decade, Adolphus Busch founded what would become Anheuser-Busch brewery in St. Louis. And, as in Germany, these breweries operated halls and gardens for recreation, drinking and family and community get-togethers. Their product was lager, honed by medieval artisans in the early 1400s in cavernous cellars using special bottom-fermenting yeast that allowed for cold brewing. In the US as well, beer and gardens went hand-in-hand as “requisites of sociability” that flow with “alcoholic persuasion.” In recalling Milwaukee prior to prohibition, journalist Gunnar Michelsen captured the German-American landscape well. States Michelsen, “Pour beer out upon a locality and it won’t be long till the ground is dotted with gardens. They will grow and blossom so long as the beer continues to nourish them.” The largest of the city’s gardens could seat 3000 under trees, along riverbanks,

562 Morgan, Over-the-Rhine.


with “greenery and shade,” fountains, flowers and orchestras. Many of these spaces evoked the rustic rural with decorative wrought iron and heavy wood chairs and the “sweet musty odor” of the wine cellar. Others were verdant leisurely places complete with animal menageries. Park-like in nature, churches and school utilized the gardens for picnics. Many were conveniently situated next to local churches as were breweries in the old world.\footnote{Michelson, “Famous Gardens and Wine,” 5.}

Historian Stephen J. Gross describes the landscape of breweries and beer gardens as particularly adept in smoothing over the rough edges of modern life. German immigrants encouraged community solidarity and local business patronage with beer, dance, music and a host of public events such as concerts and theater that not only spoke of ethnic identity and transference with immigration, but also the blurring of public and private in the complex ties between culture and politics. Such activities helped broker divisions in the marketplace, and between contentious cultural worlds and the worlds of agriculture and commerce.\footnote{Stephen J. Gross, “The Not-so-Great Cat Massacre: An Episode in American Catholic History,” \textit{Journal of Social History} 45, no. 3 (Spring 2012), 780-808. DOI: 10.1093/jsh/shr100} And in negotiating tradition and modernity Milwaukee’s brewers’ association promoted its beer and malt extract tonics as “pure” and “modern,” and as promoters of the health and temperance of old, as seen in the sobriety of the German countryside.\footnote{“Milwaukee Beer Barons,” 4.}

By temperance measures, beer took on an almost ubiquitous presence starting with the rhetoric of early documents that utilized basic administrative divisions of space
as units of measurement in locating their declared enemy geographically. This mentality extended into the late nineteenth century and later reincarnations of temperance as a movement. Over time and via this surveyor’s mindset, hardly a district appeared free of beer. The amber liquid appeared in rural and manufacturing districts. Indeed, the two were linked since political measures to support grain farms such as the English Beer Act (1830), which eased licensing restrictions and encourage sales, were widely understood to have increased the beer habit among men and women alike in manufacturing districts.  

In the US, its presence figured into political districts and school districts in the taxes paid by producers. Crime-wise, reformers implicated beer in the high crime-rates of certain judicial districts in European and American cities and thus in the proliferation of almshouses, jails, and asylums.

### The Rise of the Wine Districts

In contrast, wine districts appear in temperance literature as regional concentrations of vineyards where all aspects of immigrant life centered on the grape. Indeed, new stock immigrants also deserve much credit for the development of an American wine industry. When it comes to wine, after 1800 and prior to Civil War early successes in commercial winegrowing blossomed in Ohio, Missouri and Indiana. From

---


there it extended into Illinois and Wisconsin. Here immigrants found favorable terrain for viticulture in the Mississippi and Missouri River Valleys. After the Civil War, winegrowing moved with settlement as migration spilled over into the Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska.573 The temperance movement expressed alarm at the idea of domestic viticulture as the latest incarnation of John Barleycorn. Exclaimed one New York reverend, “The enemy is imposing itself upon us in another dress, and striving thus covertly for the mastery.”574 This concern, once again, drew upon a well-established fear of the survival of pre-capitalist economies. The wine districts that so troubled Delevan conjured up a history and landscape that paralleled the supremacy of barley and beer-- aka John Barleycorn, in the medieval village.

In central and southern Europe, John Barleycorn had a counterpart in wine and its associated vegetation spirit. Wine making using grapes developed alongside western civilization throughout the Mediterranean. Ancient Egyptians were among the first to cultivate the grape and record, in detail, viniculture. By 2000 BCE, grape cultivation had spread with contact with Egypt among the great empires of the Mediterranean and especially with Greek tradesmen and settlements.575 Among these island people the undying vine became identified with Dionysus, a vegetation and fertility god whose


mythos personified the miraculous metamorphosis of death and rebirth in “twice-born” plants. Dionysus, like Barleycorn, evinced an agrarian existence, among other things. His was, as voiced by historian Walter Friedrich Otto, the “myth that deals with living images of reality as it presented itself to mortals who had not yet willfully severed their connections with the world and set themselves up in opposition to it.”

Dionysus originated in early Minoan Greek pantheon (or earlier), and endured after the Olympian “sky gods” were installed by the invaders of mid-second millennium BCE. Likewise, under the name Bacchus, Dionysus maintained votaries and his association with agriculture and unruly nature. And though Roman latifundia enjoyed the pecuniary benefits of viticulture inherited from the Greeks, Bacchus remained an ambivalent figure, so much so that in the second century BCE, the Bacchanalia (Dionysian festivals) were outlawed by Roman officials. Bacchus transitioned into a savior figure whose powerful story informed a ferment of mystery cults that bubbled up under Roman rule. As a god of the colonized, Bacchus remained a god of the downtrodden, a stark contrast to Apollo, god of order and security. As a protean figure that skirted the boundaries of life and death, Bacchus endured as the insurer of resurrection, transcendence, and religious transport, not through order, but rather through

the “confusion of boundaries.” Notably, this generative power was equally wedded to tragedy, the “promise of deliverance or destruction or both.”

Empire carried the vine into central Europe, the home of John Barleycorn. Here, in cool-temperate zones, Romans located fitting south-facing granite and limestone escarpments of the proper microclimate for grapes. And when the empire crumbled, the vines survived on their rocky slopes under the religious prerogative of Christian monks, and the agricultural economy of feudal Europe. By 1100 regional fairs emerged and with them, an expansion of vineyards largely by monks from the Rhineland to France as a form of sharecropping in which landholders divided the revenue with workers under the “métayage” system. In a cash-poor society facing labor shortages following the plague, this form of land tenure offered benefits to estate holders and peasants alike. Peasants were granted greater access to land and the freedom to produce for their subsistence, in addition to incentives to for growing grapes for marketable wine. For instance, to encourage production, abbeys offered peasants everything from “technical help with terracing to celestial privileges for especially good results” and even “equal rights with townsmen.”

Scores of monasteries laid out the largest expansion of

581 John W. Shaffer, *Family and Farm: Agrarian Change and Household Organization in the Loire Valley, 1500-1900* (Albany: State University of New York, 1982), 170. This system has been applied elsewhere in the modern era as a means of addressing labor shortages. For an example see IICA Trinidad y Tobago, *An Overview of the Current Status of Agriculture in Tobago: Implications for the Future* (IICA Biblioteca Venezuela, 1994), 6-7.
vineyards on what became a great swath of church-ruled terrain. Spurred by growing trade with England, Church led wine villages proliferated, increasing from “less than 40 in the 7th century to almost 400 two centuries later.”583 By the late Middle Ages, German wine villages (also known as Winzerdorf) enjoyed special status and even town rights. Each was walled, some with densely planted trees, with houses centrally located or grouped along riverbeds, surrounded by cooperatively grown vineyards on terraced slopes. Examples of such medieval wine villages include Riquewihr in Alsace, Bernkastel on the Moselle River, Winkel in the Rheingau, and Wurzburg in Franconia.584

In America, alcohol carried important religious associations for Catholics, Lutherans, and Episcopalians (a more “Catholic” off-branch of Anglicanism). Wine’s role as religious sacrament denoted the incarnation of the divine. Historically, both wine and the soil specific to vineyards, for these denominations, were understood as gifts of God, an integral part of religious celebrations and feasts, and a way to celebrate the earthly origins of the eternal. Wine was precious as a spiritual vehicle and daily comfort. The preservation of the art of winemaking by monks from the fall of Rome to the modern era, its ritualized use, and role in communal bonding, in turn, implicated wine in the preservation of culture and a specific brand of spirituality. This was especially important in America where, as historian Robert C. Fuller reminds us, “Both agnostic entrepreneurs

583 Johnson, The Story of Wine, 117.
584 Johnson, The Story of Wine, 118-119.
and believers of various religious traditions viewed wine as a reminder of the finer things they nostalgically associated with European culture.”

Winegrowing in America was from the start considered an “exotic activity…regarded with suspicious hostility by large parts of the population.” Old stock Americans did not, by and large, drink wine because it was not widely available, nor did many American Protestant Christian sects embrace wine as part of religious observance. In addition, colonial attempts to establish vineyards had been frustrated by the realities of politics, horticulture, disease, and climate. In the colonial era, imperial France barred its colonies from commercial wine trade to protect its home industry and the Spanish crown prohibited colonial trade with foreigners. Other cash crops preoccupied the Anglos who viewed vineyards as a seductive waste of time and space, especially when grape cultivation proved onerous.

Quite ironically, the wild cultivars that Duden found so alluring had previously inspired dreams of an American wine industry by colonial elites from William Penn to Thomas Jefferson. But the grapes that grew in great profusion throughout North America were worlds apart from *Vitis vinifera*, the European wine grape. The grape, like the apple, will self-propagate, siring unique individuals that, in their adaptability, lack the hard-sought delicate and sweet qualities that could only be drawn out over centuries of artificial selection. Natural selection, in contrast, had created in the Americas a hardy survivor and for good reason. The harsh frosts of American winters can damage sensitive


vines and extreme heat of the continent’s summers can have an adverse effect on berry coloration, growth, and sugar accumulation. Pests and disease upped the ante. The Americas were home to powdery mildew, black rot, and Phylloxera vasatrix, the infamous vine louse. As defense, indigenous grapes evolved course skin, sturdy root-stock, and small bunches of off-colored and off-flavored berries that weathered the challenges of life in the New World well, but whose taste did not conform to European palates. American grapes from the “foxy” (musky) Muscadine and lubrusca, to the “harshly herbaceous” cordifolia, sour riparia, and the acrid mustangensis of the old Southwest, like the frontier farmer, seemed to defy domestication.  

Colonial attempts to import vinifera into the Atlantic coastal region also proved discouraging. A few backyard vines or pockets of small localized production could survive for a spell, but commercial expansion shared a common predictable fate: the vines would ultimately succumb to weather or the onslaught of pests or disease unique to the Americas for which vinifera had no natural defense. Cultivators would have to wait until after 1800 when major developments in hybridization and grafting offered a new shot at American viticulture.  

As historian Thomas Pinney notes, winegrowing in the early nineteenth century began with scattered, small-scale endeavors, the history of which “recapitulates the most familiar themes of pioneer life”; namely, winegrowing was the work of immigrants in the


backcountry carrying on in the face of “intolerant prohibitionist hostility.” The earliest settlers in the Midwest went “graping”—gathering wild grapes that flourished from hill to vale to the flat expanse of the prairie. And, as with earlier waves of intrepid colonists, responded to nature’s summons by laying out vineyards and with a few new horticultural innovations and a bit of diligence produced America’s first commercial wines.

The first big breakthrough was made by Nicholas Longworth, lawyer, land speculator and amateur horticulturalist of Newark, New Jersey. After members of the Swiss Vevay settlement declared the Ohio the “Rhineland of America,” Longworth, who had accumulated landholding around Cincinnati, responded by planting grapes. The Catawba, a *labrusca-vinifera* hybrid was among the various strains that made their way into Longworth’s vineyard. From these, Longworth produced the first commercially viable American wine. But Longworth true claim to fame was achieved in 1842, when, by accident, he made a sparkling pink wine that found an extensive drinking audience on the east coast. Moreover, Longworth and the enthusiasm he generated in horticulturalist circles, offered up Catawba wine as the first light “pure American wine,” free of added sugar or alcohol, the perfect substitute for the stronger waters of frontier farmers and the deleterious drink of foreign import. For old stock American entrepreneurs, growth of the vine was the perfect symbol of republican empire colonizing the west vineyard by

---


vineyard. Nurserymen and “businessmen-botanists” used the vine as a metaphor for progress at a time when government and market endeavors embraced all things Neoclassic, thus evoking the Roman Republic.\textsuperscript{593} Utilizing the growth in publications during the market revolution, these pioneers of the vine rhetorically sold an American wine industry as a product of science, rational order, and the agricultural development of the American “empire of liberty.”\textsuperscript{594} Henry Wadsworth Longfellow supported such claims in verse that distanced Catawba from the wild Scuppernong, Muscadel and Mustang as well as the “drugged juice” of “vine of the haunted Rhine…Danube or Quadalquivir.”\textsuperscript{595} Temperance proponents weren’t convinced. Wine, like other spirits, retained its alcoholic and feudal affiliations, as seen in this bit of “Anti-Catawba” verse:

Poet Longfellow sings, in his lyric for kings,  
The praise of Catawba wine;  
Catawba, he thinks, is the nectar of drinks,  
An elixir—semi-divine.  

Did it ne’er strike the poet—if not, he should know it—  
Though bards are not always deep thinkers,  
That wine, as the first step, is often the worst step  
That’s taken by alcohol drinkers.\textsuperscript{596}

Imports, noted one publication, had previously deterred consumption by making wine expensive. “Indigenous wine” only increased “wine houses”, “cellars” and “appetite.” It


\textsuperscript{594} Hannickel, \textit{Empire of Vines}, 13, 22-24.


made wine cheap and this, for the uncompromising reformer meant “more brandy-
distilling, more drunkenness and more demoralization”—a step backward from their
understanding of sober industrial progress.\textsuperscript{597}

Another major concern of temperance remained; that is, the influence of the
immigrant element on the character of western agriculture. Longworth and other land
proprietors that gathered around Cincinnati and contributed to the regional Catawba rush,
kept German tenant farmers and hired foreign winemakers. Indeed, Longworth actively
encouraged German migration to Cincinnati by financing the distribution of an “alluring
little sketchbook” on the region across Germany.\textsuperscript{598}

Unfortunately, the Catawba vineyards laid out by heady Yankee enterprise proved
not entirely disease resistant especially when grown as a virtual monoculture. In the
1860s, powdery-mildew and black rot swept through with the ruinous hallmark of a
biblical plague, destroying the Cincinnati wine district. Elsewhere new stock immigrants
carried production forward. As Longworth was making a name for American wine in the
1830s and 40s, a wave of Central-European immigrants arrived in the Midwest via the
corridors provided by the Great Lakes and large river systems. The confluence of rivers
and geographic features that grabbed the attention of Duden while he was searching for a
new Germania on the western frontier in the 1820s happened to be prime country for
vineyards. Here, immigrants settled, their course planned by the organizational efforts of
the Giessen Emigration Society and German Settlement Society of Philadelphia both of


\textsuperscript{598} Hannickel, \textit{Empire of Vines}, 118.
which, in response to Duden’s published letters, established the colonies from St. Louis
to Hermann, Missouri, with hopes of establishing a western German state for the
preservation of German culture.\footnote{Traveling Summer Republic and City Archives of Giessen eds., Utopia: Revisiting a German State in America (Bremen: Edition Falkenberg, 2013), Chapter 1.}

Most of the immigrants, many who were students, were unprepared for frontier
existence. They departed expecting oaken forests, Alpine mountains and moderate
temperature, but arrived in a world of extremes: frigid winters, blistering summers,
intense storms and soil of highly variable quality. None were accustomed to the life of the
frontier subsistence farmer Duden idealized. Writes historian Steven W. Rowan, “the
American frontier settler was a breed apart, happy with little and able to thrive in a world
of isolation and danger. Germans, on the other hand, were used to the solid comfort of

Initial difficulties aside, the Missouri Germans had to their advantage a vision,
perseverance, and sheer dumb luck. In the spirit of true Romantics, they looked to nature
and planted grapes. The choice of crops was more than convenient, because the site they
chose to settle according to Duden’s urgings turned out to be good for little else and
many had no where else to go. When their \textit{vinifera} withered, they moved on to hybrids
and hardy natives: Catawba, Isabella and finally, the Norton, without prejudice. By the
late 1840s the settlement producing 10,000 gallons of wine per year, which poured into
an eager immigrant consumer market. By 1861, expansion of vineyards and demand put Hermann on the map as the Cincinnati district foundered. The Missouri wine district also unexpectedly benefited from the devastation of English and European vineyards after Phylloxera was accidently introduced to old world vineyards. A large-scale winery was built; its wine sold up river to Cincinnati wine houses. The town celebrated their good fortune in old world fashion with Maifest (May Day) and Weinfest complete with an opening parade featuring an over-sized Bacchus fully adorned with flowers and grapevine wreaths.  

Wine production expanded throughout Missouri and into Illinois, Kansas and northwestern Arkansas. They survived and thrived because these immigrant experiments proved flexible enough to weather challenges. As Pinney notes, the new breed of viticulturalist in many ways rep a new school of American grape culture as defined by the new “high-minded” immigrant-- the “philanthropic and literary farmer” as exemplified by Friedrich Muench, founder of the Geissen Emigration Society, who published a treatise on the Missouri German vineyard experiment titled “Directions for Winegrowing in America” (1859). Viticulturists in Hermann and the surround Weinstrasse, the lengthy stretch of vineyards hugging the Missouri, wrote instructional books and contributed to a growing literature on grape culture. Nurserymen from Hermann also played an important role in salvaging the French wine industry by developing with French experts,

---


a means of grafting *vinifera* vines to hardy American rootstock—a development that had an equally positive effect on the formation of domestic vineyards.\(^{603}\)

Elsewhere vineyards blossomed around the Great Lakes and Finger Lakes. The Lake Erie region proved particularly well suited for viticulture. Retained heat in the lake tempered the climate, extending the growing season and limiting frosts. From the early to mid-nineteenth century a population of German immigrants and French Canadians settled a handful of lake “wine” islands. The communities they established followed the rhythms of European tradition: planting, growing, harvesting, and fermenting in vineyards, winepress houses, and cellars as an extension of their farms. In short time and traffic of the canal era, these farms went commercial. For instance, Datus Kelley who settled on what came to be known as Kelley Island, upon arrival in 1842 planted Isabella grapes. His son-in-law, Charles, took up commercial wine making three years later with much success. Profitable companies materialized and the island became a favorite destination for weekend visitors who enjoyed drinking and dancing in wine halls constructed over the islands’ cellars.\(^{604}\)

New canals fortified Lake Erie wine country which extended to the shoreline of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Ontario and the lake of the interior of New York. Most began as small family businesses--entrepreneurial endeavors that came to employ the latest machinery: crushers, pumps and presses – some imported from Europe. These small capitalists hired a small cast of cultivators, merchants, and skilled winemakers. In


the spirit of the Romantic love of the artisanal over the machinery of heavy industry, they purchased locally fashioned barrels around which they posed with baskets of wine bottles, tools and in the dress of their craft for photos. Some of the Ohio winemakers were French or Swiss, but many were German immigrants evident by their names: Hommel, Krundivig, Meier, Engels, and Lenk, among others. By late 1800s, consumer-oriented wine gardens also became part of the terrain. For example the Martinez Wine Gardens of Cleveland served food and wine produces on site by the Swiss Martinez family.605

Meanwhile, on the west coast, an amalgamation of immigrants fostered the development of California’s wine industry. Jean Louis Vignes of Bordeaux established, in 1830, one of the first commercial vineyards in Los Angeles. Through the 1850s, the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Mission regions developed as major wine district. The industry grew out of the localized production of the Spanish Missions that was secularized with the process of expropriation under the Mexican government in the 1830s.606 Production shifted north as the trickle of migrants into California turned into a flood with the discovery of gold in 1848—the same year Europe erupted in revolution. The ensuing gold rush lasted just long enough to increase regional population over the required limit for statehood as the United States laid claim to the west coast following the Mexican-American War. With gold claims petering out, migrants laid claim to another source of wealth: the land. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo between the US and Mexico

605 Tailer, Ohio’s Lake Erie Wineries, 36-42.
at war’s end was supposed to protect the property rights of Mexicans living in territories ceded to the US. But squatters quickly set about divvying up Mexican ranchos according to the American system of legal land ownership. In short order these incursions were aided in their endeavors by the federal Land Reform Act (1851) which threw into question the validity of all Spanish and Mexican era land grants. Land in the Napa Valley was soon put into the production of wheat and meat for thousands of miners but in the thin, rocky, volcanic soil dreams of profitable commercial agriculture expired in short order.\textsuperscript{607} That is, until refugees fresh from Europe with some knowledge of viticulture arrived and found inspiration in the hilly terrain and work of Agoston Haraszthy, son of an Austro-Hungarian land proprietor. Haraszthy entered the US in the 1840s, traveled about and explored a variety of promising enterprises from land speculation, gold refining to silk and wine production for the Mexican general of Napa Valley.\textsuperscript{608} By the 1850s, Haraszthy had laid out vineyards in Sonoma and proceeded to promote California vine industry via printed treatises and propagation of over 1000 varieties of vines. Haraszthy inspired a class of bourgeois viticulture in northern counties including Charles Krug, a Hungarian political refugee that took up a vineyard next to Haraszthy in Sonoma.\textsuperscript{609} Hundreds of vineyards blossomed from which emerged the Napa Valley “big five”: Jacob Schram from the Rhine Valley, Jacob and Frederick Beringer, two brothers


\textsuperscript{609} Pinney, \textit{A History of Wine}, 270-274, 279.
from a German winemaking family also from the Rhine, and Gustave Niebaum, a Fin and fur trader turned vintner. These prototype small capitalists grew a variety of grapes and mimicked the pocket proprietors of Europe with their elegant country estates and stately châteaux, the architectural counterpart of the medieval villa, recast as the symbol of the high-bourgeois. This Romantic architectural turn toward the neo-Gothic and neo-Romanesque ran concurrent with the Neoclassical. The neo-Gothic and neo-Romanesque, in contrast to the pure orderly urban ideal of classicism, materialized medieval nostalgia – a sort of resurrected rural Christian golden age standing in defense against urban nationalism, using an eclectic mix of rounded arches, hipped and gabled roofs, stone fortress-like ramparts and fanciful ornamental embellishments of the gothic. Three striking examples of this combined agricultural and architectural trend can be seen in the imposing structure of the great château and ivy-covered stone main building of Niebaum’s Inglenook Winery which opened in 1885; the Beringer brothers’ Rhine House, a seventeen room mansion complete with stained-glass windows, turrets and gables modeled on the family estate on the Rhine; and the stone castle of Château Montelena Winery constructed in 1882 by New Hampshire born entrepreneur, Alfred L. Tubbs.

The word “château” evoked the Romantic penchant for the manor house and wine villages of medieval Europe. And as wine goes, “chateau” on the label suggested

610 See Gaughan, “When the Valley Met.”
refinement— a branding or classification of vintage. The vintners of Napa Valley sought out the ideal terroir to create fine wines in the European tradition and produced space with an old world ambiance that appealed to visitors and consumers. The majority of winegrowers, however, were more akin to the small vigneron of Europe. By the late 1880s there were literally thousands of winegrowers throughout California. Most were “comparatively poor” unspecialized farmers who grew grapes alongside other crops. These growers represented a mix of nationalities: a small percentage of Italians, Swiss, and English, a comparatively large number of Frenchmen, all within in a predominately German émigré population. Together, these farmers represented a very different mix of people and worldviews than the old stock East coast farm element. What these new stock immigrants created also represented a delicate mix of tradition and modernity.

The Mystique of John Bacchus Barleycorn

While viticulture was a commercial and even speculative venture, distinctions between commercial and utopian endeavors were never sharply drawn. In fact, they were often complementary. Initially, however, viticulture like other spirituous crafts accompanied a strong desire for fellowship and escape from the dehumanizing conditions of cities and factories. In their longing for an alternative to existing commercial relations, utopian communities employed the space of folk culture and landscapes to experiment with new socio-economic arrangements—an impulse would have its parallel in the

---

612 For more on the nineteenth-century European château as fashionable architecture see Johnson, *The Story of Wine*, 375-376.

popularity of Renaissance Faires in twentieth-century American counterculture, which, as Rachel Lee Rubin notes, took a “willful turn to the old…to experiment with the new.”\textsuperscript{614} Literally hundreds of utopian communities were founded in the Americas in the nineteenth century in hopes of establishing model commonwealths. These social experiments stood in sharp contrast to national mythos of capitalist individualism. As such, this golden age of communal ventures represents one side of a central dynamic of American history as an ongoing struggle between collective and individual impulses.\textsuperscript{615}

The value of drink in these communities also highlights the strong association spirits with the communal. Desires for collectivity, in turn, translated into commercial demand for spirits, fostering a broader landscape of production that drew in many independent farmers.

In the nineteenth-century west, the undying vine became an emblem of religious and communitarian undertakings that spun out of or fed into the commercial landscape, all the while adding to wine’s foreign mystique. For instance, the followers of Etienne Cabet, politician and author of the utopian novel \textit{Voyage en Icarie (Travels in Icaria)} (1840), abandoned France for the New World in 1848 in hopes of establishing their own real-life Icaria.\textsuperscript{616} Their initial settlement in Texas dispersed in short order after suffering a devastating outbreak of yellow fever. From the 1850s to the 1880s, splinter settlements of the Icarians planted vineyards as a traditional French industry and in hopes that the


\textsuperscript{615} For more on this tension see Michael Fellman, \textit{The Unbounded Frame: Freedom and Community in Nineteenth-Century American Utopianism} (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1973).

\textsuperscript{616} Etienne Cabet, \textit{Voyage en Icarie} (Paris: Felix Malteste et Co., 1848). This is the fifth edition.
burgeoning grape market might afford them the economic independence they desired. After their communities disbanded, vineyards passed onto members who converted settlement sites in Nauvoo, Illinois, and western Iowa into formidable commercial wine-making districts. Icarians who moved to Sonoma County, California in 1881 planted grapes upon their arrival. For the new colony of Icaria Speranza, vineyards were not just economically important. The rolling hills of vines embodied the Icarian bucolic ideal while helping the commune blend in with other neighboring vineyard communities.

Vineyards provided important symbolic and economic functions for other utopian experiments. Silkville, Kansas (1869) settled by French philanthropist and admirer of Charles Fourier, Ernest Valeton de Boissiere, offers one such example. Fourier, in his science of social well-being, placed great emphasis on the idea that the poor, in accordance with the natural passions, be able to eat like the rich. According to Fourier, society, subject to the scourge of poverty by consequence of so-called “civilized industry” had “fallen victim to a ‘wasting disease, an inner vice, a secret hidden venom’” of “mercantile jealousies” that might be remedied by a new form of association known as the phalanx which combined agriculture, crafts, and industry. Each phalanx would harmonize society by locating together families of unequal wealth with the common goal of social unity. Rooted in space and the communal structure of a single manor house, the phalanx would also theoretically end civilization’s “rapid decline … to a state of

---
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Foodwise, Fourier detested the fact that the rich had their choice of superior food and wine, while the poor ate dry bread with water or poor wine. Thus, Fourier called on all phalanxes to “accumulate so many trophies” in their “kitchens” and “cellars,” including “good wines”… “such an abundance of exquisite produce that even the poor will share in it.”

Silkville complied, laid out vineyards and mulberries for the production of silk, wine, cheese, and fine livestock until the community disbanded in 1892 after competition from silk imports reduced its economic base.

Other communitarian experiments took a more religious turn. Wassaic, a wine-making commune of the Brotherhood of the New Life, was established by English spiritualist Thomas Lake Harris in upstate New York in 1861. According to Harris, wine, the economic lifeblood of the community, was no mere commodity. New Life wine, claimed Harris, “was infused with the divine aura and opened the drinker to the creative breath of God Himself.” In 1867, the community relocated during the Lake Erie district regional wine rush. Harris and his followers faced teetotaler scrutiny and in the 1870s, relocated again and founded the community of Fountain Grove, this time to Sonoma County, California, “the place of choice for winemaking communes” seeking


“refuge from prying eyes.” Here members devoted themselves exclusively to winemaking, producing upward of 200,000 gallons annually by the late 1880s and the first ever California winery newsletter.

Much like the Brotherhood, the pietistic German Rappites, founded by Johann Georg Rapp, established in the 1850s a string of Amana colonies in Indiana, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Iowa, which survived up to the Great Depression. Known as the “Inspirationists,” members lived communal lives of work and worship. Notes Fuller, “Their German heritage was steeped in a tradition in which wine and religion were fused together in the celebration of life.” The colonies brewed beer and distilled whiskey, but it was wine that held the most revered spiritual status. Wine embodied the synthesis of cooperative horticulture and personal craftsmanship of the community cellarmaster and in the making of family wines. In an otherwise simple lifestyle, wine served as a gift, the sealer of pledges, and centerpiece of community meals and feasts including Liebesmahl (Love Feast) which featured the sharing of communal wine from a special goblet. Like an ancient sage seeking a hidden truth, Rapp, the self-described Great Alchemist, ran a secret school of alchemy that sought not gold but a pure spiritual elixir, the perfect blend of possibilities for the realization of joy. This mystic quest was underscored in community construction: the wine cellar beneath their place of worship and in weaving

---
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vines into the trelliswork of communal structures. Similar to subsistence farmers on the east coast, the Rappites changed locations as land prices rose and put into question the survival and growth of their society. When doing so, they took care to locate land suitable for the vine.

Aside from the Icarians and Brotherhood of the New Life, the west coast was also home to several home-grown colonies modeled after one especially influential migrant experiment known as the German Anaheim wine colony. As the gold rush lost its luster, disenchanted immigrants turned to the task of settlement more suited to gemütlichkeit. San Franciscan Germans were attracted to a colonization scheme hatched by John Frohling and Charles Kohler, two German musicians working with George Hansen, an Austrian engineer and surveyor working in Los Angeles County. In the early 1850s, Frohling, Kohler and Hansen devised a plan for a winemaking colony in the Santa Ana Valley. The goal: profitable investment and outdoor living for their middle-class immigrant artisan shareholders. Hansen carefully chose the site according to the proper combination of natural resources and, in a less-than-utopian fashion, set about hiring indigenous, Mexican and Chinese laborers to construct for the shareholders, a community of fifty, twenty acre lots surrounding a forty acre central village of shops, homes, brewery, saloons, hall, water company, school and other public buildings. 8,000 grape cuttings of Mission and other locally available grapes were planted per lot, with lots

---


distributed to shareholders by lottery. The entire site was enclosed with a fence of willow cuttings that grew into a living wall that, aside from the main gate, secured the vineyards against invasion by free-roaming cattle and wild horses.\footnote{Samuel Armor,\textit{ History of Orange County} (Los Angeles: Historical Record Company, 1921), 53. Also see “The History of California Wine,” \textit{The Wine Institute of California}, Jan. 2012, accessed Aug. 15, 2014, http://www.discovercaliforniawines.com/wp-content/files_mf/ecawinehistory.pdf; Dorothea Jean Paule, “The German Settlement at Anaheim” (master’s thesis, University of Southern California, 1952).} Structurally, from its central village located on a river, to dense living fence, the community imitated the medieval villages of the Rheingau (Rhine wine district).\footnote{For a description of the Rheingau, see Johnson, \textit{The Story of Wine}, 119.} Likewise, the choice of names explored by residence for their new home is telling. Some shareholders voted for “Annagau” roughly translated as “Ana shire” in honor of the Santa Ana River. Others preferred “Weinheim” (“home of wine”), but the community settled on “Annaheim” (“home by the Santa Ana”).\footnote{Paule, “The German Settlement,” 22. Note: these immigrants Germanified the name of Santa Ana with their use of “Anna.” The city that emerged from this settlement reverted to the Spanish spelling.} As a blend of cooperative venture and land development scheme, common property and private property, quasi-medieval design and profit-driven commercial agriculture, the colony epitomized the romantic proto-capitalist impulse.

Colony shareholders formed the Anaheim Grape Grower’s Association which was managed by Bavarian-born Benjamin Dreyfus who marketed colony produce which steadily increased each year. The colony became home to numerous wineries and other facilities including the Reiser Winery (and later distillery and auditorium), the Dreyfus Winery, and Langenberger’s winery and distillery. Altogether the colony produced 1.25 million gallons of wine annually by the early 1880s and Dreyfus by the late 1870s was
the state’s largest distributor, providing its shareholder residents with good returns on their investments.  

The Anaheim model inspired several similar but short lived endeavors farther North on the Fresno plains including the San Joaquin River settlement (1868), the German Fancher Creek settlement (1871), the San Joaquin Vineland settlement (1873). But in the mid-1870s, German immigrant Bernard Marks successfully formed the Central California Colony. Marks migrated to California during the gold rush, after which he sold his claims and purchased land along the San Joaquin River. Working with horticulturalist William A. Sanders, and land speculator William Chapman, Marks devised a plan for a colony on the river that involved the subdivision of large tracts of land into twenty acre vineyards fed by a centrally organized irrigation system similar to the one developed in Anaheim.  

The most successful vine operations born of collaborative enterprise formed in Sonoma in the 1880s as the Italian-Swiss Agricultural Colony. This experiment in social philanthropy was the brainchild of Genoa-born Andrea Sbarboro. This successful grocer living in San Francisco took inspiration from the romanticism of English artist John Ruskin and work of Robert Owen. Sbarboro devised a plan to settle Italian and Swiss laborers of poor standing on an over 1500 acre cooperative vineyard. Settlers would tend


the vines for wages that could be exchanged for shares in the affiliated Asti Winery. 

Meanwhile, the colony offered workers good pay, room and board, all the wine they could drink and an opportunity for an agrarian existence. ISC’s arrangement bore striking resemblance to the European practice of métayage—a unique form of French peasant grower-landholder partnership similar to sharecropping—but with stock options in lieu of sharecropping. The joint-stock venture attracted many workers, but few willing to exchange wages for shares out of fear of “financial trickery.” That did not prevent Asti from selling its trademark wine, Tipo Chianti, on the colony’s philanthropic reputation—a trademark the company defended legally when necessary. The brand banked on the colony’s quintessential romantic endeavors and broader consumer desires. Tipo simulated Italian table wine and was marketed as an inexpensive, rustic vintage for the masses using warm images of simple peasant families seated around the hearth, enjoying the jus de vin from the ISC’s distinctive bulbous bottle, nestled in a basket much like the straw-covered fiaschi bottles of rural Tuscany. By 1908, with 5,000 acres of vineyards across multiple winegrowing districts, nine wineries, a 500,000 gallon wine cistern, and a distillery that produced a line of fine brandies, ISC was the largest wine producing enterprise in the world.

636 Pinney, A History of Wine, 318. Pinney does not discuss Ruskin’s romanticism, though he does mention Ruskin’s influence on Sbarboro.


Farmers not directly engaged in the production of spirits contributed much to these efforts due, once again, to demands of commercialization. Upon entry, many would-be immigrant petty commodity farmers like their Yankee counterparts sowed wheat as recommended by immigrant guides and literature provided by the railroads. But after the 1850s as new lands opened with the expansion of the railroads, increased commodification of wheat, and the development of enormous wheat plantations, small immigrant farmers were rapidly out-classed. In response, many farmers transitioned to dairying or valuable specialty crops including barley, grapes, and hops.

Barley was a cash crop of significant promise because of its use in malt liquors and the astonishing demand for and increased consumption of lager beer. Up to this date, barley had been grown in Utah, California, and northern states, but much was imported from the British provinces and continental Europe. This made barley a tempting alternative for smallholders, especially when the western press coupled barley with images of success and stability. According to the *Prairie Farmer*, barley maintained its price better than wheat and good malting barley was particularly valued because it was hard-sought by brewers, who, due to scarcity, had been forced to use raw sugar as a substitute for the more flavorful starch of “Sir John Barleycorn.”

“By increasing the cultivation of barley, substituting it for that of wheat, in convenient methods, and on soils the best adapted to its nature,” the publication asserted, “growers would produce a crop at a much smaller expense than that of wheat, and of a quality that cannot now, by any or all
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means, be procured.” And if not sowed as a substitute, the same article surmised that, as a
cover or supplemental crop, barley had no equal for increasing one’s income. Indeed, the
prospects seemed so promising for small farms that *Western Rural* celebrated the grain in
verse:

You smile, fair friend of the upper ten,
You think I’m enthusiastic,
You wonder whether these raptures now
Are as genuine as fantastic?
No, you might not think they were made for show,
Not the shade for jewels, hardly,--
Yet a blessing will follow their ways I know,
Those hands that bound the barley!\(^{640}\)

Barley, suggested the paper, was the humble but sustaining grain of the small farmer who
could not compete with the “upper ten,” i.e. the big wheat producers. Barleycorn was not
showy, but it could be gainful and honorable.

Alongside barley, western farmers seized upon hop cultivation with great
enthusiasm. A small crop that required incessant care that large industrial farmers found
tedious, hops offered farmers of small lots a way to grow a highly valued crop vertically
on towering poles, thus extending a farm’s productive space. An avid climber, these
annual vines could grow eighteen to twenty-five feet in length with sufficient light and
care. Hops were previously confined to New Hampshire, Vermont, New York,
Massachusetts, but production largely shifted in the 1860s to the western states,
Wisconsin and Michigan most notably, where production rapidly expanded. High
sustained prices and less frequent crop failures in comparison to potatoes and wheat in

\(^{640}\) N.S.G. “Brown Hands that Bound the Barley,” *Western Rural*, Sept. 1, 1877, 8. Illinois Digital
Newspaper Collections (IDNC). University of Illinois.
the mid-1860s inspired a rapid increase in cultivation.\footnote{W.M. Blanchard, “Hop Culture,” \textit{Prairie Farmer}, May 11, 1867, 7. Illinois Digital Newspaper Collections (IDNC). University of Illinois.} Almost daily correspondences regarding hop culture poured to the editors of the \textit{Prairie Farmer}, who, upon inquiry from hop importers, reported short supplies that spelled a “good margin for profit” though growers needed to watch imports closely since “heavy arrivals” from England and Germany could potentially upset these trends.\footnote{Dell Pilot, “Hops in the West,” \textit{Prairie Farmer}, Feb. 29, 1868, 1. Illinois Digital Newspaper Collections (IDNC). University of Illinois; “Agricultural Items,” \textit{Prairie Farmer}, Nov. 11, 1871, 2. Illinois Digital Newspaper Collections (IDNC). University of Illinois.} These reports were sufficient to spark a hop craze with papers waxing eloquent over the sight of thriving and orderly hop yards, as seen in this description by \textit{Western Rural}: “The thrifty, healthy, and bright appearance of the vines, the scrupulous care observed in their cultivation, the uniform size and length of the poles, general evenness and beautiful appearance of yard, had only to be seen to be admired.”\footnote{“Agricultural Selections and Condensations,” \textit{Western Rural}, Apr. 11, 1868, 2. Illinois Digital Newspaper Collections (IDNC). University of Illinois.}

Likewise an appealing sense of order could be found in the care and cultivation of grapes. In establishing a western landscape of vineyards, grape enthusiasts tried to place their work into the continuity of history through land and plants. Agricultural treatises on the grape seemed particularly inclined to root the endeavors of American farmers in the image of the undying vines dating to antiquity. For instance, \textit{Western Rural} in 1868 expounded the properties of \textit{Vitis vinifera} which had “been cultivated from time
Grapes linked to the Holy Land and Judeo-Christian heritage and to European associations and identities, alluded to the merit of all things grounded in earth and time. According to *Western Rural*, the grape thrived in Palestine fostered by the Hebrews who grew grapes of “extraordinary size,” uniformity of growth, and production. The venerable vine fared equally well in Italy and the English Royal Garden at Hampton Court where a single vine was known to bear “annually more than a ton of grapes.”

The paper then suggested that America might also boast of its own native vines. There were five main varieties native to the lands east of the Mississippi: the Northern Fox grape, the Frost grape, the Winter grape, Bull grape, and DeCandolle, each an elder established in its own range. European grape vine thrived in Southern California near Santa Barbara and in the Sonoma and Napa Valleys, grafted to native rootstock as immigrants were to the land. This process birthed hardy louse-resistant plants, presumably with the best qualities of the old and new world necessary to secure an edge in the grape market. With a bit of luck, the shrewd farmer could buy into past and future, and achieve security, if not wealth.

The very name “Vitis” suggested the vitality of an undying world. Indeed, *Western Rural* found in grapes longevity, ripening into the high imaginings of mature and noble things. Vines could live hundreds of years and retain the latent power of the prolific. What’s more, the process of mixing and matching vines through hybridization and grafting, produced what seemed like an endless supply of new promising cultivars.
that horticulturalists eagerly marketed as the latest in the line of best paying grapes. “GRAPE VINES! GRAPE VINES!” shouted the advertisements. Catawba, Concord, Hartford, Delaware, Diana and others, sold singular, by the dozen or by the thousand under the claims of farmers attesting to their qualities.646 “Good grapes are like gold,” concluded the Western Rural in 1870, “no one has enough.”647

A survey of the major agricultural newspapers west of Appalachia, reveal that temperance, as in teetotalism, was not an issue of import for many farmers in the American West until the late 1870s when articles on the topic became increasingly common. Until that time, a reader would more likely find advertisements for barley seed, hop roots, or grape vines, or associated equipment for their cultivation as well as discussions on market developments and strategies for successful cultivation. Prior to 1870s, and even thereafter, papers often road the fence on the issue of temperance, most likely out of recognition that their constituency—advertisers and subscribers, who were economically linked to the alcohol industry, and hailing from various cultural backgrounds. For instance, in 1868 the editor of Western Rural responded to the question of the morality of hop raising with an overview of farmer perspectives on the topic, stating:

There are many good men who sincerely desire to promote the cause of temperance who claim that the evils of intemperance can best be counteracted by encouraging the use of wines, ale, beer, etc., in the place of stronger liquors. Many eminent physicians recommend the use of ale or beer, and these liquors are


used largely in private families of all grades. There are other men who claim that they have nothing whatever to do with the use made by others of the product of their farms—that they are entirely justified in raising and selling corn, or barley, or hops, knowing that it will be used in making liquor. Others claim that no one who is a temperance man has any right to encourage, in any way, the making of intoxicating liquors, and that all use of such beverages is injurious. It is not our province to decide for others as to which of these positions is correct.\textsuperscript{648}

The definition of intemperance was clearly debatable. The West, with its mix of peoples, communal social experiments, and prominent German influence, developed as a world apart from the New England teetotalism. The consumption of certain forms alcohol, for many westerners constituted temperance and even carried the symbolic import of balance between collective aspirations and the profit imperative. Thus drink maintained its association with social and personal health. As such, spirits remained something worth defending.

Chapter 5:
Interrogating the Peasantry

Cider, strong beer, and wine are at the bottom, they are at the foundation of intemperate drinking.
-- “Cider in the Pledge” (1881)\(^{649}\)

The strangest thing about this country is that the smaller towns are usually worse than the cities. In talking of countries we often hear it said—'The towns and rural places are comparatively exempt from drink and sin. If you want to see vice rampant you must go to the large cities,' but this cannot be said of the Emerald Isle, it is perhaps more of the country places that you feel like saying: ‘God! What base ignorable faces; God! What bodies wanting souls.'
-- Matthew Woods, *Rambles of a Physician* (1889)\(^{650}\)

Enclosure, which began in England in the fourteenth century and proceeded over the course of several centuries, occurred in full force on the European continent only after the French Revolution. For American temperance advocates, Europe’s enduring commons, its enthusiasm for carnival week preceding Lent, and its Romantic turn with enclosure, indicated a truly persistent devotion to the social and religious “evils” of old and undying customs of the land. Notes Massachusetts temperance reformer Rev. William M. Thayer, wine-making animated in the most ignoble ways, countries such as Italy, France and Switzerland. In field and custom, the inhabitants of “Christian villages” and even large cities, refused to relinquish their love for the “paradise of vineyards.” In relaying the


testimony of a fellow missionary to Paris, Thayer states, “There is scarcely a community to be found where the blighting influence of intemperance are not seen…”

Out of the revulsion of temperance activists for European culture emerged a conspicuous fascination and discourse in teetotaler publications regarding the condition of Europe’s agricultural lands and peasantry. Numerous temperance “excursionists” (a term offered up by Thayer) ventured to Europe with the temperance on their lips and a mind to convert the continent to their brand of gospel. And while these travelers served as couriers of the culture of sober industry, their observations abroad configured for American readers a vision of tumultuous events in Europe as an outgrowth of that old specter, the so-called economy of alcohol. These, of course, were packaged with many implications for the future of the US.

Inquiries into European conditions were also, in part, spurred by questions that arose from discrepancies and contradictions in temperance ideology. Skeptics of claims that the western world was disintegrating into a drunken orgy made their thoughts known in correspondences and publications with leaders of the early temperance societies. For instance, New York representative Samuel M. Hopkins engaged in correspondence with Dr. Rev. Justin Edwards of the ATS, among others. His letters voiced disbelief that the US, prior to temperance uplift, was emphatically a nation of drunkards and that continental Europe was as well incurably drunk. Hopkins published these correspondences under the lengthy title *Correspondence on the Principles of Right*
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Reasoning applicable to Temperance, and to the Effects of fermented and distilled Liquors, between Samuel M. Hopkins and Gerrit Smith, Rev. Dr. Justin Edwards, and Rev. Dr. Samuel H. Cox; with Other Papers and Notes by the Editor, Part. I (1838).  

The question at hand was whether a populace accustomed to drinking as part of public assemblies and during festivities, should be categorized as physically and habitually intoxicated. For Hopkins, the answer was definitively “no.” To drive home his point, Hopkins referenced the travel accounts of New York author and Pastor Orville Dewey, who asserted,

In seven months upon the continent of Europe, though living amidst crowds—though living in taverns, in hotels, in public houses, I have not seen four intoxicated persons! But, I have seen parks, and gardens and places of public assembly, millions of persons, exhilarated by music, by spectacles, by scenery, flowers, and fragrance, cheerful without rudeness, and gay without excess. There are moralists and preachers among us, who tell us that we enjoy great advantages in our freedom from European amusements; but I very much doubt it.

The movement’s response was perhaps best expressed by the editors of the *Christian Examiner and Review* who claimed that habitual intemperance surfaced not strictly as physical intoxication. Rather, the “proof” lay in the “evil done”—the endurance of the belief that drink was beneficial to personal and social health, the survival of drinking customs, the prevalence of illnesses of all kinds some related to drinking, but others not, and social disorder temperance reformers assumed materialized as a consequence of

---


drink. Rising to the challenge, the same editors stood fast behind notions that drink necessarily produced all associated evils of drunkenness exclaimed, "We contend that there are drunkards in wine-drinking countries, where wine is as free as water; and we will prove it before we are done."654 Certainly, people in Europe were occasionally sauced, but that is not the point. What we need to remember is that the movement’s understanding of drunkenness elicited something much bigger than physical insobriety. For crusaders, drunkenness was a cultural state of countries with producing traditions and districts. It also represented a state of insurrection in response to the social and political changes associated with the rise of market society.

The European Wasteland

Looking abroad, American reformers sought to delineate the place of spirituous consumption in the course of national development and troublesome nature of nineteenth-century society. With a few rhetorical contortions, such activists painted a grim picture of widespread upheaval as a direct consequence of alcohol and an enduring commoner mindset. Likewise, these crusaders constructed a picture of Protestantism’s continued struggle against Catholicism’s continental European presence.

From early on, France and its immediate neighbors were foremost on the minds of the champions of development. Anglo economic reformers saw in France the resilience of older agricultural forms. Notes nineteenth-century British economist Henry Higgs,

...even the traveler hurried along by a French express train can, if his eyes are open, see something of economic interest. He cannot fail to notice the variety of culture in different districts, the orchards and the cattle of Normandy with its fine pastures and comfortable farmhouses, the English-looking North with its corn, hops, and sugar-beet and centres of industry, the maize, tobacco, and flax of Burgundy, the woods of Gascony, the olive and the mulberry of the South and South-East, and the ubiquitous monotonous vine everywhere south of Paris. If he comes from England he will probably be struck by the absence of hedges between different crops and by the intermixture of strips, eloquent, to the economic historian, of the open field system of the earliest times. Or the evidences of small farming may remind him of the charges made against the Code Napoléon of bringing about a pulverization of the soil. 655

The combination of post-revolution reforms and Napoleonic Code (1804) had broken up feudal landholding and church estates, enclosed holdings and enacted rural laws to encourage commercial agricultural development. But, as noted by Higgs, many advocates of “good farming” were especially dismayed by the survival of the métayer—the French peasant vintner, and a great landscape of vineyards “south of Paris,” considered by advocates of the Improvement Movement as “the lowest depths of bad farming” that lingered “to the detriment of morality and the public welfare.”656

Temperance reformers saw in the fields of Mediterranean Europe the hallmark of feudal tenacity. In 1839, E.C. Delevan—the famed excursionist featured at the beginning of this section-- suggested that a large spance of land in both nations went to waste on the alcohol of the peasantry. He states:

I should judge, from what I see and have learned, that full one-half of the agricultural industry of Italy and one-third of France is worse than wasted in

655 Henry Higgs, “‘Metayage’ in Western France,” The Economic Journal 4, no. 13 (March 1894), 1-2.
656 Higgs, “‘Metayage’ in Western France,” 2. Also see Albert Grey, “Profit Sharing in Agriculture,” Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England (London: John Murray, 1891), 781. See the footnote on the survival of métayage in France despite its disappearance in Italy and Spain.
devotion to the preparation of a drink, which only serves to produce poverty, crime, and disease.  

Italy drank most of what it produced and viewed wine as “an innocent and healthful beverage” –an idea Delevan found completely illogical according to well-established notions of domestic health. As one temperance journal claimed, American reformers of the revolutionary era had traveled Italy and France and established the idea that “peasants who have wine for their ordinary drink… [were] diminutive in size, in comparison to those who use, beer, or even common water.” Beer, of course, quickly fell from the list of acceptable alternatives, but the general concept was clear. Alcohol produced stunted men, if not inflamed bodies with social implications. This understanding was upheld as a morality tale for Americans. Rev. Edwin F. Hatfield, a Presbyterian minister of New York writing for the Journal of the American Temperance Union, compared the course of French history with that of the states as a result of an undisciplined peasantry:

The common people of France…are burnt up with wine, and look exactly like the cider-brandy drinkers of Connecticut, and the N. E. Rum-drinkers of Massachusetts. If they do not drink to absolute stupefaction or intoxication, it is because sensuality with Frenchmen is a science and a system. They drink just to that point, at which their moral sense and judgment are laid asleep; but all their other faculties remain awake. Hence all the horrors of the French Revolution.


658 “Extracts from Mr. Delevan’s,” 172.


Fear of subversive forces from below, equated frontier farmers with French Revolutionaries and their call for liberty, fraternity, and egalitarianism. “Drunkenness” held literal and figurative dimensions. “Spirits” (drink and revolutionary ferment) removed inhibitions, inspired insurrection, and toppled states.

Trade wise, France’s wine exports appeared, according to Delavan, only for the “shortsighted… to be of a national gain.”661 Other temperance writers followed suit right up to the dawn of prohibition. For instance, the Scientific Temperance Journal as late as 1919 asserted that France’s problem in politics (its revolutions and counter-revolutions) was rural. “Every party has its special aims,” states the journal, “‘but the most devoted patriots carefully avoid offending the home distillers of the East and West.’”662 In another article that same year, the same journal predicted the industrial demise of Gaul.

According to its prognostications France’s wine industry had no future and would take the country down with it. Exports were decreasing as vineyards sprung up in colonies--“Tunis, Algeria, Morocco, Chili and the Crimea,” and with sobriety elsewhere. The future of the world was industry and any country that continued to produce wine for export would ultimately be force to consume it domestically as exports fell away. Imperially, colonies had to be kept in order as well; otherwise these too may be “lost” to drunken and seditious revels. The results could only be imagined: widespread alcoholism and socio-economic decline on the world stage. Thus the maintenance of wine districts,

661 “Extracts from Mr. Delevan’s,” 172.
the journal holds, “would be a distinct disadvantage in commercial and industrial competition with other countries.”

German commoners offered another allegorical example for alcoholic demise. In this case, temperance theorists claimed that beer drinking was to blame for high infant mortality rates and “inherited tendency to disease” in Austrian villages. In the German provinces, alcohol also threatened global trade but in a slightly different manner. The *Journal of the American Temperance Union* surmised that drink put at risk trade through Hamburg, “the gate by which the commerce of the world sets into the entire northern portion of the extensive country.” This entrepôt of commerce was threatened by “so much drunkenness, and wickedness of all kinds” that the paper called for missionary workers, temperance tracts translated into German, and funding for their publication. Indeed, Hamburg was in a state of tumult. Since French occupation, the populace rose up in revolt against French posts and fiscal agents. In 1819, the same year as the Peterloo Massacre of impoverished textile worker demonstrating in Manchester, England, protests rumbled through Hamburg and other German cities followed by workers riots, and revolutionary uprisings from the 1820s to the rebellions of 1848. The temperance goal was to offset the “drunkenness” (i.e. subversiveness) of the lower orders of society set in
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motion by the dispossession, potato blight, a swelling-labor market, intolerable working conditions, unemployment, depression, and famine. Notes the Bristol Temperance Herald:

This account of drunkenness in Germany among the poorest classes is frightful. The destruction of such an immense quantity of grain at a time when owing to the potato blight, thousands have died of famine, and tens of thousands have left their country for foreign lands, is an evil which, but for the infatuation of the drinking system, would in no wise be tolerated.667

In other words, if not for their intemperance, German commoners would not be poor, diseased, hungry, or worse still, agitating and migrating to the Americas.

In looking to England, reformers noted that despite centuries of enclosure and industry the island nation experienced a marked increase in social disturbances and insurrections since the late eighteenth century. Indeed, the rapid increase in productivity in industry and agriculture in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was matched by the spread of covert actions, rural protests (often in the form of arson), demonstrations, strikes, guerrilla campaigns, and wage and food riots. In England alone, between 1793 and 1820, Parliament vigorously suppressed over sixty protests of various forms.668 The number and frequency of disturbances increased through to the early twentieth century. Major agrarian protests in British Isles included the Irish Tithe War (1830s) in protest of tithes placed on subsistence farmers; the “Swing” Riots in South England (1830s) in which hungry rural workers set ablaze landowner property and destroyed threshing


machines that had deprived them of employment; and the Rebecca Riots (1838, 1842-3), a series of uprisings in Wales by male tenant farmers dressed as women, who attacked toll gates that gouged small farmers as they transported goods to market. For every major action, villages became the site of constant opposition to enclosure and “development” expressed, as noted by historian J.M. Neeson, through “[s]tubborn non-compliance, foot-dragging and mischief.” Neeson, Commoners: Common Right, 263. This included letters of opposition, petitioning, the armed defense of common boundaries, newspaper adverts for rallying opposition, and more covert actions including fence and hedge breaking, wood theft, tree-barking, the stealing and killing of livestock, and other forms of property destruction and theft that went on for years. In the words of Halperin, through the nineteenth century European states, England included, were “continually engaged in conflict with their own populations…” as well as with other states and populations in the process of claiming and transforming areas for national markets.

As elsewhere, temperance reformers found fault in land use and the trade in spirits embodied in the survival of beer and cider districts. For instance, one speaker at the International Temperance Conference (1880) suggested that the dedication of acreage to barley combined with bad harvests and “the action of brewers and distillers” … “rendered [grain] unfit for consumption,” thus provoking the 1855 and subsequent
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English bread riots. By this point, the Corn Laws could no longer be blamed for widespread hunger, but intemperance remained as a favored scapegoat. Notably, temperance papers opposed government intervention or taxation to address the problem of poverty and inadequate food. Taxes had increased as did the confiscation of property, largely to fund imperial wars, and temperance writers chaffed at further increases that might serve local social needs. The later, they couched as worse than hunger or the occasional death by starvation. States the English Western Temperance Herald,

> What is around us? Scarcity of employment, and dearness of food. Already we have news of bread riots, and these are not the most threatening aspects of the times. The keenest suffering is not the most demonstrative, and deaths by starvation will occasionally alarm us, and force the question upon the minds of the well-to-do classes—What are you doing with the means that have been placed at your disposal?

*The Herald’s* answer followed: “stop the flood-gates of intemperance.” In other words, temper the “power of appetite” as the alternative to that which “doubles my taxes.” Thus a shift in economic and governing priorities that linked politics and finance in the quest for resources and markets as well as funding necessary to maintain a modern army, animated temperance as an alternative to funding social need viewed, still, as an imposition that ran counter to the ethic of capital accumulation.

---


Temperance publication agreed that Sweden and Russia, respectively, housed the best and worst scenarios of attempts at peasant uplift—impressions generated from the missionary work of Rev. Robert Baird, Pennsylvania-born Congregational minister and a “foreign intelligence” agent of the American Temperance Society. In the 1830 and 1840s, Baird toured the North of Europe and Scandinavia where he supposed converted many peasants to Protestantism and the temperance cause. According to one temperance history, Baird’s *History of Temperance Societies* altered perceptions of drink in Europe, going through several German editions, followed by editions in Danish, Polish and Dutch. Baird went to Prussia after King Frederick William III requested, via his Washington ambassador, information on American temperance societies. In his enthusiasm, the king distributed 6,000 copies of Baird’s *History*. Throughout the provinces the king called on the governors to form temperance societies and “to direct pastors, under their supervision, to preach on the subject to their flocks.” This was temperance from the top down put into action by a ruler who was Protestant and celebrated for “cultivat[ing] initiative in the peasants” so government might “rid itself of the costly obligation to support them by subventions and privileges in the woodlands and

---


pasturage.” Peasants received proprietary right over their holdings, but lost access to the commons on crownlands. Thus “liberated” they flocked to Berlin seeking work, “laboring in factories under brutal conditions and low pay.”

Baird set up residency in Paris and toured the continent handing out printed circulars in many languages, founded societies, and met with heads of state. In Sweden, Baird met with Crown Prince Oscar who sent out his own missionaries and once, passed laws against intoxication that were strictly enforced with hard labor sentences. While there Baird as a “son of a peasant or farmer” and representative of the progress of temperance in America addressed the house of peasants or yeoman, a branch of the Swedish diet. His audience, according to the missionary, listened “with deep attention,” before several men agreed to sign the pledge. Temperance reformers in US viewed this as a “victory in the cause of the Protestant religion” in contrast to the continental power of Catholicism and attributed to temperance the amazing transformation of the country which had gone from a place of brandy, fairs and a peasantry, little versed in modern militaries or manufactures to “a temperate country” where the “peasantry was consider the most virtuous in all Europe.”

Russia too, was on Baird’s itinerary. Upon visiting Moscow, Baird met with the
Minister of the Domains of the Crown who wished to arrest the drinking habits of the
peasantry, 21 million of Russia’s small farmers. He met as well with an enthusiastic
Emperor Nicholas I to discuss the history of temperance in the US. Baird promised to
send translated tracts in Russian and Finnish and in his letters home before parting with
the tsar, “delighted” with having met such an “enlightened monarch.”683

Like many temperance reformers, Baird was not troubled by aristocracy or
oppressive tactics when these served temperance and industry. The Journal of the
American Temperance Union which featured the correspondences of both Delevan and
Baird, likewise referred to Louis Philippe of France as a “distinguished monarch” for his
interest in temperance.684 Other authors displayed striking admiration for the harsh
measures of Alexander II, under which pubs and dram shops were cleared from “the best
positions” in St. Petersburg’s geography, and of Count Kuscheleff Bessborodko who
encouraged the peasants on his estates to take an abstinence pledge, then instituted fines
and corporal punishment for any backsliding.685 Thus temperance ideology continued to
expand geographical beyond the borders of the US as a form of social power in the
imposition of the new commercial order that enabled the elite of the old feudal order to
claim their place among the elites of the new commercial order.

https://books.google.com/books?id=Xc9OAAAAYAAJ
Early American dry reform enthusiasm for developments in Russia was replaced by dismay as tsarist Russia slowly degraded into a failed state, a process spun by American publications as a tutorial for what occurred when rulers failed to uphold sustained pressure in enforcing temperance. By the early twentieth century, the narrative of the Russian experiment claimed that the tsars recognized the liquor threat but as a group, handled it poorly. Each statist attempts at regulation, from taxation to state monopoly became fodder for temperance writers of the conviction that anything less than prohibition would ultimately bring society to ruin. A temperance “history” of Russia printed by *Temperance: A Monthly Journal of the Church Temperance Society*, several decades of discourse nicely. According to the author, Catherine II was accused of “farming out” the traffic to the highest bidder in the name of raising revenue for the treasury. Thus, concluded the author, the Russian population was debauched for taxes as “liquor farmers were free to do as they please[d].”

Religious tension and race was evoked in claims that in the hands of the Jews, the traffic flourished. Alexander I tried to end the system by creating a government monopoly that fared poorly. Nicholas I followed, but his absolutist policies met opposition from farmers. Thus, the old system was reinstated to the joy of a backward-looking rural element. This pattern replayed until finally, after a lengthy contest came the fall of the Romanovs and rise of Bolshevik power which unleashed vodka “and all the lower instincts of the people.”

---


687 Shannon, “Prohibition in Russia,” 10.
all of this was presented as a grave lesson for America, another largely rural nation, where taxes from spirits provided an important source of government revenue and politicians, influenced by foreign elements, bulked at reformer demands for prohibition.

Gripping themes of the Russian temperance narrative took fictional form in Ernest Poole’s *The Village: Russian Impressions* (1918), a portrayal of a drunken rural Russian village where vodka served as the currency of a backward peasant class.⁶⁸⁸ Mired in the economy of drink, sexual promiscuity, idiocy, and violence reigned supreme. Fights along the village riverfront terminated in murder—brutal clubbings by country oafs who went home to blacken the eyes of their half-naked wives. It was an image that served a political end. *The Village* was really Russia in microcosm trapped in the disarray of what Poole viewed as a directionless revolution. A review of the work by the *Scientific Temperance Journal* connected revolutionary chaos with drink and agricultural backwardness, asserting that, “Again and again recurs expression of the necessity for help along agricultural lines to give the peasant the economic stability and opportunity for progress and reconstruction of life that will be essential to the New Russia if it is to emerge from present chaos.”⁶⁸⁹ The story closes with redemption at the hand of a telling cast of reformers: the priest, the store keeper, the progressive landowner, physician and teacher who, with great vigor, put into action economic improvements, saving the village from the terror of black bread and alcohol.

---
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Readings of the landscape could go in a different direction, but these were few and far between. Rev. Daniel Merriman from Worcester, Massachusetts tried to outline a “practical abstinence” with *A Sober View of Abstinence* (1881). Merriam’s stated goal was to get away from temperance dogmatism; in doing so, the reverend’s criticism turned on industrial civilization. Merriman viewed temperance as a slow and deliberate lifestyle in contrast to the increasingly mechanized one. “Consider the occupations of the people of Judea,” proposes Merriman, “where agriculture, slow moving, with the most primitive appliances, was the chief thing, and commerce and manufactures were comparatively unknown.” Urbanization and factory work were an “abnormal conditions,” the aggregative intensity of which was increased by “steam and electricity.” Beverages exhibited the same contrast. Commerce had produced “distilled and doubly distilled liquors” and “reinforced wines” as intoxicating as modern society itself. Better the “simple red wine manufactured by the crude art of peasants.” Excess, Merriman implied, was, in fact, an effect of modernity itself. Nonetheless, Merriman sided with his fellow crusaders by calling for abstinence. Modernity could not be undone; therefore self-control was necessary to counter temptation and socially degrading effects of indulgence. In this world of self-sacrifice, there was no place for alcohol or subsistence.

The problem of farmers and workers in these various settings reflected the course of enclosure and commercial development, a fact not recognized by missionaries. In the

---


temperance mind, radicalism was associated with French origins, and by proxy, with agrarian society. The spirit of agrarianism, wherever it was found, was also equated with socialism because of its hostility to “Junkerdom” (the tyranny of the capitalist class of aristocrats) and its demands for land redistribution. This mentality falls in line with the established rural foil, quite literally, the “villain” from the Latin villanus (farmhand) and English villein (feudal tenant), a lowly and uncouth adversary that appears in various forms in temperance literature from the “black murtherin’ thafe” (drunk and thieving negro), to the unreformed cider-drinking farmer as “drunken villain” accused of battery.

The survival of an agrarian regime, often attributed to the stubborn tenacity and communal spirit of the volk, was as much a function of human and physical geography as anything else. In France as elsewhere in Europe, village settlements came to define medieval society. But as England made early moves toward enclosure, France suffered from population decline due to the combination of plague and the Hundred Years War (1337-1453). In England, the countryside was spared the calamities of war, however, old feudal sources of revenue proved inadequate to the needs of extended warfare. Here, new taxes, levies on trade, loans from Italian bankers, and land-grabbing funded the war.

693 For example see Timothy Shay Arthur, “How to Cure a Toper,” in Arthurs’ Illustrated Temperance Tales (Lowell: L.P. Crown, 1850), 238-239. Arthur’s character, Mr. W. is mistaken for a thieving and villainous “nager” and nearly killed after he drinks whiskey at the Black Horse Inn and falls prey to a few mischievous fellows who blacken his face while he slept. An example of cider-drunkard as villain see Lucius Manlius Sargent, “Kitty Grafton,” in Sargents’ Temperance Tales, vol. 1 & 2 (Springfield: W.J. Holland & Co., 1873), 30.
expanded wool production, and precipitated enclosure.\textsuperscript{694} In contrast, the devastated French countryside needed rehabilitation while capitalist incursions into agriculture were limited. Thus as of the sixteenth century notes Bloch, “their problem was not to make new villages and enlarge their fields but to rebuild old ones and free existing fields of encroaching brush.”\textsuperscript{695}

Meanwhile, as early as the fifteenth century, French provincial customs and prohibitions against enclosure were codified. Thus enshrined the existing agricultural regime was upheld by Parlement well into the late 1700s. Embedded in strongly held socio-cultural sensibility and civil law, the open field system endured as a great quasi-impervious bulwark to enclosure. States Bloch, “prohibition of enclosure, communal grazing on the stubble and compulsory crop rotation were all so strongly felt to be ‘laws’… that when the great agricultural transformations of the late eighteenth century made their suppression unavoidable it took an entire new code to replace them.”\textsuperscript{696}

Even when the improvement movement hit France, it wore the garb of old forms. Anglo agronomists were particularly perplexed by the survival of métayage, which, as Higgs notes, was a form of joint enterprise altogether foreign to Englishmen. The system proved remarkably adaptable –more adaptive, Higgs claimed, than strict tenant farming because both losses and profits were shared by the métayer and landowner, a dynamic that buffered small farmers against loss. In reality, the system had dropped off with the
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confiscation of church estates after the French Revolution. More small proprietors briefly emerged at that time, but with a series of nineteenth century agricultural crises, the numbers of métayers increased once more, especially in isolated regions, and continued to fluctuate before being extensively replaced by tenancy.\textsuperscript{697} In the ensuing debate over the merits and flaws of the system, French agricultural societies such as the Société départemental d’agriculture de la Nièvre, established in 1840, which served as vehicles for new forms of commercial husbandry that were most beneficial to large landowners, supported a modernized métayage amélioré. This “improved” métayage granted greater influence to landholders who utilized the system to force improvements and expenditures of labor and money by their métayers.\textsuperscript{698} Hence métayers bore the burden of investments made while their landlords reaped most of the benefits. In this sense, late nineteenth-century métayage amélioré, as a capitalist form of share-cropping gave good returns to proprietors, especially in fertile northwest regions where intensive agriculture was possible. In the south, skilled vigneron retained then, as now, an edge in negotiating favorable contracts that continued to resemble partnerships with landowners.\textsuperscript{699} But for other petty commodity producers, the results were as expected. The costs of commercial
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cultivation caused many a métayer to “succumb under his burdens.” Métayers also proved resistant to the new system which in turn provoked greater demands, stricter discipline, increased surveillance and new attempts by proprietors to push métayers into tenancy. Thus the fixation on the survival of métayage, vineyards, and the French “peasantry” as a barometer for an imagined feudal opposition was in reality, an expression of fear of the dispossessed that justified the violence of on-going process of their expropriation.

In the early nineteenth-century, although feature of a traditional landscape remained, in France and western Germany, political and legal measures gradually abolished commonlands and systems. Notes historian Hugh Clout, “Numerous measures turned customary peasants into tenants or freeholders, with farmers now needing to produce surpluses for sale to pay rents and taxes in cash, rather than in kind or by means of labour services.” This harsh project, states Clout, took hold despite “much rejection by country people, whose minds were only changed by sheer hunger,” producing by the 1830s, a “mosaic …[of] varying degrees of productive intensity and commercial orientation, but also continuity with the past, in terms of both landscape and commercial practice.” The transition occurred most rapidly around major rivers: the Rhône, Rhine, and Moselle, as well as the Atlantic coast. Here viticulture expanded once more, this time
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to meet growing urban consumer demand. Due to the introduction of rail and steam ships, imports of grain and meat, and large grain operations, lowered food prices in Western Europe but depressed agriculture that spurred rural outmigration. Farmers that remained survived through specialization—grapes, dairy, veggies, sugar beets, etc.-- or use of credit for purchase of machinery and artificial fertilizers, a side-product of industry. Likewise, commercial beer production tripled in both Europe and Russia thanks to consumer demand and an abundance of cheap grain. Overall, large landholders were the primary beneficiaries, though small landholders and tenants remained despite their loss of the commons, and the latter were most likely to turn toward specialization that linked their economic well-being to commercial spirits.

In England, upheaval resulted from several converging factors. One was enclosure which continued into the nineteenth century. Even after land was enclosed, the ramifications included an enduring sentiment of social antagonism. In the past, divisions between farmers, artisans and laborers were blurred. Peasants often performed artisanal work, labors and artisans often held small plots of land, and even landless laborers had a right to the commons. In the shared space and cooperative labor of the village, common interests in maintaining common rights masked social distinctions. Everyone—peasants, artisans, and landless laborers suffered with enclosure. They lost their communities, means of subsistence, source of employment (enclosed pasture required few workers), and other aspects of the village economy. Enclosure drew sharp lines
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between classes. As noted by Neeson, “Enclosure had a terrible instructive visibility. It was seen in the societies and economies as well as in the landscapes of … Midland villages.” Farmers and agricultural labor became socially and otherwise separated. The power of commercial farmers was enhanced, while laborers were reduced to servitude. Furthermore, the end of the commons and loss of land undermined the “economy of multiple occupations.” All of this altered social relations with the new economy of conflicting interests. Bitterness lingered toward the beneficiaries of enclosure. Indeed, “the sense of loss, the sense of robbery could last forever as the bitter inheritance of the rural poor.”

This deep hostility blended with resentment among the proletarianized. Following the War of 1812 the British forces returned home to unemployment and low wages. Simultaneously, prices on agricultural goods fell and poor harvest in 1816 and 1817 fostered rural agitation. Laborer and agricultural riots followed. Luddites destroyed factory machinery. As of 1830, fearing revolution, the British authorities sent rioters of south England either to death or Australian penal colonies. Similarly, the amended Poor Laws of 1834 limited one’s options to either workhouse or emigration.

The Swedish peasantry the temperance movement found so amenable, were the product of unique circumstances. As of the early 1800s, drink held and “almost sacred
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place,” in Swedish culture: every farmer had his still and brannvin (brandy) was part of Swedish foodways.\textsuperscript{710} But, as prohibition historian Roy Rosenzweig points out, a combination of temperance and evangelical Christianity swept Sweden at approximately the same time as the Second Great Awakening, giving rise to temperance pietist splinter sects that contrasted with the brandy drinking Swedish Lutherans.\textsuperscript{711} This religious transition went hand-in-glove with enclosure. Peasant unrest prior to the seventeenth century led to greater representation in the Swedish Diet where they advanced their interests. By the 1850s, most of the land held by the crown was sold to freeholders—three-forth of who were prior tenants. In other words, land was enclosed in the hands of the peasantry. But over the nineteenth century, with rising population, land holdings increased among people of rank, especially around Stockholm, and landless classes emerged. The unlanded classes (crofters, cottagers, lodgers, and statare) numbered among the increasingly proletarianized agrarian workers whose numbers between 1750 and 1870 raised fivefold. Population growth and commerce entailed greater emphasis on property rights and privatization of lands previously held in common. Those that were not dependent on the village became less willing to assist others.\textsuperscript{712} With enclosure came a turn towards strains of Protestantism that emphasized thrift and hard work.\textsuperscript{713} In sum,
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when Baird addressed the Swedish peasants, he wasn’t speaking to commoners in the medieval sense. The landed peasantry was already becoming a middle class of sorts with the very bourgeois sensibility that temperance benefited laborers and vice explained class hierarchy.

Meanwhile, temperance missionaries played into the untenable situation that had emerged in Russia by the nineteenth century. Nicholas I, who became tsar in the wake of the failed peasant Decembrist Revolt (1825) against his reign, maintained serfdom out of fear of unleashing one to two potentially disastrous scenarios for the crown: First, popular uprising in which disaffected peasants rose up with demands of freedom and land, and second, “a bid by the gentry … to obtain a constitution once they had been deprived of their serfs.”

By this point, Russian serfs suffered heavy exploitation by the lords, including heavy taxes, and lack of redress, and none of the benefits of their position; namely, they were no longer tied to the land, only to their aristocratic owner. In this instance, Baird offered discipline and uplift for the lowest rungs of Russian society—the conservative alternative to more meaningful reform. American attitudes toward Russia’s peasantry echoed the movement’s longstanding disgust with slavery, but fear and discomfort with the liberated slave. The Decembrist Revolt that Nicholas suppressed was an attempt at a revolutionary peasant movement and incarnation of early Russian socialism that diverged from the industrial socialism of Western Europe. “With real roots in the agricultural economy and folkways” of Russia, the concept of a revolutionary
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peasantry made agrarian socialism in this part of the world where industry was practically non-existent an appealing alternative to urban socialism as an alternative to capitalist development. But on the opposite end of the globe, temperance narratives served to construct stereotypical connotations for the Russian peasant that looked suspiciously like the derogatory image of the American “hill people.”

Millennial Dreams and Nightmares

American missionaries to the old world validated the ideological roots of temperance and confirmed that the turmoil of modernity across the Atlantic drew life from the unwavering spirit of John Barleycorn. All of this bore import for the US where temperance concerns paralleled that of nativists and free-soilers regarding who, exactly, would lay claim to the continent as the colonial cycle of expansion continued. Reform elements were equally concerned with what agricultural forms would inhabit the American frontier. Some looked west and spied a region in an unsettled fluid state of “racial” mixing, where enterprising Yankee farmers were forced to share ground with numerous others, including Germans prone to “fiddling, and huckstering, and gardening, [and] drinking.” Such perspectives were matched by derisive comments that identified the manufacture of alcohol and associated customs of immigrants as a throw-back to the European “village inn” as the “most repulsive of any feature of peasant life.”
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The *Christian Advocate* (1869), for instance, decried the increase in vineyards and arrival of German beer gardens, saloons, and fairs on American soil as threatening impositions with claims that America’s German population sought to “engraft” old world customs upon America’s “higher… Puritan civilization.” American exceptionalism and presumed enduring national qualities depended on maintaining a line of difference with Europe that the proponents of abstinence drew at the manufacture and sale of alcohol. The import of European practices threatened to undermine that foundation as the *Advocate* states:

The reason why this land is the coveted refuge of pilgrims from every portion of Europe, and hundreds of thousands are crowding into it through all its ports, is the strong argument against the introduction of the social and moral habits which this new population is now persistently seeking to force upon us. The Anglo-Saxon instinct of law and order, the sacred reverence for the Bible, for the Sabbath, and for religion, have made our land what it is. If any prefer a looser morality, a more liberal faith, a holiday rather than a Sabbath, and an unlimited license for wine and beer, there stand the ancient homes of the father-land…**719**

That the land was “coveted” due to its Puritanical refashioning speaks to an enduring myth that this religious group stood apart in its ability to create a world free of anarchy or paganism. But what followed was equally intriguing, for this periodical argued that cultivation for the production of spirits in the US was untenable due to soil quality, which, we are told produced stronger more “intoxicating” spirits than elsewhere on the globe. As stated, “law and order” made the land. In following this logic we might assume that a breakdown of the stabilizing function of centralized control would unmake it, allowing the subjugated wilderness (or old world ways) to regain an upper hand. In citing

---

the American agricultural past, the author claimed that “the universal use of cider
defended by our agricultural population” had been a slippery slope to “brandy stills.”
Equally so, “the fruitful vineyards would soon be found the inviting highways to the
drunkard’s wretched road to destruction.” Moreover, the article expressed with all
certitude, that the “excitable constitutions” of Americans “render them particularly
susceptible to the appetite for stimulants,” suggesting that bacchanal release was, by far
too great a risk at this time of pronounced social instability. The unsettling nature of
territorial expansion, urbanization, industrialization, immigration, and specter of class
warfare were all threatening to the middle class, who responded by supporting
bureaucratic regimes of social discipline as a replacement for older, but rapidly
disintegrating, forms of social cohesion.\footnote{Clark, \textit{Deliver Us from Evil}, 68.}

In truth, the media debate over the inherent drunkenness or sobriety of places and
races and their cultivating regions centered on attempts to determine which western
power was most modern, industrious and in control of its faculties (land, labor, and
resources) and whether that control could be maintained in the face of established
farming and drinking cultures. Zealous American reformers felt inclined to rank
American Protestant civilization at the pinnacle of progress, followed by England.
Habitually drunk France, Germany and Italy were sites of industrial promise but social
disarray. Trailing in last, the “barbarous” hard-drinking colonized peoples such as the
Scots and Irish figure in as a stereotypical foil for everyone else.
Naturally, the representatives of growers’ associations and brewers testified to the general health, sobriety and lack of crime of these districts. For instance, Prof. J. H. Rhodes, on behalf of the Lake Shore Grape Growers Association of Ohio, having toured Europe, claimed to see no drunkenness in wine growing regions and throughout German where beer and wine drinking were the norm in contrast to the northern most and truly drunken population of the UK. Rhodes suggested that American drunkenness could be best addressed by the commercial production of “pure beer and wine.” In contrast, H.T. Sells, pastor of a Congregational Church of Cortland, New York, in a six month sojourn through Europe, bore witness to the inebriated side of these countries—towns and cities awash in alcohol, the consequence of an inundation of light beer and wine from the countryside. Via late night excursions to beer gardens, Sells acquired what he considered to be the most damning evidence of national drunkenness: tallies of nodding heads and men of unsteady gate.

Their homeland maligned, German-American reformers contributed their perspective to the fray. Taking offense at the “bacchanalian adventures” of an American traveler published in the Rochester Democrat, the Pennsylvania-based German Reformed Messenger countered claims that European Germans were little more than “impious” and “untutored barbarians,” that habitually drank in excess. The non-denominational Protestants the Messenger served were notably inclined towards temperance, as in
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moderation in drink, but disinclined towards the militancy of cold-water armies and the movement’s tendency towards nativism. Accordingly the paper decried the *Democrat* and all American travelers that ventured abroad “with a keen scent for heresy” seeking scandalous tidbits to feed their “spicy hap-hazard opinions.” In defense the German religious landscape, the paper fomented, “If they [Americans] are pious, they get out of humor with German piety because it cannot be confined to the narrow channels and be buckled into the strait-jacket uniform of the piety to which they have been accustomed at home.” As for land, the *Messenger* upheld Germany as “the fertile Egypt of Modern Science, by whose granaries the nations of the world are fed.”

This line of debate was lively enough to span several decades and, true to form, the *Messenger* published a more favorable traveler account several years later. The unnamed author, having passed through the celebrated beer and wine-growing country of Continental Europe, relayed his or her opinion regarding the difference between Europe and the Americans in the temperance matter. From personal experience and statistics offered freely by the vineyards, this traveler came to the conclusion that European cultivators of the vine were quite temperate and the consumers of their products neither more nor less temperate than any other country, though they were quite temperate in contrast to the Americans ostentatiously compared to the Irish as “great consumers of intoxicating liquors.” Moreover, the paper asserts that the men and women who engaged in the light and pleasant work of vineyards, were, in fact, performing the beneficial act of
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cultivating national health and “social joy.” In this case, older rural traditions acted as counterweight to harsh industrial landscapes and avaricious of commerce. Assemble for fete, all drank, sang, laughed, and embraced, but remained unintoxicated. In sum, the author concludes that cultivating regions were “more sober, peaceful, and cheerful” and that cultivation of this kind would be a blessing in America. But, notes the author, there was no accounting for the blessings of soil, or culture, for that matter. Fine wine would not spring from barren soil, nor could land be modified to produce its charm. Thus impoverished, America was at a loss. With a subtle snub, the traveler states: “Success depends much on climate, but more on peculiarities of soil... The secret is in the soil of that particular spot” for which we are to assume there was no equal in the states.724

More metaphor than reality, each contention made in this war of words played on language of land and tillage as a rich field of battle with lines of logic trailing into deeper and muddier meanings of soil and cultivation for the apologists or detractors of ferments. Some endowed soil with life, treating its spirituous product as a springboard of culture and modern prosperity. Others implied the necessary dissociation between the American venture and European traditions, and from the land as wild and foreboding, a reflection of social chaos, to be apprehended and controlled, if not put to work for some higher productive good.

Contributing to this discourse was the National Temperance Society and Publishing House, founded in Saratoga Springs, New York, 1865 by none other than Neal

Dow, the father of the Maine Law. The society brought together a coalition of religious
denominations to coordinate temperance forces and in the process created a publication
committee whose task was nation-wide dissemination of temperance literature geared
toward total abstinence and national prohibition. Over the course of the next sixty years
the society published a combined total of approximately 600,000 circulars in addition to
numerous tracts, books, essays, pamphlets, sermons, and histories.725

The publications of the National Temperance Society amplified arguments
regarding drink, space, and race, and the idea that temperance or intemperance somehow
explained the rise and fall of nations, colonial conquests, or superiority of Christians over
non-Christians, and Protestants over Catholics. To combat alcohol’s traditional, historical
and religious associations, the NTS republished en masse a series of works and associated
commentary that framed temperance as ancient and Christian in its origins, thus
contributing to a temperance epistemology and pseudo-history that was strangely microbe
and ferment-free. Among these was English author Rev. B. Parsons’ Bacchus and Anti-
Bacchus (1840), which argued that there were two types of wine: heathen and Christian.
The first was fermented, the latter not. Parsons came to this conclusion through a close
reading of the Bible and the latest “science” on fermentation. The exceptionally sweet
crops and high heat of Palestine, Egypt and Asia Minor, argued Parsons, made
fermentation impossible in this regional womb of Christianity since concentrated sugar
and heat presumably killed the fermentation germ. This was, by far, untrue. But it

725 See Introduction to National Temperance Society and Publishing House, ed. Jacob Aristotle (Secut
sounded erudite and contributed much to the temperance narrative. From this argument, Parsons contends that the savage nature of northern heathen nations, their poverty and inclination towards madness emerged from their habitual consumption of poisonous alcohol while the progress and refinement of early Christians proved the benefits of consuming nutritive, unfermented wine. Thus while savages destroyed the bounty of Providence by the unfortunate merit of environmental determinism, the original Christians were inclined to use the wealth of the land in the most “profitable” fashion. American author Frederick Powell’s *Bacchus Dethroned* (1871), also published by the NTS, repeated Parson’s analysis in arguing against the production and consumption of alcoholic beverages was a the great curse of distorted tradition, not the “citadel” of healthy Christian living, but the calamitous false temple of inflamed passion. Passover wine, claimed Powell, was in fact, grape juice. Modern readers had merely mistaken it for fermented wine due to a syllogism stemming from a flawed translation of Hebrew. Similarly, Rev. William Patton’s *Bible Wines; or, The Laws of Fermentation and Wines of the Ancients* (1874), using tortured logic and the latest (but limited) science on the laws of fermentation, makes the argument for the existence of unfermented wine produced in Palestine by the Jews and other ancients. Patton argued that this amazing feat was achieved in the mastery of preservative and chemical arts: the straining and burial of grape juice in the earth, or the fumigation of fruit with sulfur so as to kill yeast. Thus the

---

726 B. Parson, *Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus* (London: John Snow, 1840), Introduction and 58-61. Under the NTS this work was repeatedly republished from 1870 onward.

727 Frederick Powell’s *Bacchus Dethroned* (New York: The National Temperance Society and Publishing House, 1873), 217-218. The original publication date appears to be 1871.
Hebrew homeland a “land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, …oil olive, and honey” could thus rise as the producer of the most healthful “sweet” diet and supreme world religion in contrast to the “repugnant” populations and ferments of colder climes.  

In many ways, the workings of the world, according to the temperance conviction, pivoted on microbes. The hidden microbial universe had, in fact, contributed much to the foodways of premodern peoples the world over. Recent discovery of this universe, using the power of the microscope, raised many questions about its influence on human endeavors, and reformers leaped on the idea that microbes were the key to understanding the nature of alcohol and much, much more. Many things could be attributed to the destructive microbe. According to one Chicago physician and temperance writer, all forms of “pathogenesis” including every form of disease, but also foul predispositions and sloth, were traced to the microbes as the “instrumental agent.” Temperance publications even suggested there was a “microbe of old age” that produced aging and death. In time, it was assume that these too would be banished.

Discourse on microbes frequently gravitated back to soil and cultivation as the source of disease. “Prevent the formation of the necessary soil,” claimed the above temperance physician, “and you make sure of preventing the crop; but leave all the


730 “Microbe of Old Age,” Good Health 25 (London, New York, Battle Creek: 1890), 121.
important agents and influences that are actively at work in preparing the soil… and your crop will continue to appear, even though you cremate it as fast as it is harvested.”

In other words, internal defenses had to be nourished and strengthened, and soil sanitized to eliminate that which it harbored: the aggressor and its “crop”. This rhetoric reflects a new, very real mentality that called for waging war on soil as a means of eradicating disease and the products of microbes such as alcohol in the name of eliminating social “dis-ease.”

The microbial threat to Americans was even imagined as synonymous with the larger-than-life Lemuel Gulliver from Jonathan Swift’s eighteenth-century political satire combined with a strike against the Romantic love of all thing faerie. States “The New Liliputians,” in the World Book of Temperance,

‘Fact is stranger than fiction’ in the true story science is telling about man, the giant, attacked by a great army of microbes, germs, parasites, bacteria who are bad fairies, so small that man cannot see these tiny foes—indeed did not know till lately whence came the poison arrows that produce the diseases which have cut down life from hundreds to scores of years.

Personal and nation endurance require attentiveness and hygiene against “the little enemies that rushed in” at every given opportunity. It equally entailed discriminative consumption and the bolstering of another microscopic entity: the white blood cell, which writers were quick to racialize in a larger battle playing out in the body politic:

If we keep our white soldiers sober and strong we need not be afraid of microbes. The little white soldiers need a good many of them for their daily rations. // But if

---

731 Davis, “What are the Most,” 69.
we put wine or beer or whiskey or any other intoxicating drink down our throats, it makes our little defenders sleepy and stupid, and they don’t ‘watch out’ and fight our little foes, and then ‘all the germs from Germany and the parasites from Paris and the mike-robés from Ireland will get us.’

Other tracts identified temperance as a battle against the barbarism of the lowest orders and, by proxy, a battle against nature. Rev. Alfred Taylor, member of the NTS publication committee and clergyman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, labeled the sale of alcohol the one remaining “great national curse,” the spread of which need be stopped or civilization itself would be “lost.” It was time, claimed Taylor, to shed old practices, “the jug of brandy, or the bottle of vile ‘bitters.’” Declaring the liquor trade “worse” than the “slave auction,” Taylor called for “persistent warfare, and brave continuance in God’s strength” in “bring[ing] this tenfold more pernicious curse of drunkenness to a complete defeat” to “tumble this relic of barbarism, this blot on civilization.”

Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, abolitionist, Congregationalist minister from Brooklyn and son of antebellum temperance reformer, Lyman Beecher, added that temperance was in effect an on-going battle against nature itself. As stated “… we are continually, in one sense, going against nature; that is we are continually going against the lower nature for the sake of the higher. There is an upper or spirit nature, and there is a lower or flesh nature; the upper

---


demands the denial of the lower.”\textsuperscript{737} This hierarchy had its social equivalent with the middle and upper classes as higher, presumably rational element in comparison to the lower orders. Temperance, as the “great social battle of the age” was a “fight between the flesh and the spirit,” a doctrine of “self-control” that need be impressed on “individuals and the masses,” lest America be “utterly ruined.”\textsuperscript{738}

As we know, the scourge of drink had long been affiliated with “a living death” and “customs” the barrier to “reformation.”\textsuperscript{739} But this was not simply the fear of addiction or health problems associated with excessive drinking. It was the fear of “falling” as one minister explained, off of a “precipice” and of the failure of the “republican institutions” set in motion by the founders for the liberation of “useful and respectable men,” the “healthy, industrious and thriving yeoman.”\textsuperscript{740} Temperance was a patriotic and moral “enterprise,” “prospered” by God and united in the banishment of the spirits of the past.\textsuperscript{741} Alcohol was the “way of death” that undermined business which thrived on sobriety: This concept was established early on by the ATS, which proclaimed that:

\begin{quote}
God designed that they should all in that case be diligent in business; and in the structure of the human body, he has given them as much work as they can
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{738} Beecher, \textit{Common Sense for Young}, 22.

\textsuperscript{739} Jonathan Kittredge, \textit{An Address Delivered Before the Temperance Society of Plymouth, N.H. July 4, 1829} (Boston: Pierce and Williams, 1830), 11-12.

\textsuperscript{740} Kittredge, \textit{An Address Delivered}, 3, 7.

\textsuperscript{741} Kittredge, \textit{An Address Delivered}, 10.
perform in the proper disposal of suitable diet, and yet remain permanently healthy, and preserve life to the longest time.\textsuperscript{742}

Diligence in business defined the purpose of life in the movement. Yet temperance was not just a way to ensure one’s individual economic success. Many hoped it could stay broader socio-economic failure, especially after the Panics of 1819, 1837, 1857, and 1873 revealed the fragility of the market economy and land bubbles. Numerous reformer jeremiads across the nineteenth century concluded that intemperance invited “slumps” of all kinds: in productivity, in drained treasuries (including those of temperance societies), and an “ebbing moral tide.” Economic contraction reinforced the belief that civilization’s ascent was always at risk of “downgrades towards barbarism” caused by the population to relax into decadence and gluttony when they needed most to display “racial stamina.”\textsuperscript{743}

Under capitalism, money is the universal representative of material wealth, an equivalent of all human labor and commodities. This monetization of all things allows individuals to appropriate social and political power. The money form is also an abstraction capable of growing due to speculation and manipulation. In theory, the accumulation of wealth as money has no external limits. But in reality, wealth is limited by the environmental and social consequences of the endless drive of capital for self-expansion. The ever-increasing circulation of money and commodities becomes a mean


in itself toward the goal of more money, or in the words of Marx, the “drunken prosperity” of the bourgeoisie.\textsuperscript{744} At least until capital, as a historical force, runs up against reality—any number of barriers that arise in the ever-growing flow of production, commodities, and finance.\textsuperscript{745} Recessions and depression embody the ensuing hang-over. Reformers, being quite certain of themselves and their ideology, however, did not think the bubble should ever pop. If it did, intemperance was at fault. By rejecting alcohol they rejected the idea of limits, of death, and the inevitable crash.

As Lefebvre makes clear, in spatial politics death “must be represented and rejected.”\textsuperscript{746} Alcohol and the people and spaces associated with it, provided temperance reformers with a convenient representation for death. Prohibition offered a panacea for death’s many meanings, which, in the broader economics of religion suggested the ultimate end of death with the end of time. And along these lines Alcohol’s negative associations made it the ideal hurdle to be crossed in realizing the Christian millennium. Millennial fantasies ran wild in the nineteenth century in anticipation of the next calendar milestone and new Protestant readings of Revelations 20-21. Thus one temperance writer came to conclude God’s kingdom awaited as the “highest end of the temperance reformation.”\textsuperscript{747} The outcome he describes thusly,

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{744} Marx, \textit{Capital}, 1:236.
\textsuperscript{745} Marx, \textit{Capital}, 1: 233-236.
\textsuperscript{746} Lefebvre, \textit{Production of Space}, 35.
\end{quote}
The most favored society is that which consists most nearly of holy members; which approachest nearest to doing the will of God on earth as he angels do it in heaven; which has the most intimated fellowship with God: and in the coming period, which is described in no cunningly devised fable, of wealth and health and order and beauty, the crown and glory of that millennial prosperity, will be the universal holiness to the Lord.\textsuperscript{748}

Inspired by scientific advancements of the seventeenth century, English Puritans belonged to modernity’s first progressive millennialists. Anglo Puritans understood the Reformation as the restoration of the true church, anticipated the waning of Catholicism, conquest of Islam, and global conversion to Protestantism, and technological and economic transformation of society as precursor to Christ’s return. By the late seventeenth century, New England Puritans such as Increase Mather and Jonathan Edwards began to imagine their society as the New Jerusalem of millennial thought, but with a twist: for these preachers, the America potential for glorious redemption that outshone the chaos of Europe was ever-threatened by the shadow of possible catastrophic failure, a combination that gathered force during the Revolutionary era when the hopes and anxieties surrounding independence spurred the creation of social reform organizations.\textsuperscript{749} In the nineteenth century, English and American enthusiasm for millennialism grew with a resurgence of Catholic influence in Britain, widespread working-class rebellion, and anxiety over social degradation in western society.\textsuperscript{750}

\textsuperscript{748} Nott, Temperance and Religion, 36.


surprisingly, the US and England came to house the most enthusiastic temperance movements.

Temperance reformers upheld the idea that their version of Christian reform was pure, rational, and science-based and the crucial step for ushering in the millennium. Microbes, Catholics, and non-Anglo persons and their drinking cultures were not just a threat to society— they posed an obstacle to the fulfillment of this ultimate goal. This is clearly stated in temperance documents. For instance, Edward Hitchcock, Professor of Chemistry and Natural History at Amherst College, won an 1829 ATS essay contest with a vision for how to surpass the obstacle of alcohol in the quest for millennial perfection. For Hitchcock, the answer lay in a combination of untainted youth, rational thought, economic self-interest, proper religion, nationalism, and temperance. He states,

I feel a strong confidence that the intelligent youth of our land, who have no such habits or prejudices strongly fixed, will yield to the united voice of Philosophy, of Self-interest, or their Country, and of Christianity; and take the high vantage-ground of total abstinence. O, what an incubus would this remove from our beloved country! What a noble example for all the world! and how soon would Millennial Temperance reign in all the earth, and Millennial Happiness follow in the train?751

Globally, the ATS read into its rapid growth in the early 1830s as the harbinger of global conversion. The society’s “Forth Report” (1831) exclaims:

The Hottentot and the Hindoo, the Greenlander and Tahitian, will unite with the inhabitants of the Emerald Isle, the Caledonian, European, Asiatic, African and American of every name, in ceasing to do evil. Then, under the means of God’s appointment, will they learn to do well… The frost and the snows of six thousand

winters will be forever dissolved; and the spring-time of millennial beauty, and the autumnal fruit of millennial glory, open upon the world.\textsuperscript{752}

But the ATS equally warned of what would occur should the movement fail.

And unless members of the church shall cease to teach, by their business, that fatal error that it is right for men to buy and use ardent spirits as drink, the evil will never be eradicated; intemperance will never cease, and the day of millennial glory never come.\textsuperscript{753}

A sense of urgency and militancy was added by Philadelphia minister Albert Barnes who claimed that intemperance,

\ldotsstands in the way of revivals, and of the glories of the millennial morn. Every drunkard opposes the millennium; every dram-drinker stands in the way of it; every dram-seller stands in the way of it\ldots The pulpit must, and shall speak out. And the press must speak. And you, fellow Christians, are summoned by the God of purity to take your stand, and suffer your influence to be felt.\textsuperscript{754}

The fight for temperance took on the quality of a Zoroastrian final battle in which the prosperity of all pivoted on the elimination of alcohol. But by the late nineteenth century, reformers mourned the sobering reality that the crusade was not progressing as hoped.

English reformers abraded legislatures for a lack of political will toward the elimination of the liquor trade and thus failure to move “the millionth part of an inch nearer to the millennium.”\textsuperscript{755} In the US, reformers mourned that temperance millennium was delayed

\textsuperscript{752} “Fourth Report,” 53.


\textsuperscript{755} Archdeacon Farrar, “An Appeal to Statesmen,” The Church of England Temperance Chronicle (Nov. 22, 1884), 352-353. This article can be found in Fredk. Sherlock, ed., The Church of England Temperance
by the internal revenue system and its reliance on heavy taxes from the liquor trade. Indeed, the movement seemed stuck in an impossible predicament: the need to eliminate the system of taxation, which might unleash a perilous flood of cheap alcohol in anticipation of legal prohibition for which there was no immediate hope in sight.\footnote{William Hamilton Armstrong, \textit{National Internal Revenue Taxation in its relation to Temperance and Prohibition} (New York: National Temperance Society and Publication House, 1889), 50, accessed Sept. 2, 2014. http://books.google.com/books?id=dzIMAQAAMAAJ}

Temperance millennialism also faced oppositional utopian forms. In the remarkable ferment of utopian socialists of Europe emerged the notion of “communism” a term that was probably first used by French lawyer Etiénne Cabet in the 1830s; and popularized in his utopian novel \textit{Voyage en Icarie} (1840). Early uses of the word date as well to “communist banquets,” a form of popular protests to the July Monarchy of Louis Philippe I. The first banquet was held in Paris in 1840 where those in attendance ate, drank and discussed “commoning”—the age-old spirit of cooperation and sharing of commoners, and thus the young proletariat as a means of solidarity and survival.\footnote{See Peter Linebaugh, “Meandering on the Semantical-Historical Paths of Communism and Commons,” \textit{The Commoner} (Dec. 8, 2010), accessed Oct. 20, 2014, www.commoner.org.uk/?p=98}

Followers of Prussian radical Wilhelm Weitling, in rallying artisanal protests in the Rhineland and Switzerland in the 1840s also referred to themselves as communists. All of this preceded the publication of Marx and Engels \textit{Communist Manifesto} (1848), a work commissioned by the newly formed Communist League (1847) for the promotion of a
new type of property-free and classless society.\textsuperscript{758} As Peter Linebaugh notes, the conflation of future revolution with the old “spectre” of the commons helped give the manifesto force.\textsuperscript{759}

These early communists mixed and matched agrarianism and worker-led industry and Owenite passion for community with Fourierist romanticism. Some employed concepts of millennialism and temperance as an indictment of self-interest as central to capitalism. For instance, Robert Owen proposed that the path to an equitable millennial age required “temperance in all things,” by which he meant shared prosperity for the pleasure and health of all.\textsuperscript{760} Weitling, like many Germans blended the concept of communism with Christian fervor and Catholic communion in the “image of future banquets” of an emerging communist order. English utopian socialist John Goodwyn Barmby, another “pioneering communist” who took inspiration from Owen and Cabet, like his counterpart Weitling, coupled communism and religion in founding his Communist Church.\textsuperscript{761} What Barmby understood as communism expressed most strikingly this religiously infused revolutionary doctrine. In 1843, Barmby states,

\begin{quote}
The earth is the great Communion Table of its inhabitants. The bread and the wine, in the corn and in the grape, are spread upon its common board, so that all
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{759} Linebaugh, “Meandering on the Semantical,” 4.


may partake of the body and blood of the common parent, in the feast of the
children of God, unto sanctification and salvation.  

For Barmby, true communism entailed the sharing of the earth’s bounty and society
centered on the regeneration of the table that served all. Intemperance, in Barmby’s
world, was selfishness-- the destructive mentality at the core of modernity that denied
commoners a seat at the table.

A world-traveler in the name of a global communist movement, Barmby was in
correspondence with American thinkers and activists, including Ralph Waldo Emerson,
though Barmby “did not warm to Emerson’s prescription of self-improvement based on
individual culture and temperance.” Barmby was less particular when it came to John
Otis Wattles, an American utopian who combined teetotalism with Communist Church
anti-capitalism. In 1846, Wattles and his wife, Edith, established the utopian Excelsior
Community on the Ohio River and extended to Barmby the offer of trade in speculation-
free grain to fellow church members across the pond. The experiment was, however,
short-lived—washed away by a flood in December of 1847.

As Marxist theorist Ernest Mandel notes,

762 Goodwyn Barmby, “The Truth of the Communion Table, or the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper,
According to the Doctrine of the Communist Church,” The New Age, Concordium Gazette, and
Temperance Advocate 1, no. 12 (Dec. 1, 1843), 132, accessed July 2014,
https://books.google.com/books?id=XjIAAAAAAYAAJ. Marx and Engels, however, did not think much of
this type of communism or other utopian-socialist forms or even the Levellers since these lacked a
developed proletarian consciousness. See Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The German Ideology:
Including Theses on Feuerbach and Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy (Amherst:
Prometheus Books, 1976), 487.

2006), 203.

The first attempts at a communist society (leaving aside early, medieval and more modern Christian communities) were made in the United States in the 19th century, through the establishment of small agrarian settlements band upon collective property, communally organized labour and the total absence of money inside their boundaries.  

As I previously outlined, many of these agrarian settlements embraced spirits as part of their communal endeavors. The fact that some of these societies also tried to claim temperance posed a challenge to liberal dry activism. Maintaining the bourgeoisie claim over the movement and definition of temperance was one of the primary goals of the NTS. This national organization responded to diversions in the temperance message by publishing several times over an essay by Prof. John W. Mears of Hamilton College, New York. Mears declared the resumption of the movement after the “Waterloo defeat” of Maine Lawism through a new onslaught of publishing and legislative endeavors against the “clap-trap of nature’s journeymen” and their “kingdom of …meat and drink.” Simultaneously, the essay declared ownership over temperance and Christianity. Mears states,

Its [temperance’s] roots are not in the vague aspirations of the unrenewed heart. It does not belong to the brood of ideas generated in the brains of mere philosophers

---


and social philanthropists, such as communism, abolition of capital punishment, and woman suffrage. It is a thoroughly Christian and Scriptural idea.\textsuperscript{767}

The rise of the lower orders, according to Mears, demanded “[m]ore plainly than ever” the completion of the Temperance Reformation. “Course animal appetite” for the sake of redemption, had to be suppressed.\textsuperscript{768}

Immigration had altered the nation, challenging the dominance of the old stock. Liberal restructuring had generated popular ferment throughout the western world as commonland and systems were dismantled. The potential failure of the liberal experiment and the millennial vision amplified Anglo American anxieties. Thus, by the 1870s, the tenor of Anglo America was primed for another wave of temperance activism. Produced space defined by teetotalism would provide the next generation of activists the confidence to move forward with national prohibition.

\textsuperscript{767} Mears, “The Church and Temperance,” 7.

\textsuperscript{768} Mears, “The Church and Temperance,” 6.
Chapter 6: Temperance Colonies

We have frequently seen Yorkshire heaths and moors in course of disfigurement by row upon row of miserable hovels, hastily run-up dwellings, possessing the least possible amount of ventilation, air, sewage, space or comfort. Such places [with Beershops, etc.] soon degenerate into nests of poverty and squalid wretchedness. There is nothing of this at Saltaire… Saltaire by moonlight, will rival anything described in the Arabian Nights.

--The Temperance Spectator (1865)

We may talk for ever about the lofty philosophy and the pure Gospel of the Temperance movement, but we cannot fight the liquor interest by words only. We must act as well as talk; and one of the great necessities of the country is the opening of places equally commodious and attractive with those now in possession of the field, but without the temptations which are inseparable from their very existence.

-- Rev. CWL Christien, “A Crying Temperance Want,” (1891)

The production of space for exhibiting the promise of temperance ideology began in the early 1800s and proceed through the century as an attempt to answer the question “how, when, where, and in what manner?” a truly temperate society that was free of alcohol and all its negative associations, might take root. The answer, for some, was the temperance colony—space dedicated to the proper type of industrial and market-oriented development. Temperance colonies took multiple forms, but all sought to showcase the miraculous power of abstinence using converted space.

The Industrial Village

Temperance colonies, as understood by histories produced by the movement, began in the early nineteenth-century with the invasion of the countryside by factory

---


771 This question was raised with the formation of the National Temperance Society, as detailed by Robert C. Pitman, “Moral and Legal Susasion,” in Temperance Tracts Issued by the National Temperance Society and Publication House (New York: National Temperance Society and Publication House, 1881), Tract 119, 4, accessed Sept. 3, 2014, http://books.google.com/books?id=58wvAQAAMAAJ
towns seeking cheap land and power in fast-flowing rivers. These early manifestation
serve as a reminder of EP Thompson’s assertion that “most of the new industrial towns
did not so much displace the countryside as grow over it.” Known as “industrial
villages,” these new configurations converted land and culture in a manner “disruptive to
older traditions.” Notes Thompson, upon entry, these industrial villages covered
“farmlands… with brick” and imposed conventions judged to be more fitting of the new
mode of production.

As temperance history go, P.T. Winskill’s *The Temperance Movement and Its
Workers* (1892) identified select “industrial villages” as path blazers in among
“temperance colonies.” Indeed, the multiple editions of Winskill’s work featured a
section dedicated to the concept of the temperance colony as a form rooted in industry,
described thusly:

> Amongst other efforts to encourage the spread of temperance principles, and to
prove that when the temptations and allurements of the drink traffic are absent,
the people are sober, industrious, and prosperous, is the establishment of centres
of industry on estates where the sale of all kinds of intoxicating liquors is strictly
prohibited.

The villages of Saltaire and Bessbrook represented, for Winskill, two lauded examples of
such “industrial estates.” The first was the brainchild of Sir Titus Salt, who in the early
1850s, after acquiring a sizable fortune on alpaca wool textiles used part of his fortune to
establish the mill town of “Saltaire” on the River Aire three miles from Bradford in

---


773 Thompson, *The Making of the*, 405, 444.

Yorkshire. Here Salt employed three to four thousand workers over the next few decades in the making of worsted cloth. Notes Winskill, the grid layout of this “village” featured 700 dwellings, shops, schools, library, wash-houses and Congregational Church, “but no public-houses or places for the consumption of intoxicating liquors.” From the moment of its conception, Saltaire evinced perfected industrial life, “free from all traces of the filth and darkness and squalid misery so common in manufacturing towns and districts.” Presumably, the absence of drink ensured low crime and few “illegitimate births.”

Winskill was not alone in his admiration of Saltaire. The Temperance Spectator in 1865 reverentially treated Saltaire as constructed space bordering on something alive and quasi-divine. “It [Saltaire],” crowed the Spectator, “breathes a lesson and a moral which should be carefully studied.” The “gigantic edifices” of the massive central mill at 550 feet by 550 feet long and seventy-two feet high not counting its “lofty chimneys,” spoke to the author as if through stone, telling a charming “tale of busy labour and ceaseless production.” Grandiose was good. It signified the sheer power of industry in putting people to work. Meanwhile the city stood as testament to top-down community planning. The proprietor, Salt, matched productivity with an ideal environment for the moral uplift of its workforce, as asserted: “the workers appear to have been influenced by surrounding associations. A more clean, tidy, or intelligent body of workers it has seldom been our good fortune to meet.”


“The Lesson of Saltaire,” 63.
Bessbrook, Ireland, represented another ideal version of industrial “paradise.” The founder was one John Grubb Richardson, a Quaker, whose ancestry proudly claimed participation in Oliver Cromwell’s army. Richardson, like Salt, had grown rich in textiles—specifically linen. Prior to embarking on this town project Richardson used his wealth to support temperance candidates, temperance legislation, and the United Kingdom Alliance (Delevan’s organization). In the 1840s, Richardson purchased 6000 acres on which he built the model town of Bessbrook which he named for his wife Elizabeth. At village center sat the massive Bessbrook flax-spinning mill. On surrounding land Richardson constructed “family-oriented” worker housing—not the simple wood and earthen huts of peasants, early industrial shanties or barracks, but “proper” homes with three to five rooms each. In addition the proprietor built schools, a hotel, club, shops, a bank, churches of various denominations (Catholic included), and newsroom. On one side, the town included a 300 acre company-owned farm for the raising of dairy cows in the spirit of the agricultural improvement movement. The mill employed about 4000 workers annually and the town as a whole provided work for all members of the family.⑦⑦ Equally important was what the town lacked. According to Winskill, Bessbrook abided no alcohol sales and had “no pawnshop, ragged school, petty lodging-houses for tramps, nor a police station.”⑦⑧ That is, there was no formal police. Nonconformists, however, could expect a visit from an “assemblage” of Christian men and women charged with maintaining social order. Instead of taverns, the town contained

⑦⑧ Winskill, *The Comprehensive History*, 319. This title is an earlier edition of Winskill’s history.
a plethora of church and reform-oriented spaces: “a Society of Friends meeting-house, Catholic, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian places of worship, a Temperance Society, Band of Hope, Good Templar Lodge, &c.” Points out Winskill, Bessbrook had so many society meeting houses, that the “natural accompaniments of the public-house are not… needed.”

By far, there was more at work behind the elimination of the pub than necessity. Notes Lefebvre, space is not inert or neutral, a “thing among other things, …rather it subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationships in their coexistence and simultaneity—their (relative) order and/or (relative) disorder.” Premodern cities, observes Lefebvre, were “works” or a “sculpture” of their populations, but modern cities emerge as unique products designed for the on-going reproduction of spatial relations in connection with the forces of production. Under industrial capitalism, this meant the creation of homogenized and hierarchical space defined by private property, market incentives, and the control of labor.

Political scientist Brian Harrison notes that the pub or tavern, as well as open-air markets, had traditionally been areas of “informal collective life”—spaces of transit, politics, recreation and social gatherings. The assault on the pub was an assault on what the middle and upper class feared most; namely, the potential power of the informal


780 Lefebvre, Production of Space, 73.
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collective in creating what Lefebvre understood as differential space in the service of resistance to the homogenizing purpose of produced space.\textsuperscript{783}

Anxiety over the pub’s spatial association is well illustrated in the deep concerns expressed over how and where workers spent free time. Winskill found comfort in the fact that even Sunday “was a busy day at Bessbrook,” since busy hands and minds had little time for potentially dangerous, unstructured activities in dangerous and unstructured spaces. Adds Winskill,

\begin{quote}
You don’t see at Bessbrook what you may often see elsewhere…the intelligent and independent operative lounging about on a Sunday mourning ragged, unshaven, unwashed, a short-pipe in his mouth, the penny Radical newspaper in his pocket, an untaxed and ill-bred cur at his heels, waiting for the ‘public’ to open and supply him with his beloved and pernicious beer.\textsuperscript{784}
\end{quote}

Keeping out the pub, its beer and even mongrel pups meant keeping agitation in check, preserving the type of surveilled peace reformers believed necessary in building the “millennial” town environment so appealing to the likes of Winskill.

In addition, the discourse on Bessbrook echoed imperial and missionary-derived themes of racial reform. Winskill, as others, found in Bessbrook a gem to the foil that was Ireland, or at least the Ireland of his imagination: a place of ignorance and barbarism where much of the population was “at work cracking each other’s skulls.” Accordingly, Bessbrook was ideally located far enough into the countryside to uplift England’s colonial charges, and close enough to Newry, the heart of Ireland’s textile trade to benefit

\textsuperscript{783} Lefebvre, \textit{The Production of Space}, 52.

\textsuperscript{784} Winskill, \textit{The Comprehensive History}, 319.
from the “positive” influence of wealth. Notes another reform-oriented publication, as constructed space the village of Bessbrook denied the presumably undisciplined Irish the “allurements of the dram-shop,” directing its “operatives” (workers) instead to schools, reading rooms, and temperance societies.

Both Saltaire and Bessbrook represented the goal of centralized production and power of the new industrial nobility whose castles-like factories were believed to support and protect workers in their surrounding tenements. Hence these “colonies” evoked yet supplanted the feudal paternalism and the medieval village with industrial paternalism, monumental factory-architecture, modern technology and the capitalist economy in a great parade of industrial prowess.

Even though reformers admired these experiments, workers were not always happy with life in the town-as-gilded-cage. Having sung the praises of Saltaire, The Temperance Spectator chaffed at lack of gratitude felt by labor for this wondrous place. States the paper, “Yet we have men who sing plaintively of ‘the good old times,’ and declare that the spirit of poetry and romance has departed from us.” To this, the author exclaimed,

Foolish people! In the clang and whirr of the countless wheels of the factories, there is to be heard more music than ever was clanked by the cumbrous armour of

---


the haughtiest knights. There is more poetry in the history of Saltaire than in all the exploits of a marauding baron, or the pranks of a love-lorn squire.\textsuperscript{788}

Poetry as expressed by the Romantics, represented an aesthetic that utilized folk and medieval dressings in conceiving more sensual, free-flowing, democratic and non-alienating conditions. It served as a form of protest against modernity’s highly structured, rationalized, and banal existence.\textsuperscript{789} By contrast, \textit{The Spectator}, lionized the “poetry” of the town’s grandiose and mechanical features, and most of all in the sense of order these provided, for here, “Everywhere order reigned supreme, the establishment working in all its details like a well-constructed machine.”\textsuperscript{790}

Defending the honor of Saltaire was to defend its message, as understood by reform-oriented industrialists. The above author of the \textit{Spectator} reiterated, “the working classes have not always been ready to recognize the value of these efforts, and Mr. Salt’s endeavours have sometimes been less appreciated than they deserve.” The dispassionate response of workers reflected poorly on labor, not Salt who, the author suggests “was in advance of working-class thought.” Those things the author admired, the spectacular and picturesque: the gigantic mill, with its “granite-like solidity,” “magnificent Dinning Hall,” “beautiful Church,” “spacious and well-appointed baths and washhouses,” “clean broad streets, respectable-looking houses and broad pavements” like the suburbs of professional men; indeed, all the “sublime creations” of Salt’s Bradford architects Henry

\textsuperscript{788} “The Lesson of Saltaire,” 63.

\textsuperscript{789} Jack Zipes, \textit{Breaking the Magic Spell: Radical Theories of Folk and Fairy Tales} (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 82-83.

\textsuperscript{790} “The Lesson of Saltaire,” 63.
Lockwood and Richard Mawson, and his engineer, William Fairbairn, as well as the ban on all “demoralizing and polluting influences,” and general cleanliness of the town, had, for the author, solved the “Labor Question.”

791 In sharing his success, Mr. Salt had produced a “wise system” that tended to the “comfort and welfare of those employed by him.” All the while the author seemed blind to the fact that labor was the source of Salt’s elevated wealth, yet workers had little say over how the mill and town were structured or run. Besides, in so far as one accepted the material benefits to workers, the fact remained that the central purpose of so-called enlightened industrial town planning was self-serving: it provided autocratic control over production and the definition of a community gathered for the purpose of production. Salt is admirable for “sharing” his success but nonconforming workers enter the narrative as ungrateful, ignorant and “quarrelsome” agitators.

792 That said, Saltaire and Bessbrook remained remarkably strike free. In exchange for a higher standard of living workers that landed in either town seemed largely willing to comply with the rules, at least, on the surface. Of course, since agitators were not tolerated, that element could, as in any company town, easily be winnowed out of the community through lack of employment and housing.

As for temperance, the citizenry of these model towns was not as alcohol-free as was often suggested. Saltaire sat within the township of Shipley and though there were no pubs within Saltaire, in the 700 yard radius surrounding the “village” (itself not very


792 “The Lesson of Saltaire,” 63-64.
large) there were half a dozen establishments in operation as of 1880. At least some residents made the short trip to their outer boundaries to tipple, a striking fact that merits barely a phrase in temperance publications. According to one Mr. William Fry, Secretary of the Salt schools, “There are not more total abstainers in Saltaire than is now usual in such a [working-class] population,” yet Fry was quick to note that there was “no comparison” when it came to sobriety of the village. 793 Constructed as a sober space, Saltaire’s image hinged on its lack of pubs.

Love and admiration for Saltaire boiled down to an admiration for Salt’s autarchic ability to banish elements that did not conform to a class-oriented respectability. Such admiration is evident in the Western Temperance Herald’s veneration for Salt’s power as “freehold” owner of the “property” of Saltaire. States the Herald: “Would that every parish in our land could so easily rid themselves of the abomination!” 794 Likewise a 1860s temperance report of the Massachusetts State Temperance Alliance in contemplating the workings of Bessbrook, marveled over the potential power of the “sole proprietor,” who, could “under the English law, prohibit” whatever they found distasteful. 795 To frame this in another way, the temperate industrial village exercised the power assumed with private property and it was this that made this model so very attractive.


Order, in the end, was not so easily dictated or maintained. Nor could it be truly attributed to the lack of alcohol or pubs. The real Achilles heel of both villages came down, ironically, to economics and the economic decline of each reveals just how flawed faith in prohibition as a social palliative could be. Like other company towns these industrial villages lived and died with their monoeconomies. The first signs of trouble emerged by the late nineteenth century. In Bessbrook employment fell after the 1880s as linen mills multiplied, then consolidated, and after World War I with general decline in the use of linen. By 1921, employment dropped in half. The mill, the primary source of employment, finally closed in 1967, after which the town emerged as a front in the bloody contest for Irish liberation from British occupation. In 1970, the British Army converted the massive mill into a military base as the town became part conflict zone between the IRA and UK government.

Saltaire suffered a similar course of decline. Due to shifting fashion and competition, the town experienced a downturn in 1870s. The sale of the mill in 1892 “sent shockwaves through the Bradford trade and villagers feared for their future security.” The mill rebounded in mid 1890s and with World War I, only to be sold again in 1917. In 1923, the mill was restructured as a public company. A decade later the houses were sold to a private company though the mill managed to continue production until the financial crisis of the 1980s. By mid-80s production ceased and the mills-- these


By the 1870s, broad-based enthusiasm for “model villages” like Saltaire and Bessbrook was fading, though temperance periodicals still held them in high regard. As in other company towns, worker security required sustained employment. Those that lost their jobs lost their homes and community. In essence, company towns had not solved the issue of poverty; rather, they lacked homeless “paupers” because the unemployed are sent walking. Likewise, the definition of model infrastructure and company led recreation came under fire. By the late nineteenth century, worker accommodations once hailed as modern, were criticized as “dismal” and “cramped” and industrial paternalism as stifling.\footnote{Reynolds, \textit{The Great Paternalist}, 284-285.}

In addition, with time it became clear that the portrayal of the industrial village utopia was a cultivated fiction that failed to take into consideration the shortcomings of company funded uplift. When Winskill drew comparisons between these model towns and others, such as neighboring Bradford, where crime, infant mortality and worker strife were high, he failed to take into account the fact that other industrial spaces did not receive the same investment.\footnote{Winskill, \textit{The Temperance Movement and Its Workers}, 3:110.} In reality the trappings of success and orderly aesthetic of Bessbrook and Saltaire had more to do with the patronage and investment of each
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industrial titan than temperance. A shift in the market tide revealed the true vulnerability of the industrial village as a model for long-term development.

Temperance Colonies: The New American Model

In the US, company towns did not emerge until the late nineteenth century around heavy and extractive industries. In the early years of the twentieth century, these followed similar patterns of paternalism and social engineering laid out by Saltaire. But American company towns, even within temperance literature, did not fall under the rhetorical guise of “temperance colony” probably because the colony as conceptualized space for the imposition and ordering of relations was ultimately superseded by the legislative drive for national prohibition. In the interim, reformers in the American context explored other options for the creation of temperance colonies.

At midcentury, American reformers sought, in their own fashion, the colony as a way to reform labor and produce orderly and productive communities. Notably, this drive occurred alongside calls for the institutionalization of drunkards who had fallen under the penalty of law. Here we should note that ruminations regarding what colonies could accomplish emerged within the framework of a nineteenth century revolution in penal philosophy known as the “discovery of the asylum.” This “discovery” entailed a zealous move to incarcerate the deviant and the poor for rehabilitation beginning with the formation of formal prisons and asylums.801

In colonial period, prisons were limited in number even along the fairly well-developed Atlantic seaboard communities. Most colonies dealt with petty crime using the stocks, whippings, fines, or public shaming, while sending the most troublesome of their members packing or to the gallows. Poverty was not necessarily equated with criminality in pre-Revolution America. Rather, clergymen emphasized charity for those that fell into hard times, that is, unless those of concern were deemed “unworthy.” But by the 1820s, American reformers began to approach “problematic” people—the juvenile delinquent, the orphaned, the pauper, the deviant, the criminal or insane, with institutionalization. Elimination of these elements through rehabilitation was the primary goal. On one hand, the rise of correctional facilities reflected the belief of the time in human perfectibility and a sincere desire to provide refuge for the down-and-out. On the other, the movement was ostensibly conformist, and, in had much power in defining what was normative. Within the asylum there was “no escape from order and regularity.” As detailed by historian David J. Rothman, “incarceration became the first resort as psychiatrists rushed to put patients behind walls and judges with little hesitation meted out long sentences for convicted criminals.”

Temperance journals frequently complained about the expense of prisons and almshouses but expressed remarkable interest in institutionalizing inebriates. Indeed, reformers on “both sides of the Atlantic” as expressed The Western Temperance Herald, “watched with considerable interest” the opening of dedicated inebriate asylums in New

---


York State and elsewhere. The appeal of the asylum sprung, in part, from notions of scientific and moral advancement as fostered by a growing consortium of professional physicians whose work provided the movement with its modern, progressive edge. Benjamin Rush was among the first to recommend the construction of inebriate asylums in his Medical Inquiries and Observations upon the diseases of the Mind (1812). Over the next century temperance literature expressed excitement over the idea of the asylum as a means of affecting a cure, however coerced, for the “posterity of morbid appetites,” the supposed cause of labor’s destitution, “all insanity, and sixty per cent of all our idiocy.” Interest also blossomed with morbid curiosity and fear, if not righteous indignation, over the growth of lunatic asylums and their seemingly over-flowing populations. In considering the role of drink in insanity and number of applicants – including professional men and “rich men’s daughters” to the New York Inebriate Asylum, Rev. Henry Ward Beecher mourned what he believed to be a “cancer in the frame”… an evil spreading beyond “poor-house statistics.”


805 Benjamin Rush, Medical Inquiries and Observations upon the diseases of the Mind (Philadelphia: Kimber & Richardson, 1812), 354-355.


Prior to the Civil War, asylums were typically dedicated to inebriates that broke the law. Colonies, in theory, offered something new: alcohol-free place for the rehabilitation of the individual seeking “asylum” from liquor. In some instances, this implied alcoholics, but in others the goal was self-enclosed communities whose developmental trajectory was defined by an exclusive set of members hoping to shut out drink and persons associated with it. The first type of “asylum” is perhaps best exemplified by the colonization scheme of Edward Everett Hale, a Boston-born Unitarian minister, author, and frequent lecturer for the Massachusetts Total Abstinence Society. On November 1st, 1877, Hale presented his proposal for a new temperance colony before the society’s Board of Directors. For Hale, the key to curing alcoholism, or simply, a penchant for drink, lay in consistent labor and “seclusion from temptation” for a minimum of three years. Working from this premise, he pondered four potential options: the chartering of “temperance ships,” enlistment in the US Army, removal to some “large township” absent of liquor, and the settlement of “temperance islands.” Hale found fault with first three. Ships and enlistment seemed promising in that they kept inebriates busy and taught them a new profession, but, notes Hale, neither the temperance ship nor the army could ensure total abstinence. Ships had to make port from time to time, and ports cities, mourned the reformer, were hotbeds of intemperance. Enlistment posed other difficulties. The regimented life of the rank and file under “good officers” was nevertheless punctuated by regular leave of absence “in some neighboring town or

hamlet”—spaces of temptation that took form in “shops erected for the very purpose of taking away the money and brains of these very men.”

The third option—the temperance township, Hale sadly concluded as impossible in the wake of the failure of the Maine Laws of the 1850s. For these reasons Hale concluded that the best option was the formation of temperance colonies using the Sea Islands off-shore of the conquered South. In fact Hale had already chosen an island off North Carolina as ideal for this very experiment. Arrangements would proceed thusly:

Let such an island be provided with small, cheap houses, which will cost but a few hundred dollars each, with small allotments of land to each; and also with such larger farms, with shoe-shops, and other industries as would provide occupation for the recruits engaged.

Workers and their families could live free of temptation, work for the owner of the island or its large farms, and ideally purchase their habitation after a few years with wages earned. Thus, claimed Hale, organized emigration in the manner of New England and of Kansas (as compared to “barbarous Missouri”) offered “the solution of a practical difficulty in the temperance question.”

Notably, Hale’s experiment required investment from a few capitalists with deep pockets… someone or some company willing to purchase an island, construct barracks, and run plantations for Hale’s vision of “a temperance army of laboring men” looking “to recover their nerves, brains, physical constitution and self-control.” It was an expensive proposal, and Hale knew it. For this reason the reformer made certain assurances.


Investors would not be expected to go unrewarded. They would be compensated with the profits from plantation products grown by laborers under two-three year contracts. If this was not sufficient enticement, there was, in addition, the subtle implication that wages could be denied workers for failure to comply with colony’s rules.\(^{812}\)

Hale’s recommendation surfaced in a moment of frontier fever. While the industrial village appealed to a pioneering spirit into rural England and colonized Ireland, in the US, the new frontier lay in the opening of lands South and West. Hale was an abolitionist, as well as a temperance advocate. Thus his settlement schemes were South-oriented. Before the War, Hale endorsed, via the New England Emigrant Aid Company, the settlement of free-labor colonies of European immigrants in Kansas and Texas as a means of hedging in the expansion of slavery.\(^{813}\) During the Civil War, Hale served as Vice President of the Boston Educational Commission, formed in 1862, for the recruitment of teachers and missionaries in the opening of schools in the Sea Islands during the Port Royal Experiment—an agricultural experiment that employed confiscated plantations and “contraband” slaves to test the capacity of blacks to behave as free laborers, and more importantly, their willingness to grow cotton.\(^{814}\) After the war, Hale argued for the settlement of discharged soldiers in Florida in communities complete with forges, schools, factories, and churches for purpose of rehabilitating soldiers and this

---

\(^{812}\) Hale, “Temperance Colonies,” 15-16.


southern state by reorganizing population, industry, and political control. All along the way, Hale recruited the patronage of Boston businessmen in these reform schemes, using potential for profit as the enticement to “harness self-interest for social good.”

Securing business interest and the money that came with it entailed taking a stance in the name of industrious sobriety. For instance, in recruiting teachers for the Sea Islands, Hale was particularly emphatic that those chosen “instruct blacks in the necessity of temperance, self-respect, neatness and order, and ‘system in work,’” to prevent their reversion to “savagery.” The result would be a dedicated work force—“cheap cotton by free labor” as outlined by economist Edward Atkinson, a fellow supporter of the New England Emigrant Aid Company and Boston Educational Commission.

The South hosted many colonization schemes following the war, and it is worth noting that Hale’s brand of labor-temperance reform, at least in the early years of Reconstruction, was preferred to more radical colonial incarnations. For contrast, we might look to the work of Tunis G. Campbell, a New Jersey minister in the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Campbell’s original training with the Episcopal school in Babylon, New York, directed him toward service with the American Colonization Society (ACS), an organization for the resettlement of enslaved blacks in Liberia. As a preacher Campbell promoted “equality and self-help”, temperance, and abolition in New

---

815 Abbott, *Cotton and Capital*, 82-83.
But with time Campbell’s involvement in the abolitionist movement turned him against the ACS. Black slaves, after all, helped build America. Why should they be forced to leave? 

During the 1860s and 70s as an agent of the Freedmen’s Bureau, Campbell established a black colony on a handful of Carolina Sea Islands—the same group of islands featured in Hale’s colonization schemes. Campbell made a point of approving land grants to freedmen under General William T. Sherman’s Special Field Order No. 15. This prioritization of freedmen autonomy through independent land holdings and autonomous black communities earned Campbell the ire of Davis Tillson, a fellow agent of the bureau who opposed land redistribution. Notes historian Russell Duncan:

At base, Tillson seems to have been concerned with helping freedmen, but he was more interested in capitalist expansion and profits than with humanitarian and radical reform. He would not tolerate paralyzed labor relations, nor did he have the patience for the time-consuming work of ensuring an equitable readjustment between former masters and slaves. Under Tillson’s guidance the contract system was employed as the most efficient way to get blacks back in the fields…

Tillson was alarmed by the lack of white men on Campbell’s islands and the refusal of Campbell’s blacks to allow white plantation owners, or any whites for that matter, to lay claim to the land they understood to be theirs. From Tillson’s perspective, land, under these black freeholders, had gone to waste. Black settlers prioritized diversified crops, 
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821 The islands in question were St. Catherines, Sapelo, Colonel’s, Ausaba, and Burnside.

including corn, meat, game, and fish for their subsistence—none of which constituted productive land tenure by market measures. Furthermore, Tillson supported the land claims of two white northern capitalists looking to rent land on St. Catherines Island for cotton production. In a calculated move intended to return the islands to “proper” white ownership, Tillson accused Campbell of illegal lumber sales and payment of black laborers with liquor. Though specious, the accusations led to Campbell’s discharge from the bureau in 1866. In turn, Campbell’s removal paved the way for white land reclamation and bureau-supervised labor contracts.\footnote{823} 

In most ways, Campbell epitomized the bourgeois temperance reformer who valued self-help, hard work, and sobriety. Unlike most free blacks of his time, Campbell received an education in his youth on par with members of the white middle class and within white middle-class institutions. In the process, notes Duncan, “Campbell learned to deal with white people as a peer rather than as an inferior.”\footnote{824} Raised in this manner, Campbell embraced middle-class reform culture including its penchant for black uplift through labor. As a young New England baker and waiter, Campbell, in his early years had even written his cookbook titled \textit{Hotel Keepers, Head Waiters, and Housekeepers Guide} (1848), which emphasized orderliness through military drills and success through “polite service.” Moreover, Campbell ascribed to food-reformist fears of fermentation and was a partner in Davies and Company, Unfermented Bread Manufacturers located in

\footnote{823} Duncan, \textit{Freedom's Shore}, 29-32.
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Manhattan’s East Village. But Campbell’s sympathy for enslaved blacks and the dynamics of African-American relations informed a radical vision of liberation that was rooted in a belief in the empowering principle of the right to land. In his mind, free blacks helped make the country and through their labor, blacks had a right to the country that was enrich by slavery. For many black abolitionists-- Campbell included, this meant access to the land blacks had worked for generations.

Campbell’s position put him at odds with white abolitionists and businessmen who valorized the idea of a black working class. As historian Karen Taylor explains, though Campbell “embodied the Christian gentleman version of manhood” he nonetheless occupied a different space in the racial and class hierarchy than his fellow white reformers. Campbell’s education and role as preacher granted him status among freedmen, but white men in the same position, were accustomed to “conform[ing] to the expectations of more powerful white men and the peers they wanted as advocates.” It was one thing to preach temperance, fair labor contracts, and hard work, and quite another to preach autonomy, land redistribution, and community farming.

It is worth adding that Campbell’s understanding of temperance was incomplete, that is, lacking the movement’s ideological foundations in the struggle over the definition

825 Zanger, “Campbell, Tunis G.” 87.
of land and property rights. The fact that Campbell’s colony was undone by accusations of intemperance was not simply malicious; it evoked the “intemperate” subsistence farmer as an obstacle to commercial development. It stands to reason that the accusation of liquor distribution need not even be literal, for it was well established that liquor represented the “intoxicating” empowerment of labor unalienated from the land.

Returning to Hale, we can note that his latest scheme failed to catch sufficient interest to make temperance islands a reality. Hale’s proposal for temperance colonies did receive praise from some, because it spared inebriates the humiliation of institutionalization and because it targeted an “undeniable…class with whom the love of drink is to be attributed to weakness of mind.” Investors, however, failed to materialize. The reasons are not totally clear. Perhaps the idea of temperance plantations was a bit too suggestive of indentured servitude or, worse still, slavery. More likely, businessmen saw little to be gained in the venture. By 1877, land in the South was once more secured in the hands of white owners and free black labor was already settling into sharecropping. Moreover, Hale’s settlement schemes had early on developed a reputation for being unprofitable. With the imperative to reform the South on the wane, Hale’s proposal stands out as a dated gamble.

The fact of the matter is that when it comes to reform-oriented profitable ventures another type of temperance colony was already on the make. These too involved land

---
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development schemes in undeveloped spaces, but unlike experiments performed in the South, the new focus was the creation of exclusive temperance utopias marketed to the hopes and dreams of middle-class investors in remaining undeveloped pockets of the northeast and lands to the west.

Early reformers, spurred by the reform enthusiasm of the 1830s and 40s attempted to establish, from scratch, ideal communities devoted to temperance utilizing the medium of exclusive real estate sales. Take, for instance, the community of Delavan, Wisconsin, established by Samuel and Henry Phoenix, devoted followers of E.C. Delavan. The Phoenix brothers purchased land in the undeveloped Wisconsin territory in 1836 and through the sale of property deeds that barred the sale of all intoxicants, established a community free of liquor.\(^{831}\) The experiment worked briefly. Both brothers died before the close of the 1840s and without their force of character and their control over land sales, new settlers arrived and the colony soon wandered from its original temperance covenant.\(^{832}\)

Other attempts materialized at mid-century from frustration associated with problems surrounding Maine-Lawism--the passage of legal measures for prohibition. New England reformers venturing into new territory often found the political route to drydom difficult to navigate and impossible to maintain. Such was the case with John Wesley North, a New York state born minister, lawyer and land speculator. Raised in a family of preachers on “frontier Methodism,” North set out for the frontier of the Old


\(^{832}\) “Temperance House.”
Northwest in the name of liberal reform and to make good on the climate and resources of Minnesota. North entered the territory as a Republican among Democrats-- an uncomfortable position this ambitious land agent sought to address by soliciting sales to the “right sort” of immigrants: temperance-minded Scandinavians and “Northern, liberal Protestants who desired to live a whiskey-free, vice-free, slave-free, care-free community.” North bought and sold acreage, and from his imported political base founded the Minnesota Republican Party. As an elected official to the Territorial legislature and part of the State Constitutional Convention, North ranked among the powerful and influential persons within the territory. Reform-wise, North promoted temperance as president of the Sons of Temperance Society (SOTS) and politically in his promotion of a Maine-Law which was passed by the legislature with a provision for referendum in 1852. He also had a hand in promoting railroad development and the founding of the University of Minnesota. Still, North and the Republicans struggled for control over the territory long dominated by “Fur Democrats”: fur traders, lumbermen, Indian agents and soldiers that controlled land, development and politics prior to his arrival. Moreover, the passage of the dry law did not clean up the territory as North hoped. Indeed, Minnesota’s “rabble” resisted, first with threats of riot in St. Paul when a boatload of whiskey was seized by the Sheriff and a “posse of priests and preachers,” and
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second through participation in a healthy black market. Wets also had on their side the courts. Judge HZ Hayner struck down the law on the basis of a legislative technicality.\textsuperscript{836} North’s goals were further frustrated by discontent among his real estate customers. Like most promoters, North enticed westward migrants with stunning testimonies and images of scenic and bountiful land. Disillusionment typically followed settlement, and with it accusations of profiteering, especially when land titles that passed through North proved insecure.\textsuperscript{837} The ruthless and messy politics of the territory combined with slanderous allegation were all a bit too much for North to bear. According to North’s biographer, Merlin Stonehouse, North’s experience in Minnesota inspired a sharp desire to create ideal settlements composed from scratch of like-minded liberals.\textsuperscript{838} This desire ultimately carried North in the early 1870s to southern California where he purchased land for the establishment of a bonafide temperance colony in anticipation of railroad construction and land boom on the Santa Ana River in what is today the city of Riverside.

Reformers of a similar mindset found inspiration in the establishment of the jewel of temperance colonies: Vineland, New Jersey. The town of Vineland was established in 1861 on 20,000 acres purchased by Philadelphia lawyer and land developer Charles K. Landis. The land Landis acquired was located in the New Jersey Pine Barrens: a stretch of coastal pine forest whose nutrient-scarce soil was long-skirted by commercial farmers, 
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but home to a unique ecology and subsistence communities that farmed and lived off the
sea, harvesting wood, salt hay, and fishing during summer months, and during the winter,
survived by hunting and craft trades. In many ways, the Barrens were reminiscent of
the interrelated ecosystems of old world fens and the liminal space they represented. The
Barrens were a mosaic: patches of spruce and oak forest on sandy acidic soil, with
numerous streams passing through heath and marshland, carrying nutrients out to oyster
beds and fisheries.

During the late nineteenth-century, real-estate frenzy in the barrens, locals provide
labor for clearing the land, but their presence and objections to the wholesale destruction
of the forest on which they depended also posed a challenge to regional development.
In the case of Vineland, encounters with locals spurred prohibitionary measures. Whether
true or embellished, the story goes that Landis, concerned over the use of liquor by local
Pineys hired to clear the woods of his vast holding and by the sale of malt liquors (beer
and ale) by a local merchant, called together a league of concerned citizens against the
traffic. Landis’ and Vineland’s League of like-minded settlers resolved in June 1863 to

ban the sale of drink. Thus prohibition was written into Article 1 of the community’s 1864 Constitution.\footnote{Frank D. Andrews, \textit{The Beginning of the Temperance Movement in Vineland} (Vineland: Vineland Historical & Antiquarian Society, 1911), 5-6, 8, and 14. Accessed Oct. 6, 2014. \url{https://archive.org/details/beginningoftempe00andr}

Vineland represented intelligently planned settlement complete with an “industrial center” surrounded by commercial “farm and fruit lands.”\footnote{Advertisement titled “Vineland: Farm and Fruit Lands,” \textit{American Agriculturalist} 25 (Sept. 1866), 334, accessed Aug. 12, 2014, \url{https://books.google.com/books?id=zeBFAQAAAMAAJ}} The industrial core was essentially a carefully surveyed borough set aside for housing and businesses that Landis sold as highly desirable locations in what he hoped would become a bustling city. Early businesses included a door and window sash factory, glass mill that made use of locally abundant sand, a laundry, hotel, railroad depot and a general store. Vineland’s farms producing strawberries, peaches, and pears, though Landis also advertised the land as suitable for wheat and tobacco.\footnote{Vineland Historical and Antiquarian Society, \textit{Vineland} (Charleston: Arcadia Publishing, 2011), 11, 14, 24-26.} Landis also made a point of promoting the cultivation of grapes—a booming cash crop, but not for fermentation. Rather, the grapes the community produced inspired in 1869, one Dr. Thomas Bramwell Welch, a physician, dentist and Methodist minister living in Vineland, to bottle and market pasteurized grape juice as a health tonic and substitute for fermented sacramental wine. This move spawned the grape juice industry, which in turn supported the proliferation of Concord grapes — a
mediocre-tasting labrusca that was initially promoted in the 1860s by unscrupulous vine
hockers.\textsuperscript{845}

Photographs document the careful development of Vineland from dense forest to
modern city. This process began with the clear-cutting of native trees. The bare stretch of
land that emerged was then carefully divided by grid on which neat rows of houses and
the shade trees of future streets were planted. The result was an orderly residential district
that was strikingly suburban in appearance. Indeed Vineland at mid-century epitomized
produced space absent of disruptive elements: wild spaces, subsistence farming, taverns
and strong spirits.

As noted by Frank Andrews an early secretary of the Vineland Historical Society,
in its founding the decision to prohibit alcohol was considered “a momentious [sic]
question and one on which the future prosperity of Vineland depended” simply because
“a majority of the settlers being in favor of temperance would not care to remain in a
community where such principles did not prevail.”\textsuperscript{846} Notes Andrews, Landis himself
opposed alcohol as the “great destroyer” of towns and cities and for that reason, its sale
was abolished.\textsuperscript{847} Indeed, temperance and the promises it offered stand out as the primary
selling point for the formation of an agricultural colony on what was typically understood
as marginal land.
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Agricultural reports and temperance journals alike sang praises for Vineland. The USDA *Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture* (1870) measured Vineland’s success in booming land prices. The Department of Agriculture was quick to note that the wooded land used to create Vineland, once valued at $5 per acre for its lumber, as of 1869 went for $150 per 50 by 150 foot lot in town, and $500-1500 per acre for farmland—astonishing prices even today. These rates placed the estimated value of the Landis Township at a whopping $7,500,000. The USDA deemed such “enhanced values” as “safer and surer” than any other market, in part due to the colonies’ “preference for temperance principles,” which provided, according to the report, the “best moral influences” offered. Furthermore, these things, combined with railway access and fifteen schools, plenty of religious and educational societies, and the colony’s salubrious northern location, “demonstrated that the colonization of neglected tracts … [could] be made remunerative to all concerned when capital, skill, and judgment are employed.”

Vineland, by the measures of the time, had succeeded in making “waste” productive and generating, at least in abstract terms, incredible wealth in under a decade.

Temperance writers saw in Vineland a promise made manifest. For A.M. Powell, New York lawyer and member of the National Temperance Society, in the wreckage of the Maine Laws, Vineland functioned as an “exhibit” of prohibition’s true promise. The benefits could be seen, according to the lawyer, in Vineland’s limited “police and poor
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expenses” –only $25 for police and $350 for the poor in 1872. The money saved, suggested Powell, generated Vineland’s tremendous prosperity. Support for these claims was supplied by none other than Landis, who Powell quotes as stating:

> These figures speak for themselves, but they are not all. There is a material and industrial prosperity existing in Vineland which, though I say it myself, is unexampled in the history of colonization, and must be due to more than ordinary causes. The influence of temperance upon the health and industry of her people is no doubt the principal of these causes… The settlement has built twenty fine school-houses, ten churches, and kept up one of the finest systems of road improvements, covering 178 miles, in this country. There are now some fifteen manufacturing establishments on the Vineland tract, and they are constantly increasing in number. Her stores in extent and building will rival any other place in South Jersey. There are seventeen miles of railroad upon the tract, embracing six railway stations. The amount of products sent away to market is enormous. The poorest of her people seek to make their homes beautiful.

In sum, temperance not only saved money in prisons and almshouses, it generated health and industry among community members. Abstinence, in this narrative, provided the crucial ingredient for success.

Writers equated the magic of Vineland with Saltaire. Indeed, these two colonies emerge in temperance periodicals as wonders of the world on par with Mount Everest and the great palace of Versaille, as expressed in the following children’s word puzzle featured in the *Methodist Temperance Magazine*, 1880:

```
V  ersaille  S
L   ndi   A
N   ata   L
E   veres  T
L    en   A
```
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As a temperance colony, Vineland attracted an intellectual element and distinguished lecturers on everything from Shakespeare to the works of Herbert Spencer. The colony was home to Rev. William Pittenger, a Methodist minister and skilled “microscopist” who spoke frequently on the revelations of the microscope, as well as author Eliza B. Duffey, a columnist for *Godey’s Ladies Book* and *Arthurs Home Magazine*. Indeed, Vineland functioned as a pilgrimage site for the reform-oriented, who ventured to Vineland to lecture and devote time to literary endeavors. Some, like Duffey, moved on with time. Others, like Prof. Day Otis Kellogg retired in Vineland. Kellogg, having taught history and English literature at Kansas State University and lectured on the preaching circuit, settled in Vineland where he dabbled in municipal affairs and wrote columns for *The Atlantic Monthly, The American,* and *The Critic*.852

Few things inflated temperance hubris quite like Vineland. From their acclaimed perch, Vineland authors took particular interest in studying “the condition of the people.”853 For example, Vineland resident and Unitarian minister Jonathan Baxter Harrison penned *Certain Dangerous Tendencies in American Life, and Other Places* (1880) on the “labor question” and the “principal influences” of national prosperity and
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decay.\textsuperscript{854} The work was primarily a lengthy rant over the sorry state of American religion and the “tendency of the “multitudes …to regard the capitalist… as their natural enemy and prey.”\textsuperscript{855} The solution, as determined by Harrison, required the cultivation of a “national feeling” and revitalization of Christianity. Opines Harrison, (who clearly believed in treating economic ills with religious doctrine); “Christianity must learn how to dry up, in great measure, the sources of the rising currents of pauperism, vice, and crime.”\textsuperscript{856}

In the quest to reform the conditions of the people, Vineland became home to the Vineland Training School, an asylum for so-called feeble-minded children originally founded by Rev. Stephen Olin Garrison at nearby Millville in 1887. In 1888, when a philanthropist living in the colony offered Garrison forty acres of land, the school moved to Vineland where the institution became a center for research and education in the study of feeblemindedness, a presumed hereditary state of curable mental deficiency associated with social deviants and a lower order of human “wild men.” Testing for feeblemindedness was notably prejudiced in favor of scholastic knowledge and a white middle-class cultural literacy. Truly disabled or not, the feebleminded were generally considered a menace to society.\textsuperscript{857} Via training sessions, publications and the Feebleminded Club (founded in 1904), the Vineland school disseminated a vision of
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\textsuperscript{855} Harrison, \textit{Certain Dangerous Tendencies}, 21.

\textsuperscript{856} Harrison, \textit{Certain Dangerous Tendencies}, 14.

\textsuperscript{857} Daniel J. Kevles, \textit{In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity} (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985), 78-81.
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intelligence as a hereditary condition stemming from the moral propensities of certain populations. Alcohol and the frontier conditions of backwoods farmers not unlike the surrounding Pine Barrens, stand out as the paragon for an understanding of intergenerational feeblemindedness established by the Vineland school. This conceptualization of the “moron” as consequence of the alcoholic indulgence of degenerate rural stock is perhaps displayed in the work of Henry H. Goddard who joined the school in 1906 and published in 1912, his infamous study titled, The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness. Complete with doctored photographs, this work featured sinister-looking members of a degenerate family-line that Goddard supposedly traced to a feebleminded barmaid and an otherwise upright Revolutionary war hero. Thus Goddard’s pseudo-science reinforced a popular narrative of national progress gone awry. Intemperance-- illicit sex and alcoholic indulgence with a backwoods maiden doomed one branch of the Kallikak family tree. The manufactured name “Kallikak” spoke volumes. Goddard chose it for its dissonance and Greek meaning: “foul” or “evil beauty”— the temptation behind the hereditary curse. As dubious as it was, the study’s made Goddard a leading crusader in American eugenics. His recommendation: sterilization and “mass incarceration in special colonies.” Goddard’s work directly promoted the mass use of intelligence testing for the identification of
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“eugenically inferior groups”: immigrants, blacks, Native Americans, and the rural poor, all of which typically fell into the country’s “socially maligned” populations.\textsuperscript{861} And, by the 1930s, such notions informed what investigative journalist Edwin Black has called “mountain sweeps,” i.e. police raids of Appalachian farm communities that spirited away young boys and girls to several asylums where they were sterilized against their will before being shipped home or pressed into forced labor.\textsuperscript{862}

The Vineland Training School was linked to two other noteworthy institutions: the New Jersey State Home for the Care and Training of Feeble-Minded Women in the city of Vineland and the Menantico Colony, a 500 acre farm covered in scrub oak on the south side of the Vineland Training School. The home for women provided placement, care and domestic training for older girls in housekeeping and sewing. The farm, purchased in 1912, instructed older boys in the methods of “scientific” farming. As stated by historian Leila Zenderland, the farm featured training in the transformation of the oak-strewn “wasteland into a thriving agricultural community.”\textsuperscript{863} Using state financial support and the aid of Rutgers University, the Menantico colony also served as an agricultural experimental station for egg, poultry, and peach production for the Vineland colony.\textsuperscript{864} Thus, presumed mentally deficient women might be reclaimed for home and industry and men for labor in commercial agriculture in conjunction with the

\textsuperscript{861} Black, \textit{War Against the Weak}, 81, 85.

\textsuperscript{862} Black, \textit{War Against the Weak}, 3-6.


\textsuperscript{864} Zenderland, \textit{Measuring Minds}, 227-228.
transformation of land. Indeed, from all angles, the Vineland asylum projects pivoted on an imperative to reclaim waste: wasted land, minds, and bodies. Eugenic goals by extension were the latest version of the improvement ethic, with all the promise of better breeding previously applied to plants and livestock now applied to people.\textsuperscript{865} Thus, we can say that these colonies complete with their psychiatric institutions epitomize Michel Foucault’s understanding of the asylum as a space in the service of not only “enlightened medicine,” but also a moral order that commanded, often mercilessly, the “subjugation of non-reason” and absolute conformity to one realm of rational thought.\textsuperscript{866} More than a social experiment, Vineland’s conspicuous package of industry, commercial farming, intellectual ferment, and houses of confinement acted as producer and disseminator of temperance-minded middle-class culture.

Vineland inspired imitators most of which found form in the West where speculative interests were drawn to abundant and cheap land. For instance, the city of Lompoc, California, was established as a “New Vineland” in Santa Barbara county, California, on property derived from a subdivided Mexican land grant. George Roberts, Lompoc’s promoter, was born near Utica, New York, where his English-born father owned a farm. As a young man, Roberts worked as a horse driver on the Erie Canal, where he came into contact with “rough elements” and the temptations that Roberts’ came to associate with the undoing of a boy’s character. In the 1850s, Roberts drove stage in New York City, before rejoining his family on a new commercial fruit farm in


\textsuperscript{866} Foucault, Madness and Civilization, ix-x.
Osceola, New York. Ever restless and in search of his fortune, in 1860, Roberts left for the west coast landing for a time in Omega, California, where he sold general merchandise and supplies to mining camps while dabbling in real estate. He repeated this pattern of business in San Jose before, in 1874, selling his various ventures and joining the Lompoc Valley Land Company. As secretary and a land agent for the company, Roberts sold most of the company’s land associated with the Lompoc and Mission Viejo Ranchos. To protect these properties and the town of Lompoc-- most of which Roberts owned-- against the threat of alcohol, Roberts deeded all land sales to settlers with a prohibitionary clause.  

Like Landis, Roberts sought to make money as a land developer who combined town formation and commercial farming. Roberts and other Lompoc residents experimented with promising commercial products including wheat, flax, barley, tobacco, potatoes, walnuts, various vegetable crops, and sheep’s wool. Like Vineland, prohibition in Lompoc was deemed necessary for a vision of success in which profits were intimately linked to sobriety. For the broader temperance community, Lompoc, like Vineland, served as yet another promising social experiment in proving, once and for all, the incomparable role of abstinence as a determiner of socio-economic health. As noted by the Pacific Medical and Surgical Journal in regards to Vineland and “New Vineland,”

867 J.D. Mason, History of Santa Barbara county California (Oakland: Thompson & West, 1883), 287; H.S. Foote, Pen Pictures from the Garden of the World, or, Santa Clara County, California, Illustrated (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company, 1888), 272.

868 “Lompoc Temperance Colony,” Pacific Rural Press 10, no. 3 (July 17, 1875), 84. California Digital Newspaper Collection; Mason, History of Santa Barbara, 287, 292.
From this and the other sources named, we shall soon have statistical returns concerning not only crops and profits, but births and deaths, crime and pauperism, health and disease and longevity, which every medical philosopher and every friend of man will regard with deep interest.  

Proof, dry activists surmised, would be in the numbers.

Other colonies formed up and down the west coast, on the plains, at the foot of the Rockies, and in the Canadian West. As we shall see, the boosters for each advertized similar combinations of inexpensive land, orderly and planned communities, excellent soil for highly-valued cash crops, and commitment to the transformative capacity of technology, capital, and sobriety in converting languishing wilderness into a prolific and profitable landscape. For instance, in California-- a hot-spot for colonization—the citrus towns of Riverside, Garden Grove, and Westminster originated as temperance colonies. Notes historian Gilbert G. González, these colonies drew in “professional, successful, and middle-class people of means, owners of capital, but with little experience in semiarid farming or ranching.” Such settlers were attracted by “master-planned” communities, prepared in advance of colony leaders. This trend gave citrus towns a more “suburban” character denoted by larger populations living on small agricultural estates of a less rural flavor, tidily arranged by grid. Perfectly planned, these and other temperance colonies offered surety—a permanent place in the sun.


The Techno-Utopians

In colonies, temperance intermingled with technological utopianism defined by Howard P. Segal as an “uncritical defense of technology,” an espoused “belief in the inevitability of progress and in progress precisely as technological progress,” and the equation of “advancing technology with utopia itself.”871 As such techno utopianism was, like romanticism, a response to fundamental social problems that “included increasing poverty, unemployment, disease, rural and urban blight, immigration, political corruption, and centralization of economic power.”872 But this form of utopianism, notes Segal, in its technocratic approach had a tendency to distort social problems and consequently offered what proved to be unviable solutions. This evaluation holds true for temperance colonies, which, as we shall see, placed excessive faith in the potential of capital, complicated water works, and sobriety as a route to their vision of a perfect order.

One of the challenges of western settlement involved the limitations of dry farming and indeed the limitations of environment had made viticulture appealing. Some writers of the time, such as James Fowler Rusling, praised the tenacity and thrift of foreign immigrants, especially the “sturdy Rhine-man” who were “as true to freedom as in the days of Tacitus” and “everywhere planting vineyards” that “were sure of handsome returns from petty farms.”873 Temperance colonies from Vineland forward, mimicked the German model. Grapes were cultivated for raisins, juice, or table fruit, by temperance

871 Howard P. Segal, Technological Utopianism in American Culture (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2005), xii, 1.
872 Segal, Technological Utopianism, 6-7.
colonies in the West. One author even suggested that “fresh and dried grapes [were] both favorable to health and frugality” and thus a boon to the temperance farmer. But grape growing came with restrictions. Westminster allowed grape cultivation but only if members “pledged… not to grow grapes for the production of wine and brandy.” For others, including California’s Central Colony, raisin vineyards served as important show pieces. In this instance, four female schoolteachers who combined their resources to purchase a temperance farm, provided colony propaganda with an image of a sure-living even for these independent women, on a twenty acre parcel of land.

But determined temperance colonists had no intention of limited their operations to the grape. Water works provide the vital element for agricultural expansion. Water made Central Colony the “marvel of the desert”—a success despite the failure of earlier colonization attempts. To ensure the colony’s survival, the main irrigation canals were completed in 1875 by the Mills Brothers Engineering firm. Water improvements, special railroad enticements, “high-powered advertising,” and boosterism from the Fresno papers, especially J. W. Ferguson of the Fresno Weekly, editor and colony landholder, attracted a slow but steady stream of settlers.

---


877 Panter, “Central California Colony,” 2.
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Subsistence-oriented peoples had lived throughout the West without irrigation and major water projects for centuries. Teetotalers, however, sought real estate as an investment and a basis of wealth through the most profitable farm industries. Towards these ends irrigation became a magical word afloat in the press, especially the agricultural press. As notes Mark Fiege, the promise of irrigation not only sustained the agrarian dream of turning over a new leaf on fresh land on the frontier, it also represented modern ingenuity in making the “vagaries of nature” abide human will.\textsuperscript{879} Irrigation merged farming with technology, professional engineers, state agencies and corporate power through the construction of monolithic projects. In late-nineteenth-century America, irrigation signified transformation in the divine scheme of things—the ultimate of improvement projects. Asserts Fiege, “irrigators were master technicians whose work realized the inherent potential or purpose of the land.” They were “understudies of the creator” perfecting nature by completing God’s design to make the earth fruitful.\textsuperscript{880}

Water held special significance for temperance. In the early years of the movement water came to signify the perfect drink. The ATS defined water as a “simple beverage” associated with purity, renunciation, and hard work. The organization’s “Eighth Report” (1835) took care to emphasize that nothing quenched the thirsty laborer like “pure, unadulterated” water. Carried to its logical end, ATS arguments went so far as to claim that other drinks, even milk and lemonade, because they were “more palatable” and a tempting alternative to water, had to be scrutinized. As stated:

\textsuperscript{879} Mark Fiege, \textit{Irrigated Eden: The Making of an Agricultural Landscape in the American West} (University of Washington Press, 1999), 17.

\textsuperscript{880} Fiege, \textit{Irrigated Eden}, 23.
While we adhere to this simple beverage we shall be sure to have an unerring prompter to remind us when we really require drink; and we shall be in no danger of being tempted to drink when nature requires it not. But the moment we depart from pure water, we lose this inestimable guide, and are left not to the real instincts of nature, but to an artificial taste in deciding on actions intimately connected with health and long life.  

This “inestimable guide” of temperance—water—signified abstinence from that which one did not presumably need, and perfect measure of what was required for health. In agriculture, the proper application of water constituted an important aspect of agricultural improvement. The drainage of marshland and irrigation of arid land produced acreage from land that was previously deemed desolate, barren, and uninhabitable “waste.” Temperance journals the best managers of land understood the value of moving water about, as noted in an 1843 printing of the *Dublin Journal of Temperance, Science, and Literature*:

A well-conducted system of drainage adds one quarter acre to the produce of arable land. The drainage water of ten acres is nearly sufficient to irrigate one acre; and irrigation adds, at least, a ton of hay an acre to the produce of upland grass land… and yet how little irrigation is practiced in such situations!

The improvement of dry land with water held special significance. Some suggest that dry barrens brought under irrigation would produce exceptional soil. Indeed, to not irrigate was to waste, states one improvement enthusiast, “Ninety-nine streams out of a hundred
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are allowed to flow away unprofitably, a great proportion of which might be turned to account by creating meadow land of permanent fertility.”\textsuperscript{883}

Alcohol, in contrast, represented perdition in the continuation of wilderness and wayward peoples, as seen in the following temperance verse from the 1840s:

Ha! ha! clear the track, boys—we come;  
Our course shall astonish the nation;  
With Brandy, and Whiskey, and Rum,  
We’ll give them hot Hell’s irrigation.

It shall flow where he waters now flow,  
And soon its effects shall be seen;  
The country thus moistened shall show  
A color much darker than green.

Ha! ha! it shall flow, boys, away,  
Through every township and village,  
Nor tarry by night or by day;  
And the Devil will look to the tillage.\textsuperscript{884}

The West stood for waste in want of proper irrigation. In some instances, the presence or lack of irrigation became a point of distinction and debate regarding temperance. For instance, the depopulation of Kansas in the late 1880s and early 1890s, blamed by some on statewide prohibition, was attributed by teetotalers as consequence of “crop failures, caused by insufficient rainfall and lack of artificial irrigation.”\textsuperscript{885} Of course, in this instance, the most blame-worthy were speculators including Charles Dana Wilber who, in

\textsuperscript{883} Martin Doyle, \textit{The Works of Martin Doyle} (Dublin: William Curry, Jun. and Company, 1831), 87. This publication was produced for England’s North and South Wexford Agricultural Association.


1881—the year state prohibition went into effect—suggested that God never intended desert to remain “waste” untouched by agriculture, hence “rain follows the plow.”

Prohibition may not have been the cause of farmer flight from Kansas, but temperance could not so easily be separated from improvement as the animus of occupation and farm failure.

Water, ideologically, was also associated with “unspoiled” nature in a high-minded sense. As historian Carl Smith notes, poems and songs of praise dedicated to water were “related to but different from nostalgia” in that it had less to do with love of the temporal and the countryside than an association of flowery prose with perfect moral sentiment. After all, nostalgia was, in the nineteenth century, considered a disease of rural peoples much like intemperance. Defined as a pathological melancholia bordering on utter despair, nostalgia was constructed by philosophers and physicians in the 1820s and 30s as a “potentially fatal” and “contagious” “malady of memory,” born of an “excess of desire for the past” and for a specific environment: the countryside.


As voiced in temperance hymns, the colonial fantasy was predicated on the assumption that water in its pure simplicity was unique in its capacity to impart robust health on both plants and people. Water held “natural power,” an idea derived from the use of rapidly flowing streams in producing mechanical power for early industry.\(^8^9^0\) Beyond that, the middle-class obsession with modern therapeutics centered on the treatment of illness with water, a method known as hydropathy. Notably, temperance colonies mimicked the social vision of hydropathy, defined as noted by historian Susan E. Cayleff, by the transport of the patient away from home to the mystique of the spa: a place of personal bodily and thus societal rebirth.\(^8^9^1\) The powerful and curative properties attributed to water beginning in the late-eighteenth century, pulled from longstanding religious symbolism (the cleansing role of baptism), a lengthy history of folk pilgrimages to healing waters, water’s centrality in bathing, and its role as a life-sustaining substance. But in its modern form, water cures implied modern medicine, “science,” the feminine (redefined as a source of health and purity, not defilement), and middle-class reform culture.\(^8^9^2\) All of these attributes found form in the temperance colony. Indeed, each colony was advertised a restorative and genial place, free of fevers and ague, with quality water in abundance. For instance, Citrona Colony in California was advertised as


\(^8^9^2\) Cayleff, *Wash and Be Healed*, 18-19.
“unsurpassed for its healthfulness.” South Saskatchewan, Canada, publicized a salubrious climate—dry rolling plains with “sufficient, but not excessive rainfall” and “exhilarating” and “bracing” winters. In addition, investments in physical health were suspiciously equated with economic vigor. Promotional literature for South Saskatchewan included testimonies from settlers on how their health was restored, the superiority of the land and climate, and remarkable success in tillage. The testimony of one settler, R. W. Dulmange, claimed “indifferent health” upon arrival in 1883, but as of 1884 was “completely restored” and blessed with “better crops of wheat, barley, oats, and every kind of vegetable” to boot. Another, Peter Lantham, claimed to have been freed of rheumatism and within a summer, well-set for winter; while Lantham’s fellow settler, R.T. Richardson, urged new arrivals with the promise that “every new settler, cannot fail to succeed.” In sum, we can say that the colony offered an additional allure to the landscape of hydropathy. Whereas one visited the spa, with the colony one moved in with guarantees of health and wellbeing thereafter.

Almost every temperance colony west of the Great Divide had its signature system of water works defined by ditches and canals for drainage and irrigation. Spatially, the predominance of complex monolithic canal systems, first as extension of circuits of trade and transportation, then as a means of irrigation, were part and parcel of the production of a capitalist spatiality.


In transport, canals signified the latest of “watery frontiers,” extending the commercial order into continent. To secure their sober industrious purpose, temperance organization were quick to police the drink habits of people on the water. For instance, the Erie Canal Temperance Society formed in 1835 adrift the Patriot, a steamboat, for the purpose of “induc[ing] boatmen, and canal passengers too, to shun strong drink.”  

Meetings were regular held in passage, inspiring other boats and ultimately canal commissioners to stipulate in labor contracts on existing canals and new lateral canals under construction. Notes historian Ronald Shaw, though impossible to enforce, such attempts at moral regulation functioned to extend modern notions of water and purity, and the uplift measures of reform-oriented burned-over-district into the rural hinterlands of the country. Unsurprisingly the process did not stop in the continental US. The WCTU prided itself for its hand promoting temperance meetings and legislation in the Panama Canal Zone after construction began in 1908.

Notes Michel Foucault, the problem of modernity is the “problem of circulation”—the constant need for movement, exchange, and distribution. And indeed, for theorists within the movement, canals and railway transport were the health of the state, just as blood vessels were the health of the body. “The blood vessels are the
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canals,” asserted one temperance writer and physician, “or what are better, the rail-roads that convey back and forth the commodities which are wanted.”\(^{900}\) Growth in this matrix could only be achieved by spatial displacement—occupying and producing space. By water and rail a new commercial farming order could take shape.

Canals in the agricultural sense made possible the product of a range of thirsty crops: citrus, vegetables, and table fruit. In addition, within and beyond the borders of the colony, members were politically involved in the formation of agricultural experimentation stations and colleges to boost production, address irrigation problems, control frosts in tropical fruit orchards, protect monocrops from proliferating insects and pathogens, counter attendant nutritional deficiencies, and to develop new specialty crops as others failed or markets turned sour. Vineland of course had its experimental station, located in its asylum system. Greeley competed with Fort Collins, Colorado, for the site of an agricultural college, and in fact, NC Meeker went into politics, at least in part, in hopes of securing at college at Greeley.\(^{901}\) Most notably of all, the southern California citrus belt became a hotbed of stations and land grant colleges, the heart of which was Riverside where the citrus industry expanded with the construction of the Gage Canal in the 1880s, the state-funded Citrus Experiment Station in 1907, and University of

\(^{900}\) N.R. Smith, “An Address Delivered before the Temperance Society of Baltimore,” in Smith,\(\) *The Constitution and Address of the Baltimore Temperance Society; to which is added An Address, Delivered before the Society* (Baltimore: J.D. Toy, 1830), 19, accessed Oct. 26, 2014, [https://books.google.com/books?id=nb5YAAAAcAAJ](https://books.google.com/books?id=nb5YAAAAcAAJ) Smith was the Professor of Surgery at the University of Maryland.

\(^{901}\) David Boyd, *A History: Greeley and the Union Colony* (Greeley: The Greeley Tribune Press, 1890), 319. Boyd was an early settler in the colony and quotes Greeley and Meeker’s writings frequently and at length. This book also included many of Meeker’s letters, dairy entries, and reproductions of other colony documents.
California, Riverside, in 1954. Likewise, colony politics and protective associations informed growing interest in state and federally-funded irrigation projects after 1880. All of this contributed to what González identifies as a pattern of boom-bust planting cycles that encouraged over-planting, soil exhaustion, and insect incursion prior to market failure.\textsuperscript{902}

The temperance formula for success was understood by colonists as essential for the establishment of \textit{better} colonies, as in, ones that could surpass other forms of settlement in assembling ideal and profitable communities. From the start, the formation of each temperance colony adopted the transplantation sentiment and organizational imperatives that had been part of colonization since the seventeenth century. The writings of Hale, for instance, traced efforts along New England lines. As with prior circuit riders, northeastern preachers played a conspicuous role as architects of colonies in the west. North was one such preacher, Rev. Lemuel P. Webber was another. Webber, born in Salem County, New Jersey, attended Williams College in Massachusetts. As a young man he migrated west and attended Presbyterian seminary in Dayton, Ohio. For a while he preached in Indiana, before venturing to Nevada in response to the call for the uplift of regional miners. After four years, with a sickly wife and daughter, Webber made plans to move to the salubrious climate of California where he hoped to establish a temperance colony. His wife and daughter died, however, before they were able to make the trip. Webber then married his wife’s sister and together the couple moved in 1869 to Anaheim where Webber preached in a room over a saloon before founding a Presbyterian church.

\textsuperscript{902} González, \textit{Labor and Community}, 46-47.
Anaheim had a small Presbyterian community, but Webber hoped to relocate his congregation to a less seductive setting. In 1870, Webber leapt at the opportunity to act as promoter for the sale of 7000 acres of ranchland held by Abel Stearns, a Southern California landowner and politician, who had risen to power by picking-up and turning over tens of thousands of acres of old Mexican ranchos. By the 1870s, Stearns, attune to real estate trends, moved to cash-in by subdividing his holdings into small parcels for sale in the surging land boom. Webber laid out the townsite and subdivided land into 40 to 160 acre tracts which sold at $13 an acre. Land sold so well that four years later an additional 3,000 acres were opened to prospective settlers. Meanwhile, other sections of the Stearns Ranchos, a total of 200,000 acres surrounding the Anaheim settlement were, as historian James Guinn put it, “thrown into the market” by the Los Angeles and San Bernardino Land Company “hoping to lure a town founder and a group of ready-made settlers.”

The most notorious example of attempts at colonial one-upmanship is to be found in the history of Union Colony, aka Greeley, Colorado. Greeley’s founder, Nathan Cook Meeker, agricultural journalist and land reformer, formulated the idea for a colony while touring west to the Rocky Mountains. Meeker, according to his editor, Horace Greeley, after whom the colony was named in 1870s, was a “practical farmer,” in other words a

903 Jerry Hicks, “Shaping the Future,” *Orange Coast Magazine* (Sept. 2007), 158.
905 Brigandi, *Orange County Chronicles*, 28.
person who stood for progress, the “scientific spirit,” and knowledge of business that appreciated the advantages of irrigation canals and defense of temperance principles.\footnote{Boyd, \textit{A History}, ii, ix-x.}

Despite his reputation, Meeker was a spectacle of disappointment, uncertainty, and wavering loyalties. Meeker was born in Euclid, Ohio, in 1814. A dreamer and writer since childhood with little interest in farming, as a young man he travelled to New Orleans then New York seeking work as a journalist.\footnote{Boyd, \textit{A History}, 12-13.} This wanderer taught and dabbled in fiction and poetry with little success. Consequently, his quest for security and his sorry pocket-book drew him and his young wife to Ohio’s Fourier movement as it blossomed in the 1840s. In 1844, the couple joined a new phalanx known as Trumbull, near Warren on Ohio’s Eagle Creek. The Phalanx of 150 persons contributed to the purchase of an old flour mill on five or six hundred acres of land. On this the colonists planned to build a tannery, shoe-shop, and wooden bowl factory with the understanding that all members would divide the profits of these industries according to Fourier’s complex and controversial system of twelfths: five twelfths to labor, four to investors, and three to administrators, with labor rewarded higher pay and the highest dividend for performing the most arduous and useful work.\footnote{\textit{History of Trumbull and Mahoning Counties}, vol. 2 (Cleveland: H.Z. Williams & Co., 1882), 509.}

Through columns published in Horace Greeley’s \textit{New York Tribune}, Meeker picked up a translated and filtered understanding of the phalanstery as the key to
profitable farming and industry through the cooperative organization of labor.\textsuperscript{909} In essence, the “beautiful spectacle of prosperous, harmonic, happy Phalanxes, dotting the broad prairies of the West” came to represent the latest sure-thing—the answer to the great problem of how to organize industry in line with the democratic principles of the nation.\textsuperscript{910} Meeker himself wrote in 1845, “I have the pleasure of informing the public, through the columns of the \textit{Commercial Journal}, that we consider the success of our Association as entirely certain.”\textsuperscript{911} This optimism was dubious, however. Indeed, there were problems from the outset. Meeker may have boasted certain success, but as of 1845, poor crops and food purchases in the first year set the phalanx back $1000 and upwards of ten families had already abandoned the project, taking their monetary contribution to the community with them. The phalanx needed more members and Meeker knew it. His letters to the press sought them out stating that the phalanx was prepared to receive new members interested achieving that which was only capable of a “spiritual and superior race of beings.”\textsuperscript{912}

Meeker continued to solicit members for Trumbull through the press with glowing testimonies though the project was strained by debt, a “disagreeable fever”,

\textsuperscript{909} Peter R. Decker, “\textit{The Utes Must Go!”} American Expansion and the Removal of a People (Golden: Fulcrum Publishing, 2004), 75.


\textsuperscript{912} “N.C. Meeker to the Pittsburg Journal,” 69.
heavy workloads, and disputes over unequal pay.\textsuperscript{913} In the end, the phalanx had neither sufficient money nor sufficient numbers and consequently it dissolved within four years. Truth was most of Trumbull members resembled Meeker: people of limited means and success.\textsuperscript{914} But after the fact, an embittered Meeker pointed the finger at the collective model and the environment as diseased. According to the would-be reformer, Trumbull’s marshy creek was blamed for the recurring fever epidemic and though all members, including the women, bore heavy workloads and had to “live poorly, dress homely, and listen calmly” to the complaints of organizers, Meeker blamed the whole for shiftlessness and most families as burdensome for being too large.\textsuperscript{915} Perhaps unsurprisingly Meeker’s own colonial undertakings would stress a proper climate, capitalization, and members carefully selected for their sobriety and work ethic.

After Trumbull, Meeker worked a small vegetable farm and fell into debt before coming across sufficient money, possibly via relatives, to open a store in Hiram, Ohio. The store thrived, ironically, from liquor sales. According to historian Peter R. Decker, Meeker as an upright temperance man, displayed no discomfort with his source of success. Indeed, this was but one instance that revealed Meeker to be a walking contradiction. Others include a closet opium habit, questionable bookkeeping, and the


\textsuperscript{914} Yaacov Oved, Two Hundred Years of American Communes (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1993), 138-139.

completion of a quirky lackluster novel, *The Life and Adventures of Captain Jacob D. Armstrong* (1852), a satirical tale of a ship captain who brought civilization to a land of savages.⁹¹⁶

In Hiram, Meeker heard of the Rocky Mountains via Mormons he encountered. He dreamed of travel, profit, and new social experiments, but with 1857 depression and war, the financially ruined Meeker family moved to southern Illinois to run a small store and farm. After the war Meeker went to New Jersey to become an agricultural reporter for the *New York Tribune*. This new line of work offered the journalist opportunities to travel and view a wide-range of settlements and colonial experiments as he contemplated his own dream community.⁹¹⁷ The moment could not have been timelier. New railroad lines had opened the land around the Rockies to settlement. The Denver Pacific and Kansas Pacific Railroads entered into contract with the National Land Company and seeking settlers along newly laid lines, advertised extensively and strategically in the Colorado press and the *Star of Empire*, an advertisement magazine, with emphasis on regional potential for colonies.⁹¹⁸

In 1869 Meeker travelled, writing extensively on the Oneida commune, Mormon Utah and the small towns of the Midwest. His critiques on Oneida gained Meeker a reading audience. Meanwhile, the Mormon settlement strategy piqued Meeker’s interest
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⁹¹⁶ Decker, *“The Utes Must Go!”* 72, 76-78; N.C. Meeker, *The Life and Adventures of Captain Jacob D. Armstrong* (New York: Dewitt and Davenport, 1852).


in colonial development through modern irrigation projects. In contrast, the author disparaged German towns as backward and insufficiently industrious. He states,

The progress of towns settled by Germans has been exceedingly slow,… a large admixture of Germans is far from favourable to rapid development. It is true that they build up a village or town after their fashion, and that they slowly make money; but they do not branch out into business and manufactories. It seems by their beer-drinking and convivial habits they are made unfitted for engaging in enterprising industries, and incapable of understanding what American progress means.

In addition to the influence of alcohol and “convivial habits,” Meeker attributed this German “failure” to racial tendencies and the influence of Catholicism, the cathedrals of which sprang up and presumably nipped in the bud, any town of promise. Regardless, the writer was certain that the English language, religion and habits would ultimately prevail given Anglo racial strength. This was merely a matter of sufficient Yankee migration.

Having circled the west via railroad, seeing Mexicans, Germans, Irish, and “wild” Indians, Meeker arrived in Denver. The mountains he long found enchanting from afar captivated his imagination despite being plagued with the “poor Indian” who robbed and murdered local ranchers. The city of Denver was of primary interest to Meeker who reveled at its population of 7000 “sober” and “upright” men going about their business in “a brusque rapid way.” For an agricultural journalist, Meeker’s focus was strikingly industry-oriented. Meeker was a man enraptured by a city he described as a nascent Chicago and a future of limitless growth thanks to a healthy climate, the stretch of

---


endless fertile prairie, local water power, timber, coal and valuable mineral deposits, and
the nervous energy he associated with success.

Upon returning to New York in December, Meeker called the first meeting for the
settlement of a colony of “high moral purposes” at the foot of the Rockies. Toward this
purpose Meeker advertised for the right sort of setters: ambitious men with capital. States
Meeker:

The persons with whom I would be willing to associate must be temperance men,
and ambitious to establish a good society, and among as many as fifty, ten should
have as much as $10,000, or twenty $5,000 each, while others may have $200 to
$1,000, or upwards.923

In design, the village model was maintained for social cohesion, but otherwise settlement
would proceed as had occurred in New England towns –not as collectives, but rather as
“cooperatives”, with private property maintained and the best lots sold at auction, first
come, first serve.924 Greeley settler David Boyd summed up the role of individual
interests in the colony thusly, “Even those who only worked for selfish ends and devoted
no time to the general welfare in making their own careers successful, also to that extent
made the colony successful.” Indeed, Boyd was critical of those that waited for the
colony to become a success, while others made it so by pursuing self-interest.

Cooperation, in this sense meant those that “took the hint, and either went to work, or
betook themselves elsewhere.”925

923 Boyd, A History, 32. Quote from one of Meeker’s circulars.


Land was secured by a committee headed by Meeker to be divided into expansive farmsteads for distribution among shareholders. The process of land acquisition points to another site of departure from prior forms of settlement. Using shareholder funds, the colony Locating Committee aimed to purchase as much land as possible in anticipation that the presence of the colony would rapidly elevate land prices. The land, however, already had occupants: nomadic Utes and a number of hard-scrabble pioneer “squatters”- -homesteaders who had prior claim to the land. The committee paid little attention to the Utes who they assumed would simply fade from existence as civilization claimed land for cultivation. As for the squatters, the committee took “utmost caution... in order to be able to purchase out the old settlers before they knew that the site had been fixed there,” for “only persons of the character designated in Mr. Meeker’s call” qualified as colonists, “and it appeared to them that the old settlers as a body could hardly be considered eligible.”\footnote{Boyd, \textit{A History}, 42.} This land was quietly purchased at the lowest rate possible and without disclosure of development plans. For example, David Barnes sold his 126 acre farm to the committee for $1100--$.87 per acre as compared to railroad land purchased at $3 to 4 per acre, and government land at $.90 per acre.\footnote{Boyd, \textit{A History}, 43. The original price for the Barnes homestead was $1269.80 but David’s son, Samuel, to whom the farm was recently deeded, brought suit against the colony and won. The colony was supposed to pay a compromise price of $2000, but only paid $1100—even less than the original price, as instructed by Greeley’s attorney, Henry M. Teller.}

The treatment of local farmers by the committee falls in line with established assumptions regarding frontier farmers. In the US, squatting had a lengthy history that ran from the formation of the inland subsistence paradigm to the Homestead Act of 1862,
which recognized, however problematically, squatter’s rights—the idea that through their labor farmers had a right to land. But the temperance movement across time associated squatting with unwashed bacchanals and an older production system that stood in the way of the new commercial order. In Scotland, the squatter elicited the image of the subsistence community of the Highland Village, those “drunken holes,” “environed by woods and waters, rugged rocks, and towering hills.” The inhabitants of these spaces, the “Aimless, lazy, dirty, intemperate, and with little or no knowledge of domestic economy,” notes one Scottish reformer, cruelly armed and “barelegged, squatted amidst the filth in front of their miserable hovels.”

P.T. Winskill identified squatters as a “pioneer element” born of the transportation of “convicts” into Britain’s many colonies, where, in the interest of progress, they became subject to taming by churches and societies in the nineteenth century. During the early 1800s, the American movement formed in the context of commercial opposition to frontier squatters, including Whiskey Rebels and Liberty Men. And after the Civil War in the West, this element represented the promise and dangers of “squatter sovereignty”; namely, local jurisdiction in the rejection or support of local options for prohibition. The people were drinkers and public sentiment fickle, which meant that if prohibition was to succeed, the masses had to first be “set straight” by education.

In cities, squatters became associated with an army of
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930 “Hall of Columbus, Tuesday Afternoon, June 6, 1893 (World’s Temperance Conference),” in *Temperance in all Nations: Papers, Essays, Discussions, Addresses, and Histories of the World’s Temperance Congress held by the National Temperance Society, in Chicago, ILL., June, 1893*, ed. John
the unemployed who “squatted down” and idly made a living by “retailing intoxicating
drinks.”

931 Others compared licensing of retailers as on par with granting land rights to a
squatter with an implication of theft or cost to the public, as expressed in the American
Temperance Magazine, “that their [venders] rights are but at sufferance like those of a
squatter.”

Squatting was suggestive of something else: native peoples which Francis
Willard, future president of the WCTU described as

Unkempt, uncleanly, huddled together in squatting attitude, with untaught hands,
brains cobwebbed by superstition, and bodies diseased by strong drink; without
habits of industry, instincts of home, and knowledge of Christianity.

Working from this and similar visions, female reformers of the late nineteenth century
would seek both European-American squatter and “heathen for her [the female
crusader’s] inheritance” and “these uttermost parts of the earth for her possession.”

It is worth noting that this construct of human worth hinged on a person’s
figurative relationship to soil. The “upright” and “industrious” are discursively distanced
from the earth while the lowly and undeserving crouched upon its surface. Intemperance
signified an attachment to a condition and a place in comparison to ever-moving

Newton Stearns (New York: The National Temperance Society and Publication House, 1893), 105,

931 “Public-Houses,” in The Temperance Cyclopaedia, ed. William Reid (Glasgow: Scottish Temperance

932 “The License System—What is it Worth?” in The American Temperance Magazine and Sons of

933 Frances Elizabeth Willard and Mary Artemisia Lathbury, Women and Temperance: Or, The Workers of
the Women’s Christian Temperance Union (Hartford: James Betts & Co., 1883), 505.

934 Willard and Lathbury, Women and Temperance, 505.
commerce. Progress—the making of a temperance colony—entailed displacing prior inhabitants, a process rationalized by the “ineligibility” of natives and pioneers in the modernizing project.

As for Greeley’s comparison with German settlements, the Union Colony has enjoyed a favorable historical reputation as a superior settlement thanks to the work of James F. Willard whose history, *The Union Colony at Greeley, Colorado, 1869-1871* (1918) conspicuously juxtaposed Greeley with a short-lived “communist” colony established by the German Colonization Company at Colfax in southern Colorado’s Wet Mountain Valley.\(^{935}\) Willard’s narrative strategy directs attention to organizational forms in a manner that dismisses collective models as inferior to “cooperatives” such as Greeley where members, as independent economic entities defined by private property holdings, shared common cultural goals and the cost of irrigation projects and the like. But the dichotomy was forced and reinforced popular treatment. Greeley and the German colony represent only two of several colonization projects in Colorado of varying degrees of success. Some colonies—Wyandotte and Fountain, Willard dismissed as not true colonies because they lacked Union’s degree of cooperative development in combined agriculture and town formation and irrigation ditch construction.\(^{936}\) Union, notes Willard, became the model for colony formation in Colorado, birthing, as it were, three more colonies of relative success: the Chicago-Colorado Colony, the St. Louis-Western Colony, and the
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\(^{935}\) James F. Willard, *The Union Colony at Greeley, Colorado, 1869-1871* (1918), see xiv-xvi of the Introduction for Willard’s understanding of these two colonies.

\(^{936}\) Willard, *The Union Colony*, ix, xv.
South Western Colony, at Longmont, Evans, and Green City, respectively. Together with Union Colony, these experiments turned the “spectacular growth” of Greeley” into a new mode of development that “overshadows the advances made” by independent outlying farms.

There were others colonies that went unmentioned in Willard’s work. The Hebrew Immigration Aid Society, which recruited Russian Jews for a colony in Cotopaxi in the 1870s failed miserably, as did the Holland American Land and Immigration Company’s Dutch colony in San Luis Valley, founded in 1892. The 1890s Salvation Army Fort Amity Project, which tried to simultaneously transplant and uplift poor urban immigrants in Colorado, enjoyed brief success before salinization from irrigation irreparably degraded its soil. In contrast, the Mormon colony founded in the San Luis Valley in 1877 successfully established a Mormon enclave using the distinct Mormon pattern “in effect weaving once more the fabric of religious, social, and economic practices that,” as historians Leonard J. Arrington and Davis Bitton note, “had become characteristic of rural Mormon life.” Adding these to the mix muddies Willard’s colonial evaluation. Failure was a common problem of colonization. The above colonial mishaps were generally speaking not collective in nature, though Fort Amity did farm and work collectively through its first season in order to break ground and construct

---
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938 Willard, The Union Colony, xxiv.


buildings—labor that required many hands. Notably, sober-industriousness, private property, town formation and irrigation ditches did not necessarily guarantee success. Nor were respected temperance organizations such as the Salvation Army in this instance accused of communism.

Aside from the omission of other colonial experiments, Willard’s representation of the German colony as “communist” deserves scrutiny. Colony founder, Carl Wulsten, philanthropist, newspaper editor, and retired Union Army colonel, understood the venture as a “philanthropic plan of co-operation” organized on a “militia” model defined by “mutual existence” for pragmatic purposes. In joint-stock company fashion, the Colfax colony was established on collective grounds for the first five years as a means to an ends—for initial construction and groundbreaking that required many hands and for the colonization of poor men of limited substance who could not otherwise afford the cost of migration and settlement (calculated at $690 by Wulsten). Funds raised served placement, provisioning and land development. Mutual security was another motivating factor in colony design. The land under question being of mixed quality –


“good farming land… stony grazing land… and timber land,” settlement of individual homesteaders would have left settlers “spread over many miles up and down the sixty miles long valley.” Thus, Wulsten devised a compact village structure for mutual security against “depredations committed by Indians and wild beasts.” Finally, the society would organize all farming and business until the five year deadline when the property was to be divided for individual economic independence.

It’s important to note that Wulsten was no radical. Wulsten edited the *Staats Zeitung*, one of three Chicago German newspapers of the 1870s. *Staats Zeitung* was Republican, in comparison to the Democratic *Neue Freie Presse*, and *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, a socialist working-class paper. Working from Republican military mindset and his own brand of boosterism, Wulsten believed that an efficient form of settlement would benefit individual and country. He argued for his settlement plan as a means to develop new territories “in less time than the ordinary way”—by which we are to presume individual settlement. In studding the West with taxable, “prosperous towns, booming villages and industrious hamlets,” draining cities of their “surplus of poor inhabitants,” and “bringing happiness and plenty upon the now, comparatively speaking, waste lands of the great American plateau,” Wulsten couched the project as altogether beneficial for the nation.

Similar to its Anglo counterparts, process of settlement would also be regimented.

944 Carl Wulsten to Albert Philipp, 2-3.
Historian Robert S. Fogarty reminds us that the conditions for membership as detailed in the Colfax constitution were “liberal” in nature. To participate, German immigrant applicants need be of “good moral character,” sound health, working age (twenty-one to forty-five years), and capable of contributing $250 to the venture.\textsuperscript{947}

Greeley and Colfax embarked for settlement at approximately the same time and with much fanfare, a point that emanates from Willard’s history. As competitors on the stage of western settlement, however, Colfax was resented by old stock Yankees already in the territory. For Denver Anglos and Greeleyites, Colfax migrants represented the wrong sort of Republicans.\textsuperscript{948} Ethnic-orientation was the foundation for this narrow-minded partisanship. The settlers were ethnically German and Wulsten openly advertized that once Colfax found its feet “hundreds of other German colonies would follow the example of this one.”\textsuperscript{949} Resentment was heightened by the fact that Wulsten was able to procure a military escort and aid in transporting the German colonists to their destination to set up their homesteads while they waited for word on their petition for land. For instance, the editor of the \textit{Colorado Chieftain} complained vociferously that this “Teutonic” invasion received preferential treatment over old stock colonists who struggled without assistance. States the editor:

\begin{quote}
…we who have lived here for ten or twelve years; before the days of railroad; when the population was sparse, and surrounded by hostile Indians... found it extremely difficult … But now, when a party of emigrants propose to ride across
\end{quote}
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\textsuperscript{949} Carl Wulsten to Albert Philipp, 4.
\end{flushleft}
the plains… and travel thense to their destination through a thickly settled country, over a road filled with freight teams, and a daily line of couches running over it, past two military posts,… a man goes to Washington and proposes to come out here and makes a settlement, and call it after the name of the Vice-President of the United States [Schuyler Colfax], he is rewarded with immediate smiles, the ear of the Government is bent listening, and the great Secretary of War is made to come down, and he forthwith sends orders to military posts all along the line to furnish escorts of troops, arms and rations, to cover the march of these Teutons along through the peaceful cornfields of Pueblo and Fremont counties.\textsuperscript{950} 

German immigrants, the established “barbarian hoard” of the upper Midwest, by the 1870s were perceived by anxious Anglos of the Colorado Plateau as an existential threat on par with Rome’s Teutonic rival.

As a colony, Colfax was short-lived for multiple reasons. Its members, factory workers with no experience in farming, much less dry, high-altitude farming, struggled to procure a crop. Wet Mountain Valley turned out to be not so wet after all and the colony was quickly overcome with the logistical problems of irrigation. To make matters worse, an early frost spoiled their crops and the storehouse holding their rations burned to the ground.\textsuperscript{951} Acrimony set in. Then Wulsten’s petition for the company land grant failed. Notably, Wulsten had requested 40,000 acres under the territorial squatter law of the Homestead Act which had no provision for collective parcel requests. The petition essentially called for an amendment to the law that only allowed individuals to file homestead claims. At this point the company dissolved because it had no claim to the land.\textsuperscript{952} This is an important point because railroad companies and speculators could and

\textsuperscript{950} Goodykoontz, “The Settlement of Colorado,” 446-447, quote from the Colorado Chieftain, Feb. 24, 1870.

\textsuperscript{951} Fogarty, All Things New, 56.

\textsuperscript{952} Goodykoontz, “The Settlement of Colorado,” 444.
did acquire large swaths of acreage for construction, subdivision, and sale via similar grant requests. Meanwhile, most of the 300 plus original colony members left, but thirty families remained on homesteads that became successful farms. For this reason Wulsten believed the colony was a success, at least in part, though his detractors declared it a failure.\textsuperscript{953} Meanwhile Greeley nearly succumbed to a host of problems, some analogous to the difficulties faced by their German neighbors, which will be discussed shortly. The point is that Colfax as a colony broke up due to inexperience with tillage, unexpected tragedy, logistical difficulties, legal technicalities and the predictable discord of a vexed situation. If collectivist failed, it was because policy and circumstances were stacked against it.

But by far the larger issue is rhetorical. The idea that collectivity, even in a limited sense, could simultaneously be bound to fail and a looming threat, speaks of a general hostility to anyone that broke form with existing definitions of property acquisition and ownership as a path to development. Moreover, German ethnicity by the 1870s was associated with communal endeavors that competed with Yankee individualism, even when their politics did not fit neatly into any particular ideology. Of course, all colonies were cooperative in nature. Colonies across the gamut were meant to off-set individual expense, provide community, and ensure the security for the whole. All entailed forms of collective labor for breaking ground, construction, and/or irrigation ditch-digging. Reservation of the term “communist” for Colfax served to stigmatize the

\textsuperscript{953} Goodykoontz, “The Settlement of Colorado,” 444, 448.
venture. The term “cooperative,” in turn, valorized specific models of Anglo social experimentation.

Hopes, Fears, and Private Property

One definitive aspect of temperance colonies was their commitment to the sanctity of private property for idealistic and speculative reasons. Temperance colonists may have been idealists, but they were also speculators in search of promising investments, preferably without the usual risk. For this reason, they rationalized reform—especially temperance—as value added to property. The equation of the two was as rooted in hope as it was in fear. For instance, Landis, Vineland’s developer, understood the prospect of his own profits as dependent on the individual prosperity of setters on his tract. To encourage settlement growth and industry to take hold, Landis fretted over every detail of colony. *Fraser’s London Magazine* in 1875 documented the centrality of the threat of failure in the impulse to micromanage Vineland as speculative venture. Exuding unease, Landis explained for paper’s readers his sense of imperative thusly:

My own profits depended upon this. If the people did not individually prosper, the Settlement would cease to increase or spread, land would not sell, and the result would be a financial failure. I therefore had to deliberate carefully upon all possible things which would benefit the settler directly or indirectly, develop industry, protect it—make the improvements of one man, in usefulness and beauty, redound to the benefit of each neighboring man, make families contented by giving them religious and educational privileges, supply them with information as to the best things to cultivate, and how to do it, secure them facilities for transporting their goods to market at the lowest possible prices, keep down all local trade monopolies, which would take money from the people without adequate return. In short, selling land to them was but the beginning of the
business; without their prosperity the sale of land would soon stop, before a fifth of my immense purchase could be taken up. 954

Although many admired Landis for his involvement, not everyone appreciated his obsessive micromanaging efforts. Landis had enemies: Pineys dispossessed by sprawling development plans and settlers deemed unfit after the fact, for Landis used his power as founder to cancel leases and confiscate property at whim. Resentment against “King Landis” found voice in Uri Carruth’s Vineland Independent, a newspaper set in opposition to Landis’ own news publication. 955 Carruth and his family had relocated to Vineland from Wisconsin, in hopes of benefiting from the town’s lauded “healthful climate,” but Carruth found himself at odds with Landis over colony management. 956 Finally, after one particularly pejorative article, Landis walked to Carruth’s office and shot him in the back of the head. Several months later, after Carruth died, the Landis murder case became the trial of the century. Landis’ defense claimed temporary insanity and won. In fact, the defense used Landis’ critics and his unconventional reputation to his benefit, suggesting that Landis carried some wayward genes from a “mad” grandfather and indulged in wine upon occasion. 957 Journalist Jon Blackwell notes that there was something a little idiosyncratic about Landis, but it was the brand of crazy that merged

957 Bennett “Jury finds Charles,” and Blackwell, Notorious New Jersey, 42.
speculation with a visionary spirit.\textsuperscript{958} Idiosyncrasies aside, we should note that the criterion for temporary insanity was, in effect, a combination of assumptions about alcohol and heredity propagated by the temperance and asylum movement. In this particular case, however, the defendant’s social standing suggested nonpermanent diminished capacity that placed him beyond punishment for an act of murder committed in defense of his reputation as a developer. Not surprisingly, the trial outcome represented for many an egregious example of how the justice system treated classes differently. Indeed, the whole affair did little to assuage the widely held belief that, as Attorney General Jacob Vanatta asserted, if Landis was insane, his insanity was one that “never occurs with anyone unless he is very rich or holds some high social position.”\textsuperscript{959} Landis walked away, a bit humiliated yet free to develop more land and make more money.

Promotional efforts aside, securing prohibition as a way of securing property values was not necessarily easy or effective. Eliminating liquor in temperance colonies over the long haul was not feasible for several reasons. For one, even carefully screened members had tendency to break the rules. For instance, Boyd chaffed at habits that brought reproach on the colony; namely, the fact that several “anti-liquor men never refused to drink when away from Greeley, and many of them keep it in their houses and treat their friends to it there.”\textsuperscript{960} And of course if Landis’ defense was truthful, even
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Landis did not abide by his own strict prohibitionary creed. Second, because temperance colonies did not exist in isolation, alcohol trickled in from outside. Wet neighbors and the migrant labor required in the production of specialty crops favored by colonists made the enforcement of prohibition difficult. Notes historian Steven Bogener, the West was “open territory”—laborers, making their way from one camp or town to another had access to beer, whiskey, and saloons whose wares they carried about.961

Concomitantly, colonies displayed marked antipathy toward non-temperate neighbors and seasonal workers. Tellingly, as colonies formed they were forced to come to terms with an important element that had been omitted in colony formula, that is, labor. Protestant work ethic notwithstanding, the type of settler drawn to temperance colonies were generally unfamiliar with the labor demands of agriculture. For instance, Vineland attracted a middle-class set that knew little about farming and were generally disinclined to manual labor. These Vinelanders bought up parcels in the borough, leaving a lot of real estate that Landis intended for agriculture, undeveloped. To address the lopsided nature of colonial settlement, Landis advertised through the New York Italian press for immigrants willing to settle in “East Vineland” or “New Italy,” a separate colony next door to Vineland.

Soaring prices barred most immigrants from purchasing land so many became part of the working poor of America’s cities. Landis, in a paternalistic fashion, generally felt that the peasant immigrant would fare better and serve the country better if directed

into commercial agriculture. By 1877, 56 parcels were sold with most purchasing tracts of 20 acres for $20-25 per acre and 6% interest. As a colony, New Vineland, unlike Vineland, lacked an industrial center. As far as Landis was concerned this would be a strictly agricultural colony. The plan was not, however, geared towards immigrant self-sufficiency or economic independence through land ownership. Most the Italian settlers worked side jobs as berry pickers or in Vineland’s factories. Additionally, Italian settlers did not receive the same degree of aid in developing their land, and notably, the land in New Vineland was marginal. Many tracts were either sandy or swampland which needed to be drained by the settler. Maintaining the workload and earning a sufficient income was not easy. Consequently, by 1890, many of these tracts had transferred to Anglo owners.962

Inviting Italian peasants to grow grapes and other fruit posed another challenge. Though Landis sought upstanding temperate settlers, Landis’ ethical requirements did not prevent this labor force from doing what they did best: convert grapes into wine. In fact, East Vineland settlers managed to produce wine “in commercial quantities” and one German immigrant, Peter Lenk, openly operated a winery, at least until the region’s vineyards were destroyed by black rot in the late 1880s.963

Lacking an internal pool of labor colonies typically relied on migrant workers and neighboring “wet” communities that became subject to colony reform efforts. In Vineland, Dr. Welch led a dogmatic assault on neighboring the towns of Millville and

Bridgeton that force out venders. Residents of Bridgeton responded in kind, resisting
the trial of saloonkeepers and closure of dram-shops with rioting. In Lompoc,
animosity to the persistent threat of alcohol fueled extreme violence. According to J.D.
Mason’s *History of Santa Barbara county California* (1883), Lompoc residents came to
dread harvest time when “deadfalls” (makeshift corner grog-shops) appeared and strained
the town’s commitment to temperance. The local paper, the *Lompoc Record*, stoked the
flames against the intrusion, calling for a militant response with special police and
methods of confinement:

Sheep-shearers will soon be here in considerable numbers to receive and spend
their wages. If much of it goes for whiskey, as it nearly always does, we ought to
have some special constables sworn in, a calaboose erected, and a night watchman
employed. Harvest will be at hand shortly, and every one [sic] knows what a
terror a rumhole is at that season of the year. 

Harvest, the traditional time for feasting and celebration, had become a time of class
antagonism. Meetings were held at in local churches for a planned assault against the
“common enemy”—the threat of migrant labor and drink to “community and the safety
of property.”

Harvest time reveals the paradoxical processes of fragmentation and
homogenization with the spatial organization of labor in the colony system. Controlling
functions were internal but field workers were geographically alienated—they literally
had no place, or only a marginalized or temporary place, within the community. This was


true to some degree within many non-temperance colonies, including wine colonies such as Anaheim, and indeed these spatial arrangements across the board stressed class and cultural differences.\textsuperscript{967} But the added element of temperance policing in colonies such as Lompoc augmented domination and exploitation within production by simultaneously associating labor’s presence with the illegality and criminality of drinking spaces which we can views as an example of what Lebvre called differential space—space that existed at odds with “trends toward homogeneity.”\textsuperscript{968} Overall, temperance colony dynamics can be viewed as yet another spatial strategy of capital accumulation that utilized the enforcement of prohibition as a way of accentuating and suppressing difference. In addition, within the national context this strategy mirrored broader trends in which class relations were materially constituted through the alienation of laborers from the soil.

Next to arrests, Lompoc’s preferred method of dealing with the threat of drink to “dry” property entailed explosives and the physical dismantling of any property associated with alcohol. In the first eight years of its existence, undisclosed and unpunished culprits bombed two structures—one hotel and a saloon, and temperance crowd actions emptied one drugstore of liquor and dismantled a second saloon.\textsuperscript{969}

The first offending premises, Green’s Drug Store, was stormed by axe wielding women in March of 1875. Then in 1881, the Lompoc Hotel was blasted to pieces in the middle of the night by a bomb. The owner, G. Butchart and his wife subsequently fled
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when they found an explosive devise under their bed. Shortly after, a bomb blast
took out George Walker’s saloon. Again, in 1885, a second saloon run by George Drumm
was pulled to pieces by a crowd action as Drumm and his patrons stood by helpless,
threatened by prominent resident JW Saunders, with death if they interfered.
Nevertheless, a third saloon appeared shortly thereafter. Its owner, John Quincy Adams
Spooner, endured arson and bombing attempts, and landed in prison for six months under
the spurious charge of swimming in inadequate attire. Reformers also took to searching
the homes and premises of rumored dealers and threatened to tar and feather future
venders. These tactics made Lompoc a celebrity in the temperance press. The Union
Signal in 1883 stated with glee,

Some time ago some lawless mortals attempted to violate this [the temperance
clause] and a ‘visitation’ overtook them so rapidly that it was fortunate they
escaped with their lives. Another dastardly attempt was made recently, and on
Saturday there was a citizen’s mass meeting in front of the newly opened saloon.
Hundreds of men and women assembled, a good portion of them coming many
miles from all over the valley. There were singing, prayers, speeches, and
exhortation to the rum sellers in true crusader style.

Notes the Union Signal, the temperance element having surrounded the saloon, offered to
pay the two owners for the building’s wood as material for “a rousing bonfire.” The two
men refused and the crowd of men, women and children tore down the building against
the owners’ will.

---
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The emergence of “wet” properties in Lompoc and elsewhere exposed problems with property-based covenants. As property continued to change hands, new deeds did not necessarily uphold old temperance agreements. Nor did temperance covenants stand up to legal scrutiny. In Lompoc, temperance provisions attached to deeds were nullified shortly after the town’s founding because they failed to “specify to whom the property would revert in case of violation.”

This made all of the above temperance actions extralegal—the latest form of community vigilantism. Drumm filed suit against Saunders and three others—an attempt at legal retribution that also failed when the local jury fell in line with the defense’s argument that a town meeting (not a mob) had dismantled the structure.

In addition there were, of course, always borderlands where covenants ended abruptly and arbitrarily. A prime example for this can be found in the source of Greeley’s 1870s “whiskey riot.” Within a year of the colony’s founding a Prussian brewer named Frederick Neimeyer leased a sod house on land not held by the colony, yet “in the Union Colony’s backyard.” In this space, Neimeyer established a saloon. Upon learning of the business, a committee of three men from the colony met with Neimeyer who agreed to close shop in exchange for $200 to cover the expense of his lease. But before this transaction was completed, another faction led approximately 200 colonists to the saloon where someone set the structure ablaze. Legally Neimeyer and the owner of the sodd...
were in the right, but attempts to bring riot and arson charges against a handful of Greeleyites, including N.C. Meeker’s son Ralph, failed. Court paperwork mysteriously disappeared and although 200 people were present, it was difficult to find witnesses willing to testify against the accused.\textsuperscript{975} Such cases fell within a deeply ingrained history of intimidating and violent vigilantism in the US, and more specifically to the temperance movement dating back to the 1830s. As with other forms of vigilantism, temperance actions were instrumental in protecting and defining the nature of property.\textsuperscript{976} Like a microcosm of the nation-state, extralegal violence served as an ideological vanguard—a way of orchestrating control beyond the boundaries and the limits of law. It is also important to note that local courts willingly entertained and reinforce vigilantism despite its illegality.

Temperance settlements also had to compete with other settlers that bordered their tracts for resources. In some cases, the competition posed by dry new-comers undermined the control of resources by prior settlements. For instance, the mushrooming of sober citrus colonies with the introduction the South Pacific Railroad in the 1870s helped fracture Anaheim’s water monopoly. By diverting water from the Santa Ana River, colonies in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties caused a shortfall of water to Anaheim’s homes, businesses and fields. Colonies on the opposite side of the Santa Ana in what would become Orange County also used their land claims to divert water. In this
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instance, Yankee settlers were willing to defend land-associated water rights with shotguns and bowie-knives if necessary. The Germans responded with litigation against San Bernardino County’s Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company but lost the case when the official county records for the Anaheim’s water company, incorporated under the Los Angeles Vineyard Society, went missing.977

But competition for space could as easily undermine the expansion of temperance prerogatives. Consider the case of Riverside in Southern California. Riverside colony bordered on the so-called Government Tract—a strip of land opened to settlement according to squatter’s rights. With the completion of its first irrigation canal, the colony extended water rights to claimants on the Government Tract because land speculators, including the colony’s founder, John Wesley North, held claims therein. When all was said and done, in order to service all claimants, the canal spanned the colony, the Spanish-speaking village of La Placita, and the Government Tract. This move, notes local historian Tom Patterson, compromised the colony’s hold over this basic resource as a controlling factor in regional development. In addition, attempts by the Riverside Land and Irrigation Company to renege on earlier extensions of water rights fostered antagonism between Riverside and its neighbors, and between colony residents.978

The division of land for colony use was never complete or perfect and attempts to eliminate incongruities fostered bad blood. Boyd admitted that the conniving acquisition


of land from pioneer farmers by the Greeley Locating Committee generated lasting “ill-will … toward the Greeleyites.”\textsuperscript{979} Elsewhere, in Southern California, in the in-between spaces and failed settlements born of the Stearns Ranchos, squatters formed their own organic communities. The enduring presence of squatters was a consequence of and disruption to the ruling paradigm of land commodification and imperfect concessions in the transfer of land from old land feudal grants to the commodity market. Squatting exacerbated land disputes that began with imperfect concessions and further slowed speculative growth. Evictions were controversial and even when squatters moved peacefully, many simply shifted onto other disputed tracts.\textsuperscript{980}

All of the above reveal the violence and internal contradictions intrinsic in the spatial abstractions of capitalist economics as noted by Lefebvre.\textsuperscript{981} Notions of the supremacy of private property informed colonization from the outset. Neat divisions along abstract lines transformed social and ecological landscapes into a commodity (private property)—a spatial fetish that gave colonists a sense of false spatial integrity. Property, conceived as a discrete package, an empty vessel to be acquired, filled, and defined by its owner, provided the illusory foundations for a pristine starting point in the creation of a new culture; i.e. as proponents of commercial revolution, temperance colonists fell victim to the bewildering capacity of the commodity form. When property-as-abstraction failed to ensure temperance, colonists responded with violence against
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non-conforming forms of property. But even that could not forever deter the inevitable transition of temperance colonies into conventional towns and cities.

With the passage of time, the association of the colony formula with guaranteed success faded. Indeed, by the late nineteenth century, temperance colonies became associated with sketchy land schemes and real-estate bubbles. Attempts to replicate the Vineland experiment throughout the Pine Barrens left in their wake ghost towns and abandoned development projects. Mimicking Landis, realtors purchased large tracts for development, but as Peter O. Wacker points out, “the land subdivisions did not progress very far beyond sales to gullible urban residents.”

For instance, Paisley, advertised as the “Magic City” by its Long Island promoter, sold over 3000 parcels with rapidly appreciating land prices between the late 1880s and early 1890s. Then, the thoroughly primed bubble burst leaving buyers in a lurch, unable to unload their poorly-chosen purchases or to continue their tax payments. Fifty years later the settlement was largely abandoned.

A few decades earlier in the west, William S. Chapman, the land magnate of the Central Colony revealed just how much money large landholders in the state could make by subdividing real estate, organizing water rights, and marketing their product as provide a formula for guaranteed success. Each one of Chapman’s twenty acre “homesteads” which he obtained and upgraded for approximately $100 each, sold within

---
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three years for $1000 apiece. But other gambits were far less successful. The Canadian South Saskatchewan colonial joint-stock venture promoted by the Temperance Colonization Society (TCS), a consortium of Ontario and Toronto merchants looking to establish a temperance utopia while making “a tidy profit from selling land to prospective settlers,” left the gates in 1883 heavily capitalized at $2 million dollars for large land sales. To attract buyers, promotional literature boosted parcels as “free temperance homesteads” within a community built on the famed Vineland model. Every aspect of the project was sold as a bargain too good to be true—a claim not without irony given the large amount of capital needed to participate. Though land was advertised as “free,” settlers were encouraged to purchase additional land at $3 to 8 per acre to acquire the best land available. Aside from the expense of property, settlers were instructed to enter the community with sufficient capital for purchase of livestock, tools, a plough, a house and furniture, and one year’s provisions totaling at £140. This expenditure represented an investment an ideal space: soil, lauded as “admirably adapted for stock raising, and dairy farming, as well as growing grain” and a community free of the evils and expense of

---


paupers and prisons. The project failed miserably. Lacking a railroad line, travel to and from the location was difficult, and upon arrival settlers found not a well-developed community but howling wilderness which ultimately spelled few settlers. By 1891 the venture fizzled in the fallout of internal squabbles and litigation.

Colony reputations also declined with accusations of pretense as temperance farmers. In California’s wine country, temperance colonies seemed incongruous. These may have been utopian ventures and colonies, but media identified them as an odd fit in “exotic” California, a state defined by its “foreigness [sic]”—its “Spanishtowns,” its “bright Orientalism,” its “sundried brick” and “Gothic gables.” Perhaps, for this reason those that grew grapes seemingly for raisins, table fruit grapes, or preserves, such as the Temperance Colony in the San Joaquin Valley, faced accusations of hypocrisy. Notes Harper’s in 1882:

It [temperance] must be sorely tried in a spot of which the most liberal and profitable yield is the wine grape. It seems hardly a propitious place to have chosen. Scoffers say that in some of these temperance colonies, while certain settlers will not consent to make wine directly, they sell their grapes to establishments for the manufacture of wine. This, if true, would seem a distinction with but a very slight difference.

Did temperance colonies discretely try to cash-in, in their own way, on the wine-boom? Perhaps. In light of the impersonal nature of a commodity market, it is quite likely that at least some temperance vineyards supplied vintners, if only out of willful ignorance.
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Finally, the temperance colony movement suffered serious damage with the tragic turn of one of the most media-hyped projects: the Union Colony at Greeley, Colorado. From start to finish, Greeley exhibited a litany of problems. Shortly after the arrival of the initial settlers, discrepancies surfaced around lands purchased and colony management. Settlers were told the committee had purchased 70,000 acres of combined government and railroad land on the Cache a La Poudre River, located between Denver and Cheyenne; but only 12,000 acres were secured (owned); the remaining 50,000 were under contract with the railroads. In addition, that which was purchased for the railroads was grossly overpriced at $5 per acre. The colony had also been quietly incorporated and governed by twelve trustees that were members of the colony with N.C. Meeker at the head. Settlers, uninformed of this move, held elections and voted for committee members though the elections were in essence a sham since, as Boyd notes, the original compact no longer held and “was being wholly violated.” When news of the incorporation was finally disclosed, “the management lost the confidence of the people.” The move was justified by the management as necessary for the colony to engage in binding contracts, especially in regard to the control and allocation of water. The explanation did not suffice for many. The colony quickly split into administrative and opposition factions.

993 Decker, “The Utes Must Go!” 83.
994 Boyd, A History, 47.
But Greeley’s problems weren’t limited to questionable administrative dealings. Its water system known as the “great ditch” was poorly engineered. In fact, none of the leaders turned out to know anything about irrigation and this “nearly proved fatal” to the settlers.\(^996\) Crops fared poorly and wood and coal was too distant to procure easily. The colony nearly broke up in the initial months and many dissatisfied settlers left. The problem, according to Willard, lay in how the Land Committee got caught up in railroad marketing which had oversold the region and “spread through the land a highly idealized picture of the advantages, even the pleasures, of irrigation.”\(^997\) Promoters depicted irrigation as inexpensive and the work as no more arduous than ditch-digging in the East. Or, the expense incurred was portrayed as more than worth it, at least according to these campaigns which suggested that irrigated crops yielded greater quality and quantity, “cabbages weighing sixty-pounds each, potatoes five and six pounds, beets two feet in length and sweet potatoes weighing fourteen pounds.”\(^998\) The vision was all so very seductive and from this inflated optimism Meeker grossly underestimated the cost of canal construction. His first estimate was $20,000 for 12,000 acres. The colony was supposed to provide irrigation, but cost and labor ultimately fell on the settlers. Land was sold and taxes were raised to dig canals to capacity. As of 1890, the cost for four canals added up to $412,000.\(^999\)
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Land quality posed another problem. Much of the land was hardpan and the upper bench of the colony proved completely unsuited for farming. Disillusion ensued, with blame landing, rightfully so, at the feet of Meeker who headed the Locating Committee. “To most of us Mr. Meeker, from his writings, was a paragon of perfection in agricultural knowledge,” voiced Boyd. But, he continues,

We found that he [Meeker] could write better about farming than farm… it took some time to learn this; and the fact that Mr. Meeker had made this selection, was for us of far more importance than all the exaggerated extravagant statements made by a man who was not supposed to know anything on the subject.1000

Boyd’s realization highlights the drawbacks of the nineteenth-century media-based agricultural expertise as informed by an incestuous mix of speculative boosterism and the assumptions of improvement ideology. The fact is Meeker, like many newspaper “specialists,” lacked true experiential knowledge with many of the topics he championed. And like others that had intellectualized farming at the time, Meeker got caught up in a techno-fetish and promises of redemption through the mastery of nature.

As Boyd notes newsmen turned on Greeley with scathing editorials. One, written by George Augustus Hobbs, editor of the Geneseo, Illinois, Republic, following a brief stay in Greeley, paints a picture of gross negligence. Hobbs states,

There is one thing we can and will say to our uneasy restless readers, don’t go to Greeley, Colorado Territory. That is the last place on the face of this terrestrial ball that any human being should contemplate to remove to—Greeley, Colorado Territory, is a delusion, a snare, a cheat, a swindle, and the honest (?) Meeker and his long-faced coadjutor know and glory in it—or would do so, had their plans been a little more successful. Greeley, Colorado Territory, is a graveyard, in which are buried heaps of bright hopes and joyous anticipations… [it is] a baker’s dozen of slab shanties, as many tool chests, a great ditch, and twenty acres of
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prickly pears—on a barren, sandy plain, part and parcel of the Great American Desert.  

Both Willard and Boyd defended the colony’s reputation, but there was no getting around the fact that Union Colony was ill-conceived from the outset. Settlers did not prosper as hoped. Prospective colonists kept arriving and leaving—arriving because Meeker continued to publishing glowing tributes to the colony, and leaving after visiting and seeing the boondoggle for themselves. And as the colony foundered Meeker became all the more morally strident, railing against alcohol and wasteful activities such as fishing and flower-picking.  

Still, the colony limped along. All the while Horace Greely from his editor’s seat in New York City sent his recommendations pulled from the latest horticultural craze—the cultivation of the “sugar beet as an ultimate crop for Colorado,” the “opportunity to combine irrigation with water power,” and possibility of growing forests from white acorns, white pine and hickory nuts as a way to improve the land. Greeley also warned Meeker against going borrowing money to keep the colony afloat. But all the colony had to sell was land and this wasn’t easy to dispose of, even at reduced prices. So Greeley allowed Meeker to “draw on” him, then the distant editor inconveniently passed away in November of 1872, leaving the debt to be collected by the heirs of his estate. 

---
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Greeley’s death left Meeker financially ruined. Meeker tried making money from a paper he started in 1870, *The Greeley Tribune*, and ran as a Republican for a seat in the Territorial Legislature, but lost because of long-standing grudges with the old settlers and the heavily disputed liquor question.\(^{1006}\)

In 1878, deeply in debt, Meeker sought employment as an Indian agent for the nearby White River Agency. The colonist used the post to assuage his own financial difficulties and secure native lands for settlers all the while attempting to convert the local Utes to his brand of progress. Notably, Meeker achieved the position based on his media generated reputation as an agricultural writer and colony leader. His application as well suggested the writer had devised a plan to make the natives self-sufficient farmers at a time when there was much pressure to reduce Ute landholdings as defined by prior treaty.\(^{1007}\) Viewing native nomadic hunting and horse culture as “communistic” and a waste of property, agent Meeker pressured the Utes into a farming lifestyle. To accomplish this, Meeker did his best to squelch interactions between the Utes and local homesteaders, targeting, specifically, their common love of horse racing and gambling, and shared barter economy of guns, liquor and horses. In an attempt to subvert the horse—the source of Ute wealth, Meeker had the Ute racetrack and pasture plowed. Then, under the rubric of “compulsory education,” he withheld food rations as an inducement for farming. When tribal members resisted, arguments and scuffles ensued. After a particularly heated exchange with one of the Ute chiefs, Meeker called for
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military assistance to arrest the insubordinates. Tribal members responded to the unauthorized incursion of the cavalry onto their reservation as an act of hostility. The ensuing conflagration known as the Battle of Milk Creek and Meeker Massacre, September 29, 1879, resulted in the death of eleven male employees at the agency—several of whom were residents of Greeley. In addition, the raiders took captive agency women and children including Meeker’s wife, Arvilla, and daughter, Josephine. As for Meeker, he was found outside his burn-downed office stripped of most of his clothing, face-up with a bullet in his forehead, his skull bashed-in, a logging chain about his throat, and a metal stake driven through his open mouth, into the ground beneath him.

This entire unsavory affair provided the Colorado press and development interests with justification for the removal of the Utes to Utah, thus opening reservation land to settlers and mining. As for the colony, it survived and grew thanks to its high-priced and continuously expanding canal system and a growing population. Growth boosted real-estate prices, as ever, the yardstick of success. The New York Saturday Review, for instance, as early as 1873 asserted that in Greeley, “Town lots, despised in June, 1870, at the fearful price of twenty-five dollars, to-day cannot be purchased for $1,500.” It was an extravagant claim—the latest boosterism. Notes Boyd, growth was slow, with assessed values of property, “going at a snail’s pace” from 1870 to 1890. As of 1889, property values were only five times their value in the early 1870s, far below those claimed in the

1008 Decker, “The Utes Must Go!” 109, 113-114, 115-116, 118-119.

1009 Decker, “The Utes Must Go!” 144.

Still, Greeley took shape. Churches, schools, and banks rose from the center of town, lyceums featured talks on poetry music and society, and wheat and potatoes grew in the irrigated fields. It was enough of an improvement for New York lawyer and writer for the National Temperance Society, A.M. Powell, to rank Greeley as a fine exhibit of colony and prohibitionary potential, second to Vineland. After all, Greeley, claimed Powell, began with a fund of $91 for the poor, but spent only $7 of that allotment as of the mid-1870s, thanks to its ban on liquor. At the International Temperance Conference held in Philadelphia (1876), Powell made similar claims stating,

The experience of such temperance colonies as Vineland, New Jersey, and Greeley, Colorado, prosperously founded upon the basis of absolute prohibition of the liquor-traffic, with a conspicuous absence of crime and pauperism, illustrates the great benefit of preventative prohibitory legislation.

Due to these examples of prohibitionary “success,” Powell and others backed territorial bans on liquor as underpinning for what would be born-dry states. Behind the scenes, the irony is this: The foundation for these claims came, not surprisingly, from Meeker’s publications in the Greeley Tribune. Via the media echo-chamber, these assertions surfaced time and again in numerous other publications.
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Greeley could be widely celebrated over time because the fiction, cultivated by its founder, lived on all the while obscuring its history. That fiction belied another fact. Like other colonies, Greeley had problems maintaining a strict teetotaler population. Boyd mourned the fact that the colony’s character went through continuous change. New settlers deviated from temperance principles, “gloried in their shame,” won friends, and achieved political office, making the town, in Boyd’s view, “unfit for a refuge for those who fled here for safety.” Yet Greeley managed, at least in name, to preserve its temperance covenant, not because it was a true community of upright teetotalers, but rather because the corporate structure secured for several decades the community’s anti-liquor sales clause. Others, such as Lompoc, followed suit in 1886, as a way to bolster claims to a temperance identity. The move is an important one in legally reinforcing the temperance colony as modern space. Like its business counterpart, incorporated urban space is a modern institution of protected collective interests, not of the population as a whole, but of investors.

Urban incorporation dates to the Reformation and early modern market towns. With the breaking of medieval monastic power and dissolution of guilds and chantries in
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1548, market towns achieved, through royal charter, a measure of independence from the crown, the church, and the commons—the elaborate array of manorial courts, shared management, and socially reproduced customary and “vernacular” law of the countryside.¹⁰¹⁸ Most colonial America towns were unincorporated though about twenty incorporated coastal cities existed prior to the Revolution. Indeed, many towns of the era fought incorporation as a threat to popular sovereignty which, as law professor Gerald E. Frug notes, was based on similar notions of freedom of association in the making of medieval towns.¹⁰¹⁹ Early American factory towns were incorporated, but through the nineteenth and twentieth century, incorporation also increasingly reflected community desires for popular sovereignty as defined by property ownership with incorporation negotiated between homeowners and local elites.¹⁰²⁰ Omitted from this picture and the right to the community’s spatial definition, was the working class.

We can also view Greeley’s enduring image as an early corporate manifestation of branding. Temperance in Greeley was an impression, not an absolute reality—a logo of sort, a form of advertising, a reputation that the public was supposed to see when Greeley was mentioned. This does not imply that Greeley’s Board of Trustees did not
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hope to maintain a degree of sobriety, but when it came to media exposure, the colony’s inability to completely ban alcohol was not publicized. Because temperance publications reproduced the most positive information available, they reinforced favorable depictions of the colonial experience.

Overall, temperance colonies served two primary functions. First, their lauded success, however fictional, bolstered an ideology that the prohibition of alcohol could be accomplished and doing so advanced communities commercially and culturally. Second, as agricultural ventures temperance colonies advanced the spread of market- and technology-centric agriculture. Colonies were based on pre-existing notions that certain environments and related subsistence economies constituted “waste,” that such landscapes and people were morally suspect and mutually defining, and that the creation of a modern, capitalist utopia continued with the conversion of land and people.

In all, the temperance colony provides a lesson in the production of space. Colonies sought to construct an encompassing and socially transformative spatiality. This quest involved the destruction of premodern and feudal property relations and the “freeing” prior inhabitants from the means of subsistence. In addition, colonies continued the process of enclosure and commodification of land and in the process geographically induced the separation of worker and workplace.

Notes Lefebvre, the dual purpose of the production of space as a medium and outcome in the production of social activity exposes problems in concretizing life which is defined by differentiation.\footnote{Lefebvre, \textit{Production of Space}, 52.} Colonies, as part and parcel to the spread of a capitalist
matrix and as modern spatialities, were riddled with contradictions and struggles common
to the production of space. The result is a paradoxical combination of fragmentation and
homogenization as well as claims to asylum (health, freedom, and protection) and roots
of totalitarianism. The reproduction of the temperance colonial model was supported by a
socio-spatial dialectic in which the media played an important role in space formation
through boosterism and by substantiating colony claims. Overall, colonies serve as a
testing ground. They offered temperance ideology a claim to the space -- a necessity for
an ideology to take social form-- while offering a foothold for the spread of the latest
agricultural “improvements” into contested arenas.
Section 3: Contested Terrain

Introduction

Temperance puts wood on the fire, meal in the barrel, flour in the tub, money in the purse, contentment in the home, and clothes on the bairns.

--“How may we help abolish the saloon?” (1903)\textsuperscript{1022}

Drink to me only with thine eyes,
Though they, I am afraid,
Contain a potent brew more strong,
Than may today be made.

--Anon \textsuperscript{1023}

The 1870s birthed the second wave of temperance as a movement in the US. The causes and dimensions of this latest incarnation were multiple. Most we need not rehearse for the purposes of this study. One very salient topic, however, requires scrutiny. For this historic moment marks, according to prohibition historiography, a pivotal alliance between temperance crusaders and American farmers that provided the movement with, as Joseph R. Gusfield notes, important territorial gains.\textsuperscript{1024} According to Gusfield, agrarian discontent provided the proper climate for a reformer-farmer coalition. This perspective is true to a point, however, it is equally arguable that the complexity and limits of that coalition expose an enduring incongruity between the ideological roots of temperance, continuing divisions among farmers, and the troubled realities of life on the farm in a modern nation-state.

Second wave temperance would take form in two primary legs: First, a women’s temperance crusade, and second, the lobbying efforts of the Anti-Saloon League (ASL).

\textsuperscript{1022} George Marrow, “How May We Help Abolish the Saloon?” \textit{Herald of Gospel Liberty} 95, no. 45 (Nov. 5, 1903), 722. American Periodicals.

\textsuperscript{1023} “Must We Dealcoholize Literature?” 77.

\textsuperscript{1024} Gusfield, \textit{Symbolic Crusade}, 96-97.
Both would emerge in the Ohio. In addition, these movements would receive dedicated farm support within the same geographical locus. The question on hand is this: How might we explain the convergence of all three at this time and place?

In, *A Brief History of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union* (1907), activist and author Katharine Lent Stevenson identified the intense upwelling of female temperance activism of 1873-1874 as a “great moral uprising” in response to the drinking habits of returning soldiers, the wedding of liquor and government with taxation put in place during the Civil War, and “the vast influx of foreign immigration,” which brought “with it the drinking habits of the old world.” The first two factors speak to the movement’s fixation not, ironically, on the influence of war, but rather, on the presumed power of alcohol over men and government. The latter speaks to the anxious sense that “domestic” America was being overwhelmed by an immigrant other. Both seemed to beg for action on the part of women according to the gender norms of the time.

For Stevenson, the Crusade was destiny in action. “[P]rophesies” abounded in the form of sporadic events, particularly around the movement’s catalysis: the energetic and charismatic lecturer, Dr. Diocletian Lewis. A physician of sorts, Lewis had briefly attended Harvard Medical School in the 1840s but dropped out, apparently due to financial difficulties. Lewis then attended the Cleveland Homeopathic Hospital College from which he later received an honorary degree. Energetic and charismatic, this

---


“extremely active, fluent, and conspicuous evangelist” was remarkable adept in generating a following.¹⁰²⁷ Since the 1850s, Lewis had travelled the lecture circuits promoting a succession of new movements: abolition, women’s rights, calisthenics, food reform, and hygiene. In December 23rd, 1873, Lewis found an exceptionally receptive audience for his temperance speech, “The Duty of Christian Women” among the upper-middle-class women of Hillsboro, Ohio. The central figure of the speech was Delecta Barbour Lewis, the good doctor’s mother, who, in the 1850s had, through prayer and moral suasion, shut down the tavern frequented by her husband. The speech was masterfully delivered, terminating with the victory of the meek and seemingly powerless in the eternal struggle between the forces of good and evil. Galvanized, the Hillsboro audience, led by Eliza Jane Trimble Thompson, the wife of a local judge and daughter of a prior governor, marched on the local saloons. The Women’s Crusade was under way.

Needless to say, the events of the moment were less divinely ordained than timely. The speech, according to Lewis, had been delivered 300 times prior in the course of twenty years with little effect.¹⁰²⁸ But on this occasion Lewis had struck a match in contested territory at a moment of exceptional apprehension. Two months prior a major economic crisis known as the Panic of 1873 swept the country as the railroad boom came to bust. Ohio, the gateway to the West, was divided between frustrated old stock migrants and new stock immigrants; wheat fields and vineyards; the old temperance set and the


¹⁰²⁸ Diocletian Lewis, Prohibition a Failure, Or, The True Solution of the Temperance Question (Boston: James R. Osgood and Co, 1875), 229.
new landscape of communities where German was the language of home, church, politics and commerce. In this moment the women had become suddenly aware, or as Stevenson relates, “awakened” to the threat of the liquor traffic. Their signature clarion call became “Home Protection” --a domestic uprising dedicated to the overthrow of “alcoholism.” By this Stevenson meant not specifically addiction, but a system of sorts the encompassed production, consumption, and wayward government that she and her fellow crusaders understood as always ending in addiction, illness, decline and death. The target of these women was the saloon, the spatial embodiment of the immigrant set and their old world habits that was understood as promoting this system. But there was more. The female body in the context of masculine public space posed a challenged to the vested economic interests of manufacturers, and by extension, the product and gendered divisions of the field. Concern over the ethical and economic stakes of farm and field pivoted on the structural possibilities and symbolic power of gender that fell along the cultural lines of old and new stock immigrants.

As this section details, un the 1890s, on the heels of the Women’s Temperance Crusade would follow the leadership of the ASL, born from a nursery of frontier preachers who cast their lot into the Ohio frontier at mid-century. From their reform-oriented settlement, the city of Oberlin, these emissaries of first-wave temperance would, like cicadas, resurface and push the movement through to prohibition. Multiple farm crisis spurred farmers to support the women and the League, to an extent. But their commitment was haunted by their perpetual need for markets to absorb farm surplus.

1029 Stevenson, A Brief History, 9, 14.
Thus, the National Grange devised a compromise with legislation for farm-based industrial alcohol production. Implementing so-called “Free Alcohol” would test loyalties and in the end, reconfirm the underlying contradictions of a temperance farm economy.
Chapter 7:  
The Women’s Temperance Crusade

John Barleycorn and all his forbears quake on their pillars this week, for these earnest-eyed women are at work at their foundations.  
--The New York Time (1891)\textsuperscript{1030}

Old John Barleycorn is trying  
To resume his sway;  
Law and order still defying,  
In his usual way.

Hold the fort that we have taken  
From the wily foe.  
If for right we stand unshaken  
Barleycorn must go.  
--Bro. Armstrong of the Ohio Grange\textsuperscript{1031}

The Women’s Crusade began in the ethnically divided state of Ohio in which over four decades of migration had effectively reduced the influence of Anglo Americans. As noted by historian Charles Isetts, Hillsboro crusaders were old stock Anglos whose families controlled much of the town’s property, early gains “not accompanied by commensurate political power.”\textsuperscript{1032} This latter point was evident in the short-lived nature of the crusade and inability of crusaders to push through an 1874 ordinance of sufficient strength to shutter the city’s saloons. As historian Richard H. Chused points out, the sense that of lost control underscored the movement. The flush of German migrants, the dramatic increase in beer production and sales, the proliferation of public drinking facilities frequented by foreigners, and defense of the trade as a major contributor to federal


coffers, detracted from the power of local old stock Protestants who had originally passed, in 1852, a now defunct ban on alcohol sales. In 1873, the Ohio constitutional convention also raised tensions over who would control the definition of the state. The rapid spread of the Crusade and subsequent rise of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, founded in the fall of 1874 as a national organization, marshaled white women for what Amy Kaplan identifies as “Manifest Domesticity”—support for the male realm of business and territorial expansion with the values nurtured in the middle-class household. As Kaplan notes, the nineteenth-century upwelling of female activism involved a reconceptualization of both domesticity and geography to unite men and women in a contest against the alien other.

Abstinence had long been associated with the purity and safeguards of the middle-class home, but the pre-war movement was nonetheless led by men. By the 1870s, educated women, cultivated into the “noblest” of creatures with the capacity to melt the hardest of hearts came to represent more fully the future potential of temperance as a movement. As Dio Lewis postulated, prohibition had been a failure because brute force should not be necessary in an enlightened world in “securing obedience.” Women, however, bore “the power of moral influence,” a quality that could hold sway over the

---

1034 Amy Kaplan, “Manifest Domesticity,” American Literature 70, no. 3 (Sept. 1998), 583.
1035 Lewis, Prohibition a Failure, 22, 31.
most brutish people, hardened criminals, and victims of vice.\textsuperscript{1036} The goal was to speak to men’s honor as protectors of women, the embodiment of the nation.

Their first encounters were promising. Under pressure, some saloonkeepers in a symbolic gesture relinquished barrels and axes to the women. From the onset, each small victory was treated as battles won against John Barleycorn. For instance, one Mr. Van Pelt, a saloon-keeper in New Vienna, Ohio, who originally refused to capitulate to the demands of temperance crusaders, finally caved and in doing so, invited the ladies from the local Baptist church to gather in front of his business where he relinquished “two barrels and a keg” for a “spirituous sacrifice” for the many souls ruined by alcohol. Van Pelt then joined the ladies in taking an ax to the items mentioned, thus marking his conversion.\textsuperscript{1037}

But within short order, the crusade fell into contests of gendered antagonism and violence indicative of Victorian gender divisions. The Cult of Womanhood’s function as the stabilizing moral center and counter-weight to masculinity ran up against the role of alcohol in male ethnic, class and social bonding.\textsuperscript{1038} Female barroom occupations also flew against economic imperatives. On moral grounds these women pressed men to walk away from a viable livelihood at a time of severe economic depression. In response, saloonkeepers tried to drive off the women by drowning out the vigils with brass bands. They doused the women in beer, pummeling them with rotten eggs, and boycotted the

\textsuperscript{1036} Lewis, \textit{Prohibition a Failure}, 25, 31.

\textsuperscript{1037} “John Barleycorn: The War Against Him by the Ladies in Ohio,” \textit{The Daily Gazette} 39, Feb. 11, 1874, col. B. 19\textsuperscript{th} Century U.S. Newspapers.

businesses of their male counterparts. Saloonkeepers even held vigils of their own at the homes of crusading women where patrons sang drinking songs.\textsuperscript{1039} Which songs they sang is difficult to say, but “John Barleycorn” was probably among them, since the folksong was well-established as representative of a defiant drinking element. Larger establishments such as brewery-run beer gardens won injunctions against the crusaders, a move that brought women increasingly into the “traditional male judicial domain.”\textsuperscript{1040}

In their efforts, second-wave temperance activists enjoyed the support of farmers. Notes Gusfield, the wedding of Women’s Crusade and WCTU with the Grange and Populists brought new laws in Ohio, Kansas, and Iowa into the temperance fold. The Grange actively supported to the crusaders and the WCTU in its various local and state campaigns.\textsuperscript{1041} But we must be careful not to treat farmers as a uniform class. To define exactly who supported the movement, we must delve into the fractured nature of cultivation and the rapidly changing environment of farming.

Two of a Kind

By the 1870s, western farmers, thanks to social dynamics and farm journals, were encouraged to understand themselves as belonging to distinct categories that varied according to their heritage, farming practices, and degree of commercial success. The dividing line fell hard along the lines of class. Homesteaders that failed to rise from their position as subsistence farmers were disparaged as “wretches,” a “swarm of worthless

\textsuperscript{1039} Fran Grace, \textit{Carry A. Nation: Retelling the Life} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 62.
\textsuperscript{1040} Chused, “Courts and Temperance ‘Ladies,’” 33.
\textsuperscript{1041} Gusfield, \textit{Symbolic Crusade}, 96.
white squatters.” These “nomadic” pests were portrayed as “hover[ing] around towns, living in shanties and hovels, and keeping any number of breachy horses, cows and hogs to depredate upon the fields and gardens of the vicinity.” Poor whites, migrant laborers, and black migrants, “who make the mistake in supposing they can go into a wild country, and with nothing but their hands carve out for themselves, homes,” were accused of engaging in crime, stirring up trouble with the Indians, and even “voting unanimously” against the fencing of livestock and “any measure calculated to abridge their right to keep as many sheep-killing curs as they like.” Likewise, farmers who continued to migrate west “were invariably labeled as failures,” and intemperate ones at that, spoiled by the dram. In reality, prairie states were by far, least stable as their population shifted west driven on by drought, prairie fires, plagues of grasshoppers, and market ruination. Meanwhile, the commercial farmer could pride their work as the source of wealth upon which all of society depended. And of course, print culture encouraged farmers to become more business-minded and farming as a potentially lucrative pursuit if approached with business sense.

---


1045 Margaret L. Woodward, “The Northwestern Farmer, 1868-1876: A Paradox,” Agricultural History 37, No. 3 (July 1963), 139.

The agricultural press targeted English-speaking middle-rung farmers and journalists to portray their subscribers as the golden mean. Along these lines, Ohio agricultural lecturer and journalist, Waldo F. Brown, colorfully identified three types of tillers by name, with commentary on their presumed margin of “success.” There was “Peter Poverty” the “shiftless” pioneer farmer, whose only redeeming quality was to serve as an example of “how not to do it.”

“Let us be thankful,” states Brown, “that he is not as ‘numerous’ as formerly, and that his children are not likely to follow his calling.” There was, as well, “Sam Skinsoil,” the “enterprising man with a strong head of steam.” Sam represented the businessman-farmer known for buying up land, plowing “every available foot of it” and cutting every tree for timber before abandoning the wreckage for new land to exploit. Due to his destructive land tenure, Brown afforded this man no claim to success. Skinsoil’s ability to make money was all “mind” and no “soul” – an evaluation that acknowledged a common animosity for the latest breed of “aristocratic” farmers. Finally, there was “William Wealthy,” the farmer who “works harder than any day laborer in his employ.” William was a petty commodity producer with “six hundred acres of land, all in a high state of cultivation.” In Brown’s mind, William represented an ideal, that is, so long as William did not in his quest for money lose sight of “all that makes life valuable.”

Brown’s brand of success belonged to farmers that managed to occupy a narrow category between the subsistence paradigm and practices that were only good for profit. It was a difficult equation – a veritable a tight-
rope walk between farming as a lifestyle and an all-consuming monetary imperative that many petty commodity producers worked hard to negotiate, in part out of distaste for the farm-as-business-establishment, but also because few could compete with the Skinsoils even if they wanted to.

In many ways, Brown’s treatise belied reality. True, subsistence was shrinking due more to a lack of inexpensive land, shrinking communities of support, and problems with homesteading than stereotypical laziness. All the while the “Sam Skinsoils”—large wheat formations, had in fact grown in number and wealth. Most farmers fell somewhere in between, yet few middle-rung farmers looked anything like “William the Wealthy.”

Growing for commodity markets required a different skill set that was notably business-oriented: the ability to respond rapidly to market signals, to know the special needs of each new crop, and their adaptability to various climates and soils. It meant fewer crops, and focusing on what made some produce finer and more valuable for distant consumers. It meant investments in fertilizers and specialized machines, and risking great loss as diseases and pests proliferated with trade and monocrop production.\footnote{Woodward, “The Northwestern Farmer,” 135.} It also meant the near impossible task of prognosticating conditions in England, Germany, and elsewhere. And, of course, navigating an unequal playing field.

Most galling of all were the problems that arose from the structuring of the market and chicanery of what appeared to many to be a collusion of forces bent on exacting fraud at the farmer’s expense. As historian William Cronon notes, with the development of railroad and telegram networks, the economic landscape of the west had been
“partitioned.” On one side were the farmers and merchants who depended on the trade in commodities and cities as markets; on the other side of the commodity abstraction were the warehousemen and traders who, through the knowledge of their work, had the inside tract and thus the ability to predict price movements more effectively than others. The system had a tendency to push down prices paid to farmers. Railroads, grain elevator operators, and inspectors had every incentive to downgrade a farmer’s grain to boost grain elevator profits. Railroads simultaneously benefited by receiving a percentage. In addition the railroads were consistently guilty of engaging in “Rate wars, pooling arrangements, rebating, [and] discriminations of the long-and-short-haul”—to the benefit of the railroads and largest grain producers.

It is important to note that petty commodity farmers sought insight in agricultural journals, which offered the best bet in understanding the workings of the market and its abuses. Energy was directed into political action and organization ranging from the Grange to Populism, but confusion remained as to what position farmers filled in society. Notes historian Margaret L. Woodward, “the farmer was in the throes of a conflict between a half dozen different positions which he thought he held in society.” Whether “he was a mudsill or top-drawer, businessman or honest yeoman,” was unclear and indeed, “probably half of his mental energies were dissipated in confusion.”


Journalists such as Brown offered middling producers a comforting vision. Notably, Brown was not alone in his conceptualization of success in farming. The Grange voiced a similar ethos. Prior to the Civil War, agricultural reformer Oliver Hudson Kelley, the founder of the Patrons of Husbandry, promoted agricultural development on the Minnesota frontier and wrote columns on scientific farming. Working with the Federal Commission on Agriculture under President Andrew Johnson, Kelley ventured South in 1866 in an effort to rehabilitate southern farming. From all of these efforts emerged the Patrons—a secret society that grew to become the Grange. Its aim was the advancement of agriculture through the education and the organization of farmers for purposes of unity and cooperative advancement. Kelley toured Minnesota in the late 1860s, speaking, organizing granges, and writing promotional articles for the Order. For a nominal membership fee, Kelley promised farmers a string of economic advantages and social renewal. The Grange spread rapidly through that state and beyond with vigorous proselytizing. Meanwhile, the organization and its monthly circular became a vehicle for agrarian agitation. Grangers embraced a vision of republican freeholders saving themselves and the country from degeneracy and the greed of monopolists. Notably, the organization did not go so far as to indict capitalism per se, rather, notes historian Thomas Woods, the Knights sought “Reformation” through the revival of “old republican principles of virtue, self-help, popular education, and enlightened judgment.”

---


name, “Grange,” which is derived from granum (Latin for grain) and English for the farm of a yeoman or gentleman farmer was itself a striking illustration of Granger identity.

Granges proliferated alongside the women’s temperance movement with much overlap in demographics in the two movements; namely, old stock Anglo Protestants. Both grew rapidly in shared territory. Most significantly, there were over 900 local Granges in Ohio as of the mid-1870s, more than any other state.\(^\text{1056}\) Indeed the temperance movement’s agrarian support during the 1870s came specifically from Grange. As new, rapidly growing movements, both displayed a passionate and often chaotic exuberance that resulted in confusion regarding their goals and methods.\(^\text{1057}\) Moreover, the women’s temperance movement and Grange were well-suited for one another due to shared perspectives and worldviews. For one, they shared gendered visions of the power of cultivators and Republican Motherhood in preserving the integrity of national identity and purpose. They also shared notions of proper agriculture as defined by farm and food reformers of the time. This included an emphasis on wheat and the plow, the gifts of the Greco-Roman goddess Ceres. Indeed, Ceres enjoyed renewed admiration across the western world as part of the aesthetic of the Enlightenment, which drew from classical models of republican virtue, evident in many writings of the time. Because nineteenth-century American imaginings of Ceres circumscribe gender, agriculture, and nation, treatments of the Roman goddess offer valuable insight into the temperance-farmer alliance.

\(^{1056}\) George W. Knepper, *Ohio and Its People* (Kent: Kent State University, 2003), 278.

To encourage fraternity across national north-south divides, Kelley used the structure and ritualistic orientation of the Freemasons as a model for the Grange. To imbue the organization with an alluring mystique, encourage cooperation, and foster a sense of “occupational civic religion”, Kelley structured meetings around a central altar with male officers stationed opposite female representatives of Ceres (the Roman goddess of agriculture and grain), Pomona (the Roman goddess of abundance), and Flora (the Roman goddess of the Spring). The point, according to Thomas A. Woods, was to imitate classical Roman fraternities, thus evoking both the agrarian and republican foundations of the nation. The Order’s artwork, notably the famous “Gift for the Grangers,” pulled from Christian agrarian themes as well such as that of Ruth gleaning in the fields of the wealthy landholder, Boaz. Boaz rewards Ruth’s fidelity to her widowed mother-in-law (his widowed daughter-in-law), Naomi, with gleaning rights and finally, marriage. It is a compelling image, but one we must be careful not to misconstrue as support for a return to the commons or rugged subsistence. The Grangers fervently believed in an America of freedom loving freeholders. Many Grangers opposed the specter of selfish industrial capitalism by upholding the yeoman ideal. The celebrating of farmer cooperation and harvest festivals and even images of gleaning served the desire for homey-comforts associated with rural life. In this case, fidelity and kindness are the morals behind the Granger image of Ruth—this we know because the artwork labels it as such. Should any doubt remain regarding meanings one need only ponder the vignette of
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a ramshackle subsistence log cabin coupled with the words “ignorance” and “sloth,” as a foil for the prosperous Granger farm, included in the same collage.\footnote{Strobridge & Co. Lith., Gift for the Grangers, 1873, chromolithograph, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., accessed Nov. 10, 2014, http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/96512563. Woods, Knights of the Plow, 173, analyzes this promotional image for its religious associations, but not the internal tension between freeholder and commoning images which is worth noting.}

The temperance movement also borrowed eclectically from classical and Christian mythology. To draw a connection between classic paganism and modern temperance reform-oriented Christianity, the American Temperance Society, in 1840, attributed to the Greeks the practice of “sober sacrifices” -- “libations of water, milk, honey, and oil” -- wine’s use being “forbidden” we are told, “at the altar of Ceres and Prosperpine.” According to the ATS, the Greeks, in their wisdom, understood alcohol to be “opposed to everything spiritual and elevating.” “Primitive Christians,” argued the society’s paper, followed suit, and we are to believe that the Temperance Reformation stemmed from that heritage.\footnote{“Unfermented Wine Used in the Passover,” Journal of the American Temperance Union 4, no. 8 (Aug. 1840), 117, accessed June, 2014, https://books.google.com/books?id=Xc9OAAAAYAAJ} Other publications reinforced the divide. Rev. James Dawson Burns’ Temperance Dictionary (1861) cast Ceres in opposition to Bacchus, by stating, “Ceres and drunkenness are never fellow-boarders.”\footnote{James Dawson Burns, The Temperance Dictionary (London: Job Caudwell, 1861), 74, accessed Nov. 2, 2014, http://books.google.com/books?id=6pIBAAAAQAAJ} This combination too, projected a compelling but fictional historical chasm between alcohol and agricultural prosperity in the service of their reform agenda. The impulse, notably, was not unique to the movement. Rather, temperance thinkers built on a modern discourse of the classics. As Constance Jordan points out, Ceres (or the Roman Demeter), originally stood for the


give and take of the seasons. Her daughter, Persephone (Proserpina) personified fertility. But beginning with early modern representations, came to embody the “joy of the harvest,” whose gifts, notes Jordan, constitute “the object of a divine love that holds out the always vain hope of an earthly immortality in order to teach the discipline of temperance.”

Likewise, in Renaissance England, Ceres’ appearance in *The Tempest* reflects a “wish for a Golden Age of winterless years,” where, explains Kasey Evans, “the end of harvest gives way to spring again, in a perpetual cycle of abundance.” The fantasy evokes a mastery of time—even the seasons—in a never-ending procession of prosperity.

Obviously, the symbolism much like the movement’s relationship to agriculture’s history was not the most comfortable of matches. For instance, the Ohio abolitionist and reformer C.S.S. Griffing was wary of claiming a pagan goddess as a temperance ally. Griffing argued that Christianity, as in Catholicism, was not a temperance religion evident in the Eucharist, “the most august of all the Pagan ceremonies.” Implied in this notion was an inherent incompatibility of temperance with the highest of Catholic sacrament—the Eucharist as sacred bread, imbued through transubstantiation with the presence of Christ. For Protestants, the sacrament was little more than pagan medieval metaphysics as a foreign and altogether impractical religion in a modern world of

---


“business not sentiment.”\textsuperscript{1065} For Griffing, “Ceres, the goddess of corn… in allegorical language had given her flesh for food, as Bacchus, the God of wine, had given his blood to drink. During the Mysteries, wine represented Bacchus and bread Ceres.”\textsuperscript{1066} In other words, Ceres’ origins implicated her in the poetic sensibilities of transubstantiation that located salvation in sacrifice and death, and the divine in bread and wine. Needless to say, these “tokens” of heathen religious rites represented, for this particular reformer, a dead end: confinement to the “rot of the seed” as compared to the path of immortality made possible by a Christ who “banished death.”\textsuperscript{1067} Nevertheless, the neoclassical Ceres supplied a fitting symbol of improved agriculture, unlimited prosperity, and republican heritage—part and parcel to the kind of mythologizing the movement is known for. And, in the late nineteenth century middle-class temperance reformers would certainly have seen their reflection in the Grange.

The Grange and women’s temperance movement likewise shared a penchant for progress through agricultural improvement. The temperance movement sprung from the commercial, science-minded, and progress-oriented set and the women’s movement inherited this focus. This slant is most evident in the WTCU promotion of Scientific Temperance Instruction (STI) which will be addressed shortly. The Grange developed from similar foundations, evident in the life Kelley himself. Kelley, the son of a Boston tailor, was a bookish child with a propensity for writing. In New England, Kelley worked

\textsuperscript{1065} “Religion and Life” and “The Abuse of John Barleycorn,” \textit{Christian Century} (Chicago) 34, no. 2 (Jan 11, 1917), 7-8.

\textsuperscript{1066} Griffing, \textit{Christianity Not a Temperance},” 32.

\textsuperscript{1067} Griffing, \textit{Christianity Not a Temperance},” 33.
as a drug store clerk, then as a reporter for the Chicago Tribune and telegraph operator. In 1849 at age twenty-three, Kelley left New England with his first wife, Lucy, for the Minnesota territory. The couple arrived at a time of agricultural transition from subsistence forms defined by limited and local markets, regional crops, and barter, to commercial production of wheat with the development of transportation networks and infrastructure. As Wood notes, Kelley was one of many new ambitious, aggressive, entrepreneurial “book farmers” who applied education, capital, irrigation, and the latest farm implements and innovations from agricultural journals in their methods.\textsuperscript{1068} Kelley also bore a speculative streak that began with the purchase of land in hopes of cashing in on real estate when the territorial government pondered moving its capital from St. Paul to Itasca. The move did not occur and Kelley was forced to tend the land which he did with such compulsion that his “impulsive purchasing and grand schemes for success” left him deeply in debt. Foreclosure ensued, resulting in the loss of his farm in 1871, though he managed to regain it with the help of a nephew in 1873.\textsuperscript{1069}

Through all of the above, Kelley maintained a vision of progressive agriculture as the moral and economic underpinning of the American republic. He projected this vision of progress as an agricultural writer and editor for the \textit{Sauks Rapids Frontiersman}, the \textit{Prairie Farmer}, and other publications. Yet he remained troubled by what he perceived to be the primary impediments to farmer success; namely, powerful monopolies and the

\textsuperscript{1068} Woods, \textit{Knights of the Plow}, 22-27.
\textsuperscript{1069} Woods, \textit{Knights of the Plow}, 34.
non-transparent market activities of speculative middlemen.\(^{1070}\) Like many agrarian capitalists, Kelley was a true believer in the economic system and innovation as the guarantors of progress, but failed to see inequities as part and parcel of the system. Though he would toy with some wide-ranging visions of reform—the elimination of middlemen and mechanisms to ensure transparency in the pricing of commodities, Kelley and his brainchild, the Grange, gravitated toward the type of moral reforms that posed no great challenge to the economic foundations of the country. In fact, combined with a scientific focus, the Grange arguably contributed to the industrial transformation of agriculture. Notes historian Kathryn Cornell Dolan, much like the land-grant college system and the various treatises on food and the domestic economy, Kelley’s scientific focus contributed to the reorientation of agriculture in an increasingly urban and industrial nation.\(^{1071}\) All three—colleges, literature, and the Grange—promised the same things: an ability to keep agriculture relevant by making it more competitive and linking it to national expansion, educated professionalism, and new technology.\(^{1072}\)

Gender dynamics within the Grange were also a solid fit with the gender norms held by participants in the Women’s Crusade and WCTU. Women, largely pushed out of direct engagement with the soil with mechanization, were invited in a form of gendered essentialism, to aid in the quest for agricultural elevation. Within the Grange, their primary role was to serve as proper “Republican Mothers” who preserved the home

\(^{1070}\) Woods, *Knights of the Plow*, 38, 40-41, 43.


\(^{1072}\) Dolan, *Beyond the Fruited Plain*, 15-16.
against hostile and corrupting influences. Notes Woods, “Women were expected to be selfless and sacrificing, and their primary role as mothers and wives was to instill principles of republican virtue into their children and reinforce them in their husbands.”

Separate spheres were otherwise maintained—men occupied the field, while the house was deemed best for refining the unique qualities of womanhood. While women could vote within the organization, Kelley and the early Grange did not extend this right to national suffrage or women working in the male sphere. Gendered virtues espoused by the organization reflected this sentiment. Men were expected to work hard, be kind to animals, and plow straight. The latter reflected attention to work, improvement, and conduct. In contrast, a fine woman was “self-sacrificing, charitable, and forgiving.”

Home reform involved frugality and inquiry into the latest literature on the “practical economy” of housekeeping.

Nevertheless, deference afforded women by Anglo farmers encouraged female attendance, engagement and planning in farm organizations. For this reason the Grange and later the Farmer’s Alliance and Populists served as bridges that linked farm women with progressive movements and vice versa. Farm women gained experience as organizers, lecturers, and writers with local farm organizations—skills they employed as

\[1076\] Dolan, *Beyond the Fruited Plain*, 17.
advocates of temperance and woman suffrage.\textsuperscript{1077} Women also proved important in pushing Grange activism on the issue of temperance, as seen in the first meeting of New York State Grange in 1874.\textsuperscript{1078}

Temperance agitation was proper politics-- a way for middle-class and farm women to express themselves politically in a manner considered acceptable. For farm women in particular, temperance was a way of distancing oneself from the lower orders and subsistence. Since the 1850s, the press treated female agitation for temperance as virtuous and respectable in contrast to the bread riots of commoners and the working poor. One English temperance author compared the women’s temperance actions in a mid-1850s court case in New York against bread rioters. States the author,

It is a significant incident, showing how the most respectable classes regard the sale of spirits for tippling purposes as a social nuisance, that when bands of women in the West, and even in Cattaraugus county, New York, --not drunken, noisy women, such as led the Exeter-bread-riot, but quiet, well-dressed, persistent ladies, --have gone to the grog-shops, broken the kegs and demijohns, and poured out the liquor, a sacrifice to the house-hold gods,--juries have, upon prosecution, invariably acquitted.\textsuperscript{1079}

The fact that these were “quiet, well-dressed… ladies” (i.e. mid-upper class) made what might otherwise be viewed as an assault on business and property, a virtuous act in comparison to the 1855 English bread riots when the desperate poor of Liverpool disparaged as “gangs of lawless depredators” plundered bakeries and shops for bread and

\textsuperscript{1077} Corrine M. McConnaughy, *The Woman Suffrage Movement in America: A Reassessment* (New York: Cambridge, 2013), 139.


\textsuperscript{1079} Lees, *The Text-Book of Temperance*, 211.
other provisions. To battle intemperance was to universalize a concept while obscuring prejudices inherent in the crusade and economic realities of farmers within a market system. And, it was a way to delegitimize the violence of the dispossessed and legitimatize the violence of reformers.

Urban middle-class women of the temperance movement claimed roots in Yankee middling farm stock as well. For instance, the famed president of the WCTU, Frances E. Willard, was born in September of 1839 outside of Rochester, New York, but grew up on a farm in Wisconsin. Willard’s father sold lands in the East and moved west—first to Ohio, then Illinois, then Wisconsin—to improve his holdings and his health. Conservative Methodist migrants, the Willards moved from Churchville, New York, to “rum-cursed Wisconsin” where Frances’ father Josiah grew wheat. Josiah had been a member of the Washingtonian Temperance Society while in New York and consequently, Frances grew up in a temperance home listening to stories about the heroic Neal Dow.

Willard found life on the farm liberating. She had a great deal of free time to ride horses and explore, at least until she became a young woman and was expected to behave in a lady-like manner. Seeking a life of purpose, Willard attended college at Evanston, Illinois, a prohibition town, and from there went into teaching because most other professional options were closed to her. She didn’t enjoy teaching and looked down

---


1082 Strachey, Frances Willard, 187.

1083 Strachey, Frances Willard, 97, 125.
on her German and Irish immigrant students as “uncultivated.” Like many educated, middle-class women, Willard grudgingly taught while looking to missionary work as an escape and a source of excitement. She was an instructor at Northwestern Female College and in the 1870s became the first woman president of the American College in Evanston. As an ambitious woman who was galvanized by temperance orator John B. Gough, Willard viewed the new movement as both part of her intellectual development, religious destiny, and as a door-opening opportunity. Like many women of her class and background, Willard viewed the Women’s Crusade as reformation and revival—an answer to her personal tragedies—her father’s death from tuberculosis, the loss of the farm, the fracturing of her family, and her brother’s alcoholism. Contemplating the movement, she turned to the Bible and found what she believed to be prophesy in Psalm 37:3: “Trust in the Lord and go good: so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed.” Thus inspired, Willard joined the WCTU and became its president in 1879.

Notably, the Grange, like the temperance movement, was predominantly old stock Anglo. As Woods explains, Kelley looked down on “German neighborhoods,” where “males and females, old and young, are busy digging potatoes and doing other out door [sic] work.” He was particularly disturbed by women behind the plow which he viewed as “out of place.” Historian Steven J. Keillor adds that the Grange did not generally appeal to immigrants for several reasons. For one, church leaders discouraged Catholics
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and Lutherans from joining the organization due to the Grange’s original status as a secret society and because of the religious nature of Grange rituals. In addition, old stock Americans that dominated the Grange repelled many potential immigrant members with their prejudiced attitudes. Notes Keillor, “Old stock antipathy toward immigrants arose from their perception that the presence of too many low-status foreigners in farming was the cause of farming’s declining prestige.” The statement reflected broader trends. The failure of the Maine Laws and stringent enforcement tactics in curbing the proliferation of saloons and beer gardens and the Democratic Party opposition against strict temperance as an assault on ethnic customs, low class immigrants, and rural populations, fueled temperance resolve while generating regional antagonism. In the place of old southern, Mid-Atlantic and New England differences surfaced a new sense, that of “native” Protestant versus foreign Catholic.

Old stock and new stock perspectives also differed when it came to activities and loyalties. German immigrants from the colonial period into the twentieth century were known for maintaining mutually supportive village and kinship networks. When extra hands were required, German farmers relied on kin and neighbors. As my mother would say, “anyone with two hands and could walk”—that is, anyone in the family or neighboring farms, helped with plantings and harvests. Notes historian Sonya Salamon,


1089 Keillor, Cooperative Commonwealth, 39.

German immigrants proved to be “diligent husbandmen, more careful in conserving soil and more frugal.” Their primary focus was reproducing the family farm by acquiring land for their sons, a task at which they proved quite adept. Farming, for Germans, was less a business than “a joint enterprise in which, under the patriarchal authority of the men, women and children (who left school early) worked diligently.” Family welfare took precedence over individual autonomy. Throughout the Midwest, German farmers “gradually bought out and eventually replaced those who had broken the land, especially the native-born”—a tendency that alarmed Old Stock Anglos. In many ways, these distinguishing traits were cultural, but also a survival strategy of Germans as immigrants. In contrast, Old Stock Anglos as the dominant ethnic group, suggests Salamon, were less inclined to live in tightly organized communities and to maintain customary traditions or family structure. Farmers who joined the Grangers were more likely to mix speculative, merchant and farm activities. They were more likely to view farming as a business, land as a commodity, and to rely on hired labor. The Grange worldview emphasized class divisions that separated farmers from middlemen, and “monopolists.” Immigrants, however, felt the greater division lay between old and new stock farmers. Consequently, “Grange cooperatives could not count on patronage from immigrants.”

Though the Grange did not identify as a temperance organization, it upheld temperance as a guiding ethos. As Thomas Clark Atkeson, overseer of the National

---

Grange and Master of the West Virginia State Grange, asserted, “The Grange is not a temperance society, but it has always taught and enforced temperance among its own members.” The Grange would also go “on record scores of times in favor of prohibition, local, state-wide and nation-wide.”

According to agricultural historian Solon Justus Buck’s *The Granger Movement: A Study in Agricultural Organization and Its Political, Economic, and Social Manifestations, 1870-1880* (1913) temperance habits were not only required for admission, “lessons in temperance were inculcated by the ritual.”

This implied the way that Grangers ritualized all aspects of life in its “uncompromising” opposition to “carelessness and disorder, idleness and vice.” But one must wonder if temperance was an attempt to counterweight the capitalistic and individualistic pursuits of Yankee demographic.

The Grange also took the stance that the regulation of alcohol (as compared to abstinence and the ban of sales) reflected a European mindset. Granger Stephe R. Smith’s *Grains for Grangers: Discussing All Points Bearing Upon the Farmers’ Movement for the Emancipation of White Slaves from the Slave-Power of Monopoly* (1889), juxtaposed the “strong individuality” of Americans against the European “idea of looking to Papa government” as the “ground work of the protective system.”

---


Granger worldview to Alexis De Tocqueville’s perplexed attitude toward temperance in America, evinced in the following quote of the French thinker:

The first time I heard in the United States that a hundred thousand men had bound themselves publicly to abstain from spirituous liquors, it appeared to me more like a joke than a serious engagement; and I did not at once perceive why these temperate citizens could not content themselves with drinking water by their firesides. I at last understood that these hundred thousand Americans, alarmed by the progress of drunkenness around them, had made up their minds to patronize temperance. They acted just in the same way as a man of high rank who should dress very plainly, in order to inspire the humbler orders with contempt of luxury. It is probable, that if these hundred thousand men had lived in France, each of them would singly have memorialized the government to watch the public houses all over the kingdom.1098

Americans, claimed Smith, could not, after fighting the revolution, relinquish the cause to government regulation. This notion reflected a nativist political and gendered sensibility that stood in stark contrast to that of recent European immigrants. Grangers viewed individuality as preserving “them against the influence” of alcohol’s “manufacturing aristocracy which was called into existence by the war of 1812”. This point is highly debatable, but that matters little. For the Grangers, the temperance ideal fortified republicanism by decoupling of government from alcohol through the elimination of the “protective principle”.1099 Law, for Anglos, according to Smith, was for enforcing morality. Of course, no mention is made regarding whose moral sensibilities should be enforced or the type of government required to enforce prohibition. Nor did Smith comment on De Tocqueville’s class critique of the temperance movement.

1098 Smith, *Grains for Grangers*, 62.

1099 Smith, *Grains for Grangers*, 62. When it came to regulating railroads and grain elevators, the Patrons weren’t above passing a host of “Granger Laws.” The move toward regulation seemed to come from their alliance with the Greenback-Labor Movement (late 1870s) which favored regulatory actions. The Granger Laws were a feature of the late 1870s and early 1880s.
The primary Granger focus, at least in the 1860s and early 1870s, was self-help aided by the formation of their own banks, grain elevators, and insurance companies. Temperance fell within the category of “self-help,” though the Grange also supported prohibition on the grounds of morality and opposition to “fraud and adulteration in human foods.”1100 In contrast, German-Americans forged their political opposition to temperance laws around notions of male leadership and a tendency to view Anglos as immoderate in their fanatical politics and a breed of individualism that simultaneously weakened family and community while enhancing the power of the state.1101 The clash between German and nativist sensibilities in Ohio, Kansas, and Iowa surfaced in temperance as a wedge issue in the contentious politics of a divided ethnic landscape. Notes historian Jon Gjerde, battles over a series of strict temperance measures in the 1880s had less to do with drinking as a problem than the issue of political supremacy of Anglo Methodists and Republicans over Germans, Roman Catholics, and Democrats.1102

The Issue of Markets

The temperance-farmer allegiance was aided by the problems with specialty crops associated with the alcohol beverage industry. A decade prior, specialty items such as barley, hops, and grapes seemed to offer a viable alternative for small farmers that experienced difficulty competing in the grain market with large grain operations.

Success, however, was limited. Specialty crops often only fared well in select locations.


This difficulty was revealed in the reality of barley cultivation. As stated by the *Prairie Farmer*, barley was “[o]ne of the best paying crops… *when* it succeeds. We say when it succeeds for there are contingencies connected with its growth, ripening and harvesting that will affect its market price.”

Barley required much care and preferred “light, rich soil” and good drainage. The seed strain had to be a preferred variety for malting (typical 6-row was fine initially, but shifting tastes meant shifting cultivars), the weather had to be right, and grain threshed and dried at the appropriate moment to produce the high-grade barley that would fetch the coveted prices granted for grain used in malting. Otherwise, the crop might suffer severe deduction or even sell low as cattle feed.

Another danger of specialization entailed the bandwagon effect. Spurred by reports of remarkable profits, many farmers took on crops such as hops with only limited knowledge of the plant’s growing habits and needs, or production trends elsewhere. Many farmers attempted to grow hops on unsuitable prairie homesteads where the costly price of wood trellising added expense to endeavors that were later laid to waste by high winds. Success in cultivation, however, could be equally ruinous. The 1860s hop rush inspired numerous farmers to pour “their entire means and credit into the business” resulting in the Hop Crisis of 1868. Hops, which had at times brought in seventy-five cents per pound, dropped to an all-time low of three cents per pound, leaving many

---


farmers destitute.\textsuperscript{1105} Still many muddle on into the 1870s, with cultivation widely scattered. With approximately 60,000 acres in production and a discouraging market, papers suggested plowing over at least part of one’s fields for other crops, but farmers bulked. “Plowing up the hop fields would be a useless expenditure,” stated one New York farmer, “for, if the growers will wait a little, their creditors will do the plowing for them.”\textsuperscript{1106}

Likewise, a wave of “grape fever” passed over the west and like a prairie fire, burned would-be western fruit growers. Grapes provided initially favorable returns, but by the mid-1870s these farmers were suffering the consequences. Grapes grew well throughout the west which posed a serious problem as growers planted them en masse. By 1873 the fruit was so abundant that in many places such as Iowa, this fruit “went begging at one and a half cents a pound.”\textsuperscript{1107} The problem was bewildering. As one farmer noted, Iowans drank wine but farmers couldn’t seem to sell grapes for its production. “I do not, and will not, make wine at all,” the Iowan farmer concluded, “As I cannot sell my grapes at any price, the result is a dead loss.” Some farmers in the west tried preserving their grapes for sale in the winter, or dressing them up in fancy boxes for


sale in distant cities but with little success in finding a market for their product. The problem: “vast over-production and a complete collapse in price.”

Farmers in general found the exigencies of the market difficult to bear. In the not so distant past, subsistence production was safeguarded by diversity in a farming system that linked agriculture and ecology. Orchards of local cultivars, the maintenance of forests for foraging, fuel, and hunting, cooperative activities, and animal husbandry limited to subsistence needs all provided farm families with security through diversity. But market production broke these linkages. Specialization meant, not so much knowing what grew well year after year on one’s land but one’s ability to game distant markets. Even with cereal production, traditional safeguards had to be abandoned. For instance, in the quest to grow pure cereals—wheat, rye, or barley berries unsullied by the seed of any other grain—old practices such as the cultivation of maslin (a mixture of two or more cereals such as wheat, rye, oats and barley) fell away. In the old world, this simple strategy allowed farmers to bank on diversity in the face of unpredictable weather. Barley, rye or oats would fill out in moist cool temperatures when wheat fared poorly; wheat would flourish with dry warm summers. Maslin mixture also fared better on marginal soil or fields exhausted by wheat. Such mixtures also provided excellent straw for animal fodder. In the Americas, this subsistence strategy inspired regional foodstuffs such as “Thirded,” Rye and Indian, and Boston Brown breads.

\[^{1108}\] “Grape Culture in the Northwest,” 2.


a variety of grains, including maize, farmers could ensure sufficient calorie crops for family survival.

Old local economies that linked farmers to brewers, distillers and vintners were also falling away. By 1870s, *Western Rural* acknowledged a rapidly fading dream of an American landscape of prize-winning farms like those in England, whose barley was shipped off to “brewers only ten miles distant.”¹¹¹¹ Some brewers still spoke to this vision. For instance, German immigrant and “Boise beer baron” John Lemp advertised his beer as “honest” in that he used “Idaho hops and barley” and local labor.¹¹¹² But in reality small breweries were dwindling because they were unable to compete with large urban firms and their expanding distribution networks. Temperance reforms exacerbated the situation since costly licensing made it more difficult for breweries to run and find outlets for their product. High licensing laws intended to restrict the number of saloons also, ironically, enhanced the power of big brewers and their influence in government.¹¹¹³

Farmers also chaffed at the consolidation of distilleries, a process that began with the
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rehabilitation of the excise during the Civil War. The more profits distillers displayed, the more the agricultural press called for higher taxation.\textsuperscript{1114} The result was larger, more powerful distilleries. Further consolidation occurred in 1887 when nine large distiller firms absorbed 81 small distilling companies to eliminate competition, resulting in their control of 95\% of high wine and spirit production. This trust simultaneously formed the Distiller’s and Cattle Feed Company which extended its power into the stock trade.\textsuperscript{1115}

Grape cultivation equally displayed an increasingly disparate hierarchy of interests. High quality grapes and wine fetched the best prices. The rest sold low as feed for the still. By the late nineteenth century California’s 15,000 grape growers understood well the words of Prussian-born winemaker Charles Krug, that “The grape man must sell his inferior grapes and the wine man his inferior wines to the distiller.”\textsuperscript{1116} Collapsing markets fostered market consolidation; in this climate those who mastered techniques of rhetorical suasion fared best. Winemakers in the US as elsewhere to an increasing extent used the concept of terroir that was so essential to winemaking to advance a spatial construct that served some interests over others.\textsuperscript{1117} In this fashion prime wine regions in New York, Ohio, and California banked on narratives of a pastoralism as an “idyllic


cover” for an industrialized viticulture. As historian Erica Hannickel writes, “something about the Californian terroir was better, more magical than all other viticultural regions.” Destiny and exclusivity enhanced visions of old world romance. By the 1880s, prominent California growers such as German-born Jacob Beringer and Finnish Gustave Niebaum moved toward the “cult of elegance,” selling old world refinement as much as wine.

These trends were synchronous with new implications of alcohol in the “transporting schemes”, i.e. the exhortation of railroad trusts that worked against the farmer. A letter to the editors of *Western Rural* notes:

> We go to market to-day with a load of wheat and get $1.25; we go to-morrow, and if we have not made no contract we get $1.10. The average farmer does not think why. But he will take a glass of beer, go home, and put in ten acres extra, and see if he can’t raise a little more money next year, but behold he finds himself just in the same fix.

Aside from specialization, the only other option for many was an increase in production, which, in aggregate meant an overproduction of all crops, not just specialty items.

Temperance trends exacerbated matters. By the early 1870s breweries in major cities including St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Milwaukee were moving away from all-malt beer as light lagers came into fashion. American barley cultivars produced heavy beer and were pricey. As historian Maureen Ogle points out, older, protein-rich and dark
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brown lagers that served as “liquid bread” in Germany had fallen into disdain in America “where no one needed beer for food” and the big emphasis was low-alcohol “temperance” beverages. In altering their recipes and methods, big brewers bought more imported barley. They stretched their use of pricey hops and through the addition of inexpensive rice or corn as adjuncts reduced their barley outlay. The result was a light-bodied and low-alcohol pilsner that also happened to have a long shelf-life. In the early 1880s, the potential use of maize as an adjunct briefly excited corn farmers. But overall, the net effect of these trends generated resentment and suspicion among farmers, especially when brewers, in an increasingly competitive beer market, kept their methods secret. Rumors spread that brewers were being dishonest—brewing beer with cheap and harmful adulterants while leaving quality hops and barley out in the cold. These accusations were all the more believable since, according to the USDA, the use of cheap adulterants and fillers such as chicory, molasses, various grains and even acorns was on the increase in many beverage products including tea, coffee, and cocoa. Farm, Field and Stockman targeted these sentiments of suspicion with the following joke:

‘Come, let’s go and have a taste of beer,’ said a genial Nickel to a pensive Hop that was scanning the latest market report to see what he was worth. ‘No, thank you,’ replied the Hop with dignity. ‘I never touch beer.’

1125 “Current Topics,” Farm, Field and Stockman, Sept. 11, 1886, 1. Illinois Digital Newspaper Collections (IDNC). University of Illinois.
The point of the joke, the paper claimed, is that breweries used cheap aloe to make their beers bitter, instead of quality hops. This was not true, but many certainly found the accusation believable.

Overall, it stands to reason that western farmers, broadly speaking, suspected that breweries were working against farm interests by shunning farm products. A third boom and bust in the hop market in the late 1880s didn’t help matters. Nor did a series of mergers and the creation of brewing “syndicates” that sought to reduce competition using economies of scale in grain purchasing soothe farmer anxieties. The workings of the market and cultural environment only enhanced anger and suspicion. All of these dynamics made the temperance crusade more appealing to farmers, simply because they felt cheated. Meanwhile, the role of temperance fads and legislation in exacerbating industrial trends towards consolidation went unrecognized, probably because these affects were difficult to see.

In light of these trends, we can see why large urban breweries and distillers emerged in the rural press in lists of “business monstrosities” ranging from the railroads, to Standard Oil, to the makers of hoes and wall-paper—every entity that had “capitalized” on farmers who received little in return. The Grange was quick to identify the alcohol industry as “monopolists”—social “parasites” in contrast to farmers

1126 “Hops,” *Prairie Farmer*, July 24, 1886, 16. Illinois Digital Newspaper Collections (IDNC). University of Illinois. This brief article notes a hop shortage in 1886 after prices bottomed out once more in 1885. As farmers abandoned the crop, only a quarter of the “average yield” came to market.


as “producers” of life sustaining food. And ironically, monopolist did not imply successful capitalists as much as the “reinstatement of privileged classes and an aristocracy of wealth,” or, the formation of a new “Feudal Barons.” Granges proliferated with “incredible rapidity…like a prairie fire over the entire northwest” against the monopolist threat. On July 4th, 1873, the State Farmer’s Association of Illinois even issued a New Declaration of Independence averse to this new “feudal order.”

All of the above helped make the West, as stated by crusader Mrs. Maria B. Holyoke of St. Louis, the newest “front” in the temperance campaign. Temperance “Apostles” like Holyoke gave speaking tours in western cities and towns where they collected cold-water pledges and organized Women’s Christian Unions, reform clubs, and Cold Water Armies. Once established, temperance organizations sowed the seed of temperance systematically. They began with minor legislation that targeted sales close to schools, pressuring media for dedicated temperance columns, and in the passage of high license laws that withheld licenses to brewers, vintners and distillers. Temperance crusaders also targeted the formation of constitutional delegations in territories to ensure that states such as Oklahoma would enter the union dry. With a striking rallying cry, temperance missionaries in Michigan declared war against the “tyrant John Barleycorn” by targeting “people of rural districts” who “were being ruined by the use of cider” and


“communal wine.” In their enthusiasm, the crusade likewise vowed to make Missouri a sober state, “peaceably,” if possible “but by legislation and forcibly” if necessary.

The addition of some new immigrants to the Grange by the late 1870s provided some confirmation for the movement and Grange politics. And, generally speaking, growing interest in politics and social issues by farmers was seen as a sign of improvement on the frontier. Still, in mythological terms, the overriding vision of America’s less settled spaces as a moral wasteland inhabited by the destitute and ignorant—that vision cast by antebellum New England thinkers-- remained in effect, the guiding vision of reformers.

Aside from temperance organizing and legislation, the women’s temperance movement approached the threat of alcohol as part of a larger “food question.” For insight on this topic, the work of Dio Lewis is worth revisiting. Lewis’ musings over the qualities of agricultural forms, food, and the state of the modern stomach have, unfortunately, been lost in contrast to intense scholarly focus on those he inspired. A reformer adrift, for years he mourned the failure of the Maine Laws as a failure of mankind and the machinery of law to eliminate what he viewed as the king of a flawed food system.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
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A lifelong dyspeptic, Lewis found relief in temperance, a discovery that inspired his work as a practitioner of the water-cure in his home state of New York. Water therapy, the consumption of large quantities of water, the flushing of bowels, and taking to the waters as a panacea for all disease became fashionable in the health resorts of the early 1800s. Water cures were part of a cleansing regime of a middle-class temperate lifestyle informed by the understanding of the independent bourgeois self and its ability to stave off all forms of contamination thus maintaining certain “bodily fictions” regarding personal autonomy.1135 As a dietetic reformer, Lewis advised the avoidance of a lengthy checklist of “adulterated” foods including many “foods of the ancients,” of savagery and the “rudest forms… of agriculture.”1136 These included alcohol, herbs, pickles, oils, spices, preserved fruits and meats, cheese, and sprouted and fermented breads—all of which qualified in Lewis’ mind as archaic foods on par with eating “acorns,” the guiding assumption being that premoderns knew remarkably little about health or the quality of food. Rather, Lewis imagined savage peoples who indulged their stomachs, grazed freely from their environments, and were subjugated to the tyranny of alcohol and other poisonous things.1137 Lewis feared Americans, subjected to the same slow-acting poisons, were stuck in the rut of indulgence. Ceres’ simple ground grain, the food of classic Greco-Roman civilization, and the guiding hand of his mother who taught

him the importance of a temperate diet and the “art of plain cooking,” was the answer for not only dyspepsia, but the “national curse” of “gluttony.”

Respectable women and their sphere, the home and kitchen, were charged with addressing this curse. Concern for social purity and focus on women as a domestic problem made national reform a duty of the household. For this reason cooking lessons and schools stand out as central in temperance missionary work. A “poor man’s diet” could be blamed for turning men to drink. Thus women had obligation to ensure men did not go hungry and that they ate nourishing foods to control their appetites, hence the need to train women in “how to buy and how to prepare and serve food for their families.” As expressed by Temperance: A Monthly Journal of the Church of Temperance Society, “Every cooking class then is to be thought of as a good temperance agency.” The schools that emerged offered systematic and standardized recipes for an industrial age. The Boston Cooking School, established in 1879, took the lead by producing an “ingredients-first” recipe system geared towards consumerism, quick assembly, and cooking in the urban setting. As for education, both the Boston Cooking School and WCTU promoted the idea of cooking lessons in public schools. The idea of organized

1138 Lewis, Talks About Peoples’ Stomachs, 181-182, 196. For reference to Ceres see page 108.
1140 Ken Albala and Rosanna Nafziger, The Lost Art of Real Cooking: Rediscovering the Pleasure of Traditional Food One Recipe at a Time (New York: Perigee, 2010), xiv.
philanthropy along these lines was supported by the International Health and Temperance Association. The Sanitarium Health and Temperance School as an extension of the Battle Creek Sanitarium as of the 1890s trained teachers for this work through month-long instruction programs.\textsuperscript{1142}

Of course, to contemplate food was to contemplate the farm. Here, the movement tended to conflate the health of markets with human and social health, at least to a point. The movement had long prized wheat simultaneously for its association with temperance and prosperity. For instance, when production expanded in the 1840s into the temperate zone of the Ohio Valley this development was celebrated by the \textit{Western Temperance Journal} as a marker of progress.\textsuperscript{1143} After all, wheat in its global demand was the engine behind agricultural expansionism and US economic prominence. Production was industrial, required capital, and was very tech savvy. Wheat products were also highly advertised through temperance literature which promoted wheat as an ideal food of \textit{“great sustaining powers,”} due to its \textit{“flesh-forming”} starch and gluten, and \textit{“nutriment”} content.\textsuperscript{1144}

Likewise, the WCTU reiterated established temperance doctrine that farm production for spirits impoverished society and farmers, that alcohol production carried off the produce of farm and blessings of Providence to distant wineries, brewers, or

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
distilleries where it was squandered. Notably, this argument was informed by long-
standing pseudo-scientific claim that beer and wine did not qualify in any way shape or 
form as food because it was the product of the destructive process of fermentation. This 
concept was disseminated widely by temperance columns and WCTU designed Scientific 
Temperance Instruction (STI) which was made compulsory in all state schools, minus 
Arizona, by 1901, by the passage of state laws. Through obligatory instruction using 
WCTU generated literature in public schools, the organization sought to plough and seed 
the next generation with the proper moral influence and culture.

The prejudices of the movement are easily viewed in STI literature. The STI 
textbook *Hygiene for Young People* (1885), for instance, made the claim that beer did not 
qualify as food because the “food nature” of its ingredients was lost in fermentation.
Within a strikingly industrial mindset, the book cast alcohol as a poison that deadened 
nerves, diminished productivity, and disrupted the functions of the “factory” of the 
body. Similarly, another text titled *Hygiene Physiology* (1889) couched the production 
of “deleterious” alcohol as an abuse of “harmless fruits and grains” that lost their 
“innocence” through the transformation of “nutritive” food to “treacherous” drink.

These treatments of fermentation took on a coded form of racism. According to *Hygiene

1145 Zimmerman, *Distilling Democracy*, xii.
Physiology, a healthy human body responded to alcohol as an “intruder.” Similarly, cravings for certain ethnically defined foods such as mustard, vinegar and spices were cast as a form of “unnatural” appetite. In contrast, the same text cast cravings for wheat bread and butter as normative, thus extending the temperance penchant for the symbolic import of bread and butter as the staff of life and fuel of a growing industrial nation.\footnote{Palmer, Hygiene for Young People, 74.}

As before, this proclivity was translated in the field as wheat and dairy as the means to profitable agriculture.

In the mid-1880s, the eighth annual WCTU conference generated a department of hygiene within the organization with Mrs. John Harvey Kellogg, wife of the famous food reformer, at the helm as superintendent. Its purpose was the “study of hereditary tendencies” related to food and drink. Complementing departments such as “State and County Fairs” (renamed the department of “Fairs and Open Air Meetings” in 1900) disseminated WCTU propaganda for the “building of public sentiment” from the rural county level to “large national and international gatherings,” such as the Paris Expositions.\footnote{Stevenson, A Brief History, 37-38.}

The farm-temperance alliance expanded in the late 1870s and 1880s with the formation of the National Farmers’ Alliance (NFA), which grew out of the agricultural crises of the southeastern and Midwestern regions. Established in 1877, the National Farmers’ Alliance, also known as the Northern Alliance, grew rapidly in the old Grange strongholds as the rising star of the Grange dimmed. In the 1880s, the Alliance made
common cause with the Knights of Labor and Prohibition Party due to shared platform elements; namely, the regulation of railroads and inflationary monetary policies.\textsuperscript{1151} The Alliance and Knights also initially agreed with Willard and the WCTU in the understanding that poverty and unemployment promoted alcoholism and domestic abuse. So too, they upheld the maternal “housekeeping” role of farm women in countering various frontier threats, ranging from alcoholism to bank foreclosures. Firebrands such as Mary Lease, the passionate orator of the Knights of Labor who called on farmers to “raise less corn and more hell,” even managed to combine temperance politics with support for railway strikes and tenant farmers, as well opposition to British colonial rule in Ireland. Having abandoned a homestead in Kansas, Lease and her husband, Charles, knew well the chicanery of Jay Gould and the Southern Railway system in coaxing unsuspecting farmers onto marginal land.\textsuperscript{1152}

But these organizations lacked consensus internally and otherwise, on suffrage as a priority and temperance as a goal. As the NFA grew increasingly radical, temperance lost status as an issue of concern. This was particularly evident by the February 22, 1892, NFA and Industrial Union conference. Farmers, labor leaders, reformers converged on St. Louis. Willard was in attendance, but the crowd was not with her. Resolutions included call for publicly owned railroads and suffrage issue raised, but prohibition proved too

\textsuperscript{1151} Gusfield, \textit{Symbolic Crusade}, 94.

“volatile” an issue to even mention. Suffice to say, the NFA, though dominated by grain growers, represented a more ethnically mixed population and a different approach to economic and political reform. By 1890, chapters of the FA had their fill of self-help measures including temperance and cooperative farming that lay at the heart of the Grange. Temperance advocates ran into similar issues with the Populists Party. At the local and state level, Populists frequently supported prohibition—that is, depending on its audience. Nationally, the party evaded the issue out of concern over the immigrant and the Democratic vote.

Arguably, in the list of farm problems, alcohol once reduced to a self-help measure, lost its ideological force. In short, temperance got bogged down in reality and a combined farmer-labor critique of capitalism. Edward S. Richard of the National Farmers’ Alliance, in Chicago, put it thusly:

There are many classes of philanthropists [sic] and idealists who are sympathetic and well meaning, but they fail to offer adequate remedies. Among the solutions suggested by such people are temperance economy and Christian resignation. No doubt these virtues are commendable as a matter of personal conduct, but the fact remains that these partial remedies have been tried for centuries and have never yet effected [sic] industrial reform. We see that capital finds a most effective adjunct in thorough organization.

Through organization farmers hoped to achieve more useful reform: the inspection of warehouses by disinterested officials, the splitting of railways and grain warehouses, and heavy penalties for violations regulatory mechanisms.


Other factors contributed to the fracturing of the farm-temperance alliance. Though labor had tried to improve its image by distancing itself from liquor, dry activism by 1893 was fanning anti-union and anti-Populist sentiment by highlighting the role of saloons in workers’ meetings with claims that saloons had created the “criminal” anarchists of the Haymarket Square incident of 1886. This incident involved a May Day general strike, called by the Knights of Labor and other labor organizations in support of the eight-hour day. In response, workers in Chicago rallied in an old farmers’ haymarket, which had in recent years become, like similar urban haymarkets across the country, a site of low-income tenement housing mixed with commerce, religious institutions, and saloons that catered to the working class. At this outdoor meeting, spectators listened to numerous orators including anarchists, who spoke from the platform of an old wagon. When the police tried to disperse the gathering a bomb went off killing several civilians and policemen. Col. George W. Bain, speaker at the World Temperance Conference held in Chicago in 1893 alongside the Chicago World Fair, maintained that the Haymarket anarchists had committed treason against the Constitution of the United States, and charged all associated with the manufacture of drink as co-conspirators in the Haymarket affair. In couching the American struggle for liberty as one-and-the-same with temperance, Bain also denounced the Populist free-silver campaign as trivial in comparison to the fight against the “strongly entrenched evil” of alcohol. The ill-effects of wayward labor and farmers, claimed Bain, were visible at the World Fair where “the great harvest of liquor”—the “pirate upon the sea of commerce,” was afforded space
amidst legitimate industry.1156 In purpose, the fair celebrated industry, neoclassicism, and pure Anglo “whiteness” visible in the “White City”—a central court of pure-white structures housing the latest advances in manufacturing, transportation, agriculture, and science. Progress in the manufacture of American wine and spirits, showcased in the north pavilion of the White City, complete with an ornamental fountain filled with real wine, was far too much for the likes of Bain to bear.1157 Thus in the symbolic merger of anarchists, piracy, and deviant harvests, Bain condemned labor, Populism, and alcohol while reaffirming the movement’s business-orientation.

Likewise, STI, though ubiquitous in public education, met a bombardment of mixed reviews and criticism ranging from educational experts, who viewed STI as trespassing in the realm of professionals, to physiologists who argued that STI utilized erroneous “popular” science as a cloak for a cultural and emotion-based prohibition agenda.1158 Western immigrant communities frequently viewed STI as intruding on local directives, cultures and drinking traditions. To get around state mandates, local school

---
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districts ignored statutes or adopted abridged versions of STI textbooks or alternative texts via rival companies, thus voiding the language that maligned moderate drinking.\textsuperscript{1159}

Beyond the politics of reform were looming discrepancies of the temperance-farming merger. For one, arguments that emerged from temperance organization-derived sources often conflicted with farm prerogatives. Even though agricultural periodicals in advertizing themselves as family-oriented ran temperance columns, the common quest for reduced use of grain and fruit in the manufacture of alcohol was glaringly incongruous when paired with the market focus of these publications. Quite ironically, the WCTU column “Temperance News and Notes,” which celebrated annual reduction of spirits produced from grain, sat side-by-side in \textit{Farm, Field and Stockman} with “The Markets,” the go-to column for the latest commodity price for everything from wheat to hops and barley.\textsuperscript{1160} Indeed, outside of temperance columns the agricultural press continued to announce upticks in the market for good malting barley, corn, grapes, hops, and even cider.\textsuperscript{1161}

As Marx contends, capitalism does not solve its internal contradictions. Rather it internalizes and displaces them even as they broaden and deepen. Consequently, notes Lefebvre, systemic contradictions in abstract space are “thrown up in historical time.”\textsuperscript{1162}
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And indeed, the moral abstractions built into the popularized temperance “Economy of Alcohol” were betrayed by incongruities that emerged well before national prohibition. In Iowa and Kansas, where beer sales were prohibited in the late 1880s, an alliance of brewers responded with a boycott of each state’s barley. Moreover, the brewers swore to boycott the barley of any state that passed similar laws. Barley from these states did sell a few cents per bushel under the market norm, but the brewers were adamant that they would not purchase the barley at any price. This incident brought certain inconsistencies to light, the biggest being how markets undermined the role of community relations in production and consumption and the failure of temperance to address this split. The *New York Times*, for instance, contemplated the peculiarities of the prohibitionist farmer who grew the “devil’s cereal.” The paper opines, if morality was the goal then “[t]he brewers ha[d] some ground for scoffing at the virtue of the Prohibitionist who is too good to drink beer, but not too good to grow barley.”

State populations were certainly not uniform in their support for the passage of these laws and it’s difficult to say if any particular barley farmer endorsed the beer bans, but state agricultural sectors, nonetheless, benefited from brewer purchases from the barley market if only from the demand for barley that brewers created.

It is good to note that it was certainly within the brewers’ right to take their business elsewhere, but as the *Times* points out boycotts and old notions of patronage were not so easily enforced within existing market dynamics. Could any farmer or any brewer know whose grain was whose in a faceless commodity market? One of the

---

functions of the market was to sever personal relations that once linked production to consumption. Only with local trade established outside of commodity markets—as with the local brewers who made a point of buying hops, grain, and seasonal fruits and vegetables that defined regional brews from identifiable farmers—could the purchase or rejection of one by the other have much clout. As stated by the *Times*, all else amounted to little more than a “pleasing delusion.”

1164
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Chapter 8: The Anti-Saloon League, Billy Sunday, and the Politics of Cheese

I am the sworn, eternal, uncompromising enemy of the liquor traffic. I ask no quarter and I give none. I have drawn the sword in defense of God, home, wife, children and native land, and I will never sheathe it until the undertaker pumps me full of embalming fluid…
--William A. “Billy” Sunday

…I should this inexplicable lunch-fiend not happen to be called to drink, he devours whatever he can, and, while the bartender is occupied, tries to escape unnoticed. Thus he thrives on his low craft…
--The New York Times, 1872

According to numerous scholars, in temperance logic, the saloon represented unreformed urbanity, immigrant habits and political corruption. And in this line of thinking the Anti-Saloon League, a lobbyist organization formed by lawyer-turn-minister Howard Hyde Russell of Oberlin, Ohio, in 1893 converted the temperance movement into anti-saloon crusade. This is not an inaccurate perspective, but we should take care not to equate the movement as an assault on urbanity, or modernity for that matter. Instead, I would like to propose we locate the ASL in the spatial politics and ideology of temperance as it evolved during the market revolution.

Oberlin

As noted by ASL leader and historian Ernest Hurst Cherrington in 1913, the organization’s origin in Oberlin was notable for two reasons. First, Oberlin was founded by reformers in 1833 who wished to live in a “reform” community. Oberlin residents understood themselves as part of the extended history of temperance, stretching back to the early 1800, and engaged in the reform movements of the midcentury. Second,
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Oberlin, the cradle of the ASL, was in Ohio, which, as previously mentioned, had emerged as a battle ground state. Or, as Cherrington states, Ohio, “as a state, taken as a whole, has been a good seed-bed in which to plant and propagate a new ‘idee’ for human welfare.”

For Cherrington, the nineteenth century was one long battle of “the people” against the “tyranny of the saloon” which had “its hand on the throat of legitimate business.” Under the contention that alcohol sapped communities of capital and people of their productive capacity, the ASL’s early incarnation, the Oberlin Temperance Alliance, established on March 20, 1874, sought legal grounds to ban the saloon at the township and county level. In this fashion they hoped to eliminate alcohol’s deleterious economic effects in the state’s college towns (Oblerin was home to a small, private liberal-arts college) and in the immediate vicinity of the members of the league. Given this, we can say that the ASL shared a foundational premise with the temperance colony, but differed to some degree in its quest to convert unreformed spaces elsewhere throughout the state, into temperance spaces. In addition, as leagues multiplied under the direction of clergy members in other locales and with the formation of the national ASL in 1895, the movement took on national dimensions and goals.

From the start, the League was dominated by Evangelical Christian clergyman, but theirs was not the politics of a “rural, evangelical virus” as the Hofstadter school of
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prohibition scholarship long contended.\textsuperscript{1170} Rather, the ASL was a league of interdenominational Protestant churches. Oberlin’s history, once more, sheds light on the League’s religious roots. As a town, Oberlin claimed distinction in the history of modern evangelical revivalism. Charles Grandison Finney, the lawyer-turned-Presbyterian-circuit-rider who tried to bring temperance to frontier farmers, became a professor and then the second president of Oberlin College after moving to Ohio in the mid-1830s.\textsuperscript{1171} Oberlin’s aspiration remained the production of new missionaries to tend the ever-shifting frontier and a reform agenda that included temperance. It embodied the New England bid over the West, and fears of what the region might become, as famed historian Frederick Jackson Turner exclaimed, “lest the west cut loose from her [New England’s] religion.” Missionaries, such as those produced in Oberlin, knew their role and were reassured of its importance by the likes of Turner. His thesis featured in teaching and missionary publications located the nation’s conscience in New England, and the taming of the frontier in “home missions …and western colleges.”\textsuperscript{1172}

The activists Oberlin produced mirrored those of the 1830s. James H. Fairchild, president of Oberlin College, served as the first president of the Alliance.\textsuperscript{1173} And, over

\textsuperscript{1170} Hofstadter, \textit{The Age of Reform}, 290.


\textsuperscript{1173} Cherrington, \textit{History of the Anti-Saloon}, 11.
the years, Oberlin produced several of the most significant ASL leaders, including Russell, Cherrington, and the crafty lawyer-turned-political organizer, Wayne B. Wheeler. Notes Lefebvre, ideology needs space to exist and persist.\textsuperscript{1174} Oberlin kept the flame of temperance alive for the production of the next generation of activists. These three men were, generally speaking, in good company within the League. A glimpse at the ASL leadership provided by historian Jack S. Blocker Jr., reveals the League as strikingly centralized around young, ambitious men “from the most highly educated segment of the American population.”\textsuperscript{1175} Notes Blocker, over 78% of League offices were held by professionals, the majority of which were clergymen, lawyers, and teachers. Farmers, in contrast, occupied only .8% of League offices—slightly above skilled laborers at .4% and lower than farmer leadership (at 6%) in the Prohibition Party.\textsuperscript{1176}

As many scholars have noted, Wheeler turned the ASL into one of the most effective political interest groups in American history. Wheeler’s carefully honed strategy relied on legal savvy and an abundance of money, the latter of which was raised in campaigns targeting employers, industrialists, and middle-class taxpayers for whom the elimination of the saloon meant the elimination of competition, greater profits from labor or alterations in consumer spending, or merely the end of alcohol’s presumed economic drain on society.\textsuperscript{1177}
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With Wheeler’s guidance, the League launched a two pronged assault on its sworn enemy using intense lobbying efforts and local option legislation. As in the past, the League’s tactics were spatial: to restrict production to certain spaces while prohibiting them in others to affect the control of resources and people. Substantial amounts of money were directed to the election of politicians willing to vote dry and smear campaigns against the opposition, which effectively created the “threat of political annihilation to a man of soft resolve who was tempted to vote wrong in committee or on the open floor.”\footnote{Clark, \textit{Deliver Us from Evil}, 114.}

Under League direction, victors secured state local option laws, also penned by the League. These initiatives allowed counties and/or municipalities the choice to vote up or down saloon licensing under the guise of empowering community preference couched as a return to Jeffersonian democracy. To ensure desired outcomes in each election, the ASL bombarded each locality with a blitz of temperance activism not unlike the “temperance actions” performed by antebellum reformers in frontier communities sixty years prior.

League leadership may not have been farmers, but the League needed the farmer vote in its efforts to geographically marginalize liquor interests. In truth, the majority of Americans still lived a rural existence and this demographic fact meant that the urban vote was underrepresented. If one wanted to go after the saloon as a way to go after liquor, as was the ASL’s design, the political path had to involve rural voters.\footnote{Peter H. Odegard, \textit{Pressure Politics: The Story of the Anti-Saloon League} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928), 121.} To galvanize voters, similar to prior temperance organization, the ASL proved skilled in the
use of media published by its own publishing house, the American Issue Publishing
Company. Through mass publication the League inundated the public spaces with a fresh
onslaught of literature. Here, Cherrington stands out as a prime mover as the
superintendent of the ASL press, as an editor, and as an author in his own right.
Cherrington edited the six-volume *Standard Encyclopedia of the Alcohol Problem*, which
the ASL distributed to schools nation-wide.\footnote{Ernest Cherrington, ed., *Standard Encyclopedia of the Alcohol Problem* (Westerville: American Issue, 1925).} In addition, Cherrington’s pen and
editorial eye contributed to numerous other publications on the role of education in
affecting temperance reform as well as the League’s own annual *Anti-Saloon League
terms of farming, Cherrington rhetorically linked the League to rural America by
constructing an ASL history that wedded the urban League over time and space, to those
early commercial farmers in Connecticut who “joined together to exclude strong liquors
from the harvest fields in 1789.”\footnote{Ernest Hurst Cherrington, *The Anti-Saloon League Year Book, 1926: An Encyclopedia of Facts and Figures Dealing with the Liquor Traffic* (Westerville: Anti-Saloon League of America, 1927), 7.} Throughout its propaganda history, the League
targeted farmers strategically. Initially they downplayed the importance of grain to win
farm votes, at least until World War I when they inflated the same statistics to argue for prohibition as a necessary wartime measure.\textsuperscript{1183}

Local leagues complemented national publications with their own literature. For instance, the Anti-Saloon League of Charlotte, North Carolina issued a bound open letter from the league’s chairman, Heriot Clarkson, to the United States, with local testimonies on the positive effects of the city’s ban of the saloon, via a local option election held in 1904.\textsuperscript{1184} According to Clarkson, all members of the community, from businessmen to farmers and laborers, had benefited from prohibition as evident in a decrease in arrests, a 10% increase in property values, and the redirection of money from the saloon to local merchants. The transition was evident in the landscape. Notes the author, in four years time, 50 cotton mills had replaced “about 48 distilleries and many saloons.” Three photos of “converted” structures—places that were once saloons but now were proper businesses—provide proof of growing business. In effect, the city had gone from the “small village” it had been in the 1870s, to “one of the finest industrial and educational centers in this section of the South.”\textsuperscript{1185} The effects were supported by the highly instructive language of the testimonies of loan agencies, large merchants, the president of the local YMCA, renters, grocers, businessmen, contractors, several “leading” and
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“prominent” large farmers, and a few smaller “good farmers”. In this treatise, all things good were growing or already large, sober, and industrial. The “village” is paired with poverty and alcohol; the industrial city with wealth.

A Charlotte dairyman claimed his business had grown, presumably because more people were drinking milk (a fairly modern commercial product) instead of whiskey—an older, premodern commodity of dubious economic association. These farmers were businessmen, concerned with getting the most out of their workers. A “leading” farmer quipped that that he “could send [his] hired hands to town without the fear of them coming home drunk.” Yet another added a racial element, specifying that he could “send negroes to Charlotte” and “have not fear like we once had, that they would come back drunk with something broken or unattended to.” Small “good” farmers also praised prohibition for creating sober labor. Overall, the publication assured other townships and counties that prohibition was an economic godsend—a great cause of monetary benefit to town and country, and especially, the white economic elite.

Pioneer Preachers

When it came to recruitment, more effective still was the ASL’s use of the pulpit. Established evangelical clergy provided a base of continuous anti-saloon militancy and fund raising using “field days”, the dedication of one Sunday a month to anti-saloon activities across local protestant denominations. As instructed by the National League, all pastors in cooperation within a town or city arranged special services and other activities

1186 Clarkson, It Helps Business, 9, 12-16.
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as an “impetus for a concerted movement.”\textsuperscript{1188} In addition to putting to people to work, field days were intentionally structured to incorporate business interests while alienating all non-participating churches and individuals within a community. States ASL attorney and counselor William H. Anderson explains,

\begin{quote}
The movement will help cold churches because it will compel them to take a stand or cease to be respectable. It will help every church because it enlists the interest of the right-thinking, non-church man in some enterprise of the church.\textsuperscript{1189}
\end{quote}

Anderson impressed upon his readers an urgent vision of the nation’s churches standing as one “invisible force”, the “right hand of God” in a millennial battle against the saloon, the epitome of all evil. “The hour has arrived,” he states, “when the church is responsible for results. Lack of faith alone has delayed the final victory.”\textsuperscript{1190} Rev. P.A. Baker, General Superintendent of the National ASL, expounded these techniques as altogether fitting of “an age of combination, federation, and mobilization.” This, notes Baker, was not an “organic union”-- the goal was a form of Protestant federalism in the name of “efficiency,” “prestige, and power”.\textsuperscript{1191} A modern subjectivity defined by federalism had become the space of production and representation for the temperance cause.
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The leadership of churches was complemented by the latest collection of traveling “pioneer” preachers who came to define modern “mass” evangelism by the end of the nineteenth century. Though many began preaching in established society halls, auditoriums and churches, as they gained prominence they used circus tents or temporary wood tabernacles to accommodate crowds of thousands. Like the circuit riders of old, they were constantly on the move, stopping for a few weeks in a town or city, before moving onto the next location. To capacitate travels that spanned numerous states, they relied on two things: first, a company of a dozen or so staff members including managers for handling correspondences, money and scheduling, as well as front men tasked with arriving ahead of schedule to generate interest and to make necessary arrangements. Other staff support including singers and security. Other than staff, these revivalist required large collection plates and the financial backing of social elites as necessary to fund the expense of mass meetings. Reliance on deep pockets influenced the religious message. As stated by Matthew Avery Sutton, in tending the money issue, revivalists, “worked closely with corporate barons, and they praised the benefits that big business brought to the nation.”

Modern revivalists orated a heroic vision of their own past as part of an apocalyptic millennialism preparing the way for the imminent return of God’s kingdom. To enlist their communicants in this project, preachers deployed promises of future prosperity and the threat of damnation should their congregations refuse to
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participate. Proselytizing strategies included other tactics. One might appeal to populism—not the recent Populist movement which collapsed after the 1896 election, but rather, the use of vernacular language—a move popularized by preacher Billy Sunday. Slang, street language, vulgarities, and down-home talk became the language for winning over the masses. In addition, revivalists earned a reputation of evangelizing the nation—wedding evangelism and nationalism, patriotism and military service as a Christian duty. This trend was part of a growing alignment in Protestantism with militarism and all things manly such as sports and business, as a counter to the “perceived dangers of feminized religion”; namely, the growing influence of women in church operation and definition. This trend made revivalists a snug fit the ASL which worked in tandem with the WCTU but was otherwise an organization of men.

There were many revivalist preachers, each with their own stomping grounds. Dwight L. Moody worked the heartland in the 1870s and Charles Reign Scoville’s ministry targeted the new Northwest. But by far the most celebrated, politicized, and far reaching ministry belonged to William Ashley “Billy” Sunday. Sunday was a modern evangelist through and through. Indeed, his name has come to signify modern evangelism. Sunday was also the biggest champion of the dry cause. In the course of a
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career running from 1896 to 1935, he toured every state in the US. When a local option bill came to a vote, he was often present, preaching and energizing the dry base.

Sunday’s life story was the story of the modern transition from farm to city. His prominence, claims Robert F. Martin, stemmed from “the congruence between his life and work and the hopes and fears of people struggling to cope with the myriad of uncertainties inherent in the transition from a rural, agricultural nation to an urban, industrial one.\textsuperscript{1197} The Sundays were old-stock German immigrants that settled in south-central Pennsylvania where they anglicized the family name of “Sonntag” into “Sunday.” This was but the first move in what would be a lengthy process of integration. Billy’s father, William, a farmhand and mason of poor circumstance migrated from Pennsylvania to Iowa in the late 1840s in hopes of acquiring inexpensive land. This, however, did not occur. William married the daughter of a homesteader, but his young new family struggled, especially when depression hit in the 1850s. Their son, Billy was born into impoverished circumstances on his grandparents’ homestead in Iowa. His father died in the Civil War just before his birth, and after a second marriage ended in abandonment, his destitute mother gave up her two youngest sons to an orphanage. Billy was only nine at the time. The brothers bounced about, from one orphanage to another and back to their grandparent’s farm, before Billy struck out on his own at age fourteen, to work in Nevada City. There he was hired as a houseboy for the Scotts, a middle-class family. Sunday attended school and moved to Marshalltown where he developed a name as an athlete.

Then he was off to Chicago and major league baseball after being recruited by the White Stockings. By his early twenties, Sunday had a name—he was a famed ball player. But his was no easy or charmed path. Along the way, Sunday experienced excruciating loss—numerous family members, including his beloved grandmother from the “galloping consumption,” and a sister from a bonfire accident.\(^ {1198}\) And the Sunday family story as a whole epitomized the rootlessness that had come to define rural destitution as complicated by war and market crises. Yet the travails of Sunday’s youth, tragic and painful as it was, did not end in a factory or mining town as happened with so many of similar circumstance. Sunday was a regular Corn Belt Horatio Alger, and that was how he understood his life.

In the metropolis, Billy prospered. But a restive, lonely and insecure child lurked behind what otherwise appeared to be a self-assured professional athlete. While out walking with fellow teammates in the summer of 1886, he encountered the “gospel wagon” of urban evangelical street missionaries in the saloon district. Like many street goers, Billy gravitated toward the moving feast of religion and entertainment—the oompah of a brass band, a choir, and the preaching of evangelist Harry Monroe. Emotionally moved by hymns that reminded him of his mother, Billy took Monroe’s invitation to attend service at a nearby rescue mission in a space that, until 1880, was home to the Pacific Beer Garden.\(^ {1199}\) In this converted space, Billy himself was transformed. He
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began attending regular services at Jefferson Park Presbyterian Church on Chicago’s fashionable west side. There he met his future wife, Helen Amelia Thompson, daughter of William Thompson, Chicago’s dairy mogul. Helen, who Sunday referred to as “Nell” or “Ma,” versed Billy in middle-class culture and excelled as the comforting mother figure Sunday longed for. Though never a heavy drinker, as a convert Billy abandoned drinking and was sought out as a speaker by churches and the YMCA. Then, in 1891, Sunday walked away from baseball and an extravagant income of $400 a month to work full time for the YMCA. His consul—friends and family, including J.V. Farwell, president of the YMCA and Cyrus McCormick, president of the McCormick Harvesting Machine Company, encouraged the transition. In 1893, Billy entered into employment as assistant to evangelist J. Wilbur Chapman who tutored him in preaching on the revival circuit.

Sunday was a preaching sensation. He worked small town America, aka the “kerosene circuit”, first in “opera houses, large churches, or tents.” In fact, at first he utilized a circus tent he erected himself, but when this was ruined in a snow storm he insisted his hosts provide tabernacles. *Lyceum Magazine* referred to Sunday’s tabernacles as “salvation barns” and their construction as similar to a barn-raising. But unlike

---
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barns raised by neighbors, spirits, and a common meal, these structures were built by
contractors with blueprints to be highly controlled spaces. A bed of sawdust, tossed on
the aisles gave the tabernacle a coarse, earthy smell, but most of all, it dampened the
sound of feet on creaky floor-boards. All aspects of construction strategically created the
ideal stage for Sunday’s “much-pounded pulpit” or the rousing strains of the choir,
trombones, and grand pianos. 1204 Warding off disruptions was high priority. Sunday notes
in his autobiography, “A tabernacle is the safest building ever devised in which to handle
crowds safely. We always had an army of trained men as ushers, and fifteen to twenty
doors.” 1205 This “army of redemption” deftly handled crowds, keeping out stragglers and
late-comers. Notes Lyceum,

Babies cannot cry. People are instructed to cover their face with their
handkerchief when forced to cough, so as to muffle it. Billy stops and stares at the
one who coughs or makes any disturbance. The result is an audience of ten
thousand as quiet as Quakers. 1206

With sermons prepared, every detail worked out in advance, and ushers at the door,

Sunday ensured no interruptions.

The revival circuit was a suitable environment for Billy’s brand of evangelism.

Sunday was no theologian. His education, drawn from the urban missions, lacked depth,
and even he admitted that he ran out of material after a few weeks of preaching. As

Sunday put it, he had a “barrel” of sermons and when he hit bottom, it was time to move

---
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on. Contrary to popular notions, Sunday’s legacy could not be strictly rural by design. In the beginning he preached every “whiskey-soaked, gambling-cursed, jay-rube town out in short-grass country on the kerosene circuit.” But a crowd of even a few hundred, as he put it, offered “scarcely enough to pay my way home.”

His most successful campaigns were in cities where he defied media predictions and drew big crowds. New York City, 1918, topped them all. It even included a massive tabernacle constructed on 168th Street and Broadway. As for character, Sunday did not view people in either rural or urban spaces as unique. “The people in New York,” observed the preacher, “are just like the people in the corn rows out in Iowa or any other place. They are just folks, that’s all, with the same hungering for the old-fashioned Gospel of Jesus Christ that I have found everywhere.”

On center stage, Sunday, the athletic dynamo, reenacted baseball games with much enthusiasm. Aside from the “gospel of baseball” and displays of athleticism, Sunday’s other “big game” was his famous “booze” sermon. Sunday drew crowds in both urban and rural settings and in doing so he aided the ASL in its legislative goals. The question remains, when it came to the issue of alcohol, what message did he deliver to the farmers he encountered? In answering this question, Sunday’s celebrated sermon offers much insight. For this reason let us recall the sermon’s main points.

1207 Sunday, The Sawdust Trail, 71.
1208 Sunday, The Sawdust Trail, 72.
1209 Sunday, The Sawdust Trail, 79.
1210 Sunday, The Sawdust Trail, 80.
The significance of Sunday’s sermon cannot be dismissed. Its importance in rallying the dry vote is well-documented and undeniable. That said, for a reader the most striking aspect of this sermon is its lack of originality. The sermon reads like a loosely stitched quilt of well-worn arguments and imagery dating back to the antebellum temperance movement. Sunday resuscitates the analogy of productive and non-productive mills from *Ten Nights in a Bar-room*, summoning small boys to the platform to represent millions of American boys the industry supposedly ground into drunkards each year.\textsuperscript{1212} He rails against the anarchism with its “dirty, red flag … dyed with the blood of women and children.”\textsuperscript{1213} With outburst of patriotism he calls on men to protect church, state and the “sanctity of the home” while rehearsing talking points against wet arguments. He makes the usual claims that alcohol destroyed families, fostered criminality, and birthed imbeciles. States Sunday, demon rum produced “idleness, disease, pauperism and crime.”\textsuperscript{1214}

These statements are backed with the usual array of questionable statistics, leading into the latest rendition of American Temperance Society co-founder Justin Edward’s “economy of alcohol,” which launched the antebellum prohibition movement. Part of this emerges as a strong distaste for taxes. According to Sunday, alcohol corrupted politics at the expense of legitimate business. In “producing” paupers, idiots, and criminals, the alcohol industry drained society of its wealth, which was siphoned off as

\textsuperscript{1212} Billy Sunday, *The Best of Billy Sunday: 17 Burning Sermons from the Most Spectacular Evangelist the World Has Every Known* (Murfreesboro: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1965), 84-85.

\textsuperscript{1213} Billy Sunday, *The Best of Billy Sunday*, 76.

\textsuperscript{1214} Billy Sunday, *The Best of Billy Sunday*, 64-65.
taxes, imposed on the industrious and temperate, to pay for “insane asylums, and jails, and Keeley curers, and reformatories.” Eliminate alcohol and one eliminates these burdens to the benefit of proper business.

The obscure workings of the market played into Sunday’s additional claims that there was something very dishonest about the economics of alcohol. A gallon of whiskey, notes the preacher, cost only twenty cents to make, but as an item of consumption divided up and sold over the counter at 10 cents per glass, mysteriously “burned up” four dollars. Aside from bad math, this equation suggested that either industry shenanigans or some form of magic unique to alcohol inflated retail prices and destroyed capital. Sunday implies a form of theft as well on the part of the industry and government. In the process of exchange the farmer got his nickel “for corn and apples” while the rest went to the “United States government, the big distillers, and big corporations.” The role of taxes in society is never discussed, and Sunday implies that taxes might be altogether unnecessary in a world free of Demon Rum. To distance farming from the industry the preacher played on existing acrimony, professing that that breweries shunned barley and hops for “carloads of gincose and sugar and other things.” Meanwhile, the drinker got “less than nothing” for his money since alcohol “robbed” the body of it productive capacity.

---
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Sunday follows with another well-worn vision of the power of consumer capital in modern society minus alcohol. If, claimed the preacher, the dollar spent on alcohol was instead spent on shoes for a son than the boy could earn more money. In this case, states Sunday,

…my dollar becomes a silver thread in the woof and warp of happiness and joy, and the man that owns the building gets some, and the clerk that sold the shoes gets some, and the merchant, and the travelling man, and the wholesale gets some and the factory, and the man that made the shoes, and the man that tanned the hide, and the butcher that bought the calf, and the farmer that raised the calf, and the little colored fellow that shined the shoes, and my dollar is spread itself and nobody is made the worse for spending the money.1218

Once again, Edward vision of perfect economic order is rehashed complete with the assumption that consumption generates the endless cornucopia of capitalism--that is, if the goods consumed aren’t drink.

Sunday, in line with every reformer dating to the 1830s, rejects the argument that prohibition would “cut off the farmer’s market for his corn, and that the brewer, who furnishes him a market for his corn, is his benefactor.”1219 He continues quite predictably, with claims the bushel of corn sold to the brewer once transformed into liquid spirits and released into society destroyed workers and consumers and thus undermined clockwork mechanisms of a perfect capitalist market. This argument is emotionally reinforced with sentimental stereotypes: the young man driven insane by drink who winds up killing


1219 Sunday, The Best of Billy Sunday, 68.
friends and family, the father who squanders his pay and has nothing to offer his starving children, and Sunday’s personal favorite, asylums full of “whiskey orphans.”1220

Outrage was matched with reproach. The farmer, claimed Sunday, had to face the destructive capacity of his corn gone astray. “And now,” states the preacher,

I want to know, my farmer friend, if this has been a good commercial transaction for you. You sold a bushel of corn; you found a market; you got fifty cents; but a fraction of this product struck down seven lives, all of whom would have been consumers of your products for their life expectancy. And do you mean to say that is a good economic transaction to you?1221

And if the image of alcohol destroying the consumer base of farm products was insufficient, there was hell fire:

…if the man that drinks the whiskey goes to hell, the man that votes for the saloon that sold the whiskey to him will go to hell. If the man that drinks the whiskey goes to hell and the man that sold the whiskey to the man that drank it goes to heaven, than the poor drunkard will have the right to stand on the brink of eternal damnation and put his arms around the pillar of justice and say, ‘That isn’t a square deal.’ If you vote for the dirty business you go to hell as sure as you live, and I would like to fire the furnace while you are there.1222

By logical extension, farmers colluded with evil when they failed to vote against the saloon. But Sunday also made a loose promise that in the long run, if farmers were true to his vision, they would ultimately benefit financially. Getting on “the water wagon” meant more money spent on farmer products. “Boys,” exclaims the preacher, “let’s cut her out and spend money on flour, meat and clothes; what do you say?”1223 Getting rid of alcohol meant consumers swimming in money and the average American eating “porter-house

1221 Sunday, The Best of Billy Sunday, 71.
1222 “Famous ‘Booze’ Sermon.”
1223 Sunday, The Best of Billy Sunday, 80.
“steak” for dinner. Conversely, whether you drank or not, if you were hungry it was because the “whiskey gang has got your money.” Without liquor the economy would boom.

Indeed, Sunday turned revivalism into the farmer’s hope using a farm analogy. According to Sunday, the revival performed a certain magic that worked outside of “material means” producing “results [that] come to the farmer.” Notes Sunday, “He [the farmer] has his crops. That is the result. He has to plow and plant and take care of his farm before the crops come.” We are to assume that the proper political stance functions as the “plow” seeding the future results for the farmer. As Sunday asserts, the revival brought “spiritual blessings as regular as the farmer can have corn, wheat, oats, or you can have potatoes and onions and cabbage in your garden.”

It is important to emphasize that Sunday’s sermon reveals his understanding that farmer concerns with regard to alcohol were highly informed by economics. Sunday recognized the problem of farm poverty and the fact that farmers could be reluctant to act against the alcohol industry because they needed markets for their crops. Though appeals to morality are made, even these are packaged within an economic argument.

The fact that Sunday’s economic vision is flawed and remarkably disconnected from farm realities should not surprise us. Though Sunday felt the effects of rural depression when growing up, his understanding of farm economics was limited to a childhood perspective. This probably explains why he did not draw from the well of
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personal life or farm experience even though the men in Sunday’s family did drink and, as Martin notes, this fact exacerbated financial tension on the homestead.\footnote{Martin, Foreword, xvi.} The urban missions and his induction into respectable society by his wife filled the gaps, providing Sunday with an explanation for rural and working-class troubles. Sunday also claimed to have derived his sermons from reading. The closeness of language and arguments highly suggest that either Sunday’s sources came from the ASL or shared a common source with the organization.\footnote{Regarding Sunday’s writing process, see Sunday, The Sawdust Trail, 71. As for his sources, while he doesn’t name these it is clear that he was reading items generated in the temperance media echo chamber.} Though his sermons were peppered with quaint stories of farm life, what Sunday trumpeted was an echo of a long string of missionaries, now packaged as the “old time religion.” Notably, sixty years prior the same sermon would have stood out as characteristic of the new urban middle class.

Most notably, Sunday’s sermon offered nothing to reveal how farmers were victimized by the “civilizing” process and impersonal forces at work in markets. Far from delivering the truth of farm condition, or paving the way to self-realization, or contributing to an understanding the self-destructive or cruel capacity of otherwise good people when circumstances turn against them, Sunday suggests that “evil” can be conquered by a conventional script most people would recognize—that of the “bad apple” of business. Eliminate the bad apple and the system will serve all—one of the greatest and most deceptive fantasies of the modern world.

Regardless, Sunday attracted large crowds. Media coverage was glowing. The Illinois Rock Island Argus described his 1905 visit to Dixon, Illinois as “the greatest in

\footnote{Martin, Foreword, xvi.}
the history of tabernacle services” with people flocking from all directions, and 4000 in attendance. The revival ended with 367 conversions and 100 people “anounc[ing] that they will never dance, play cards, or go to the theatres again.”

The *Urbana Daily Courier* declared Sunday “the most remarkable character on the American rostrum” and his combination of showmanship and preaching as “a method that wins.” The paper states, “no man has moved more men to righteousness in the same time.”

Another article reports packed churches and tabernacles with hundreds, if not thousands, turned away. As with past movements, Sunday’s success was measured statistically in numbers of conversions—435 here, 2500 there— and whopping monthly collections of $2500 to $4000.

Moreover, the ASL won political victories. By 1900, the League succeeded in passing local option laws in 37 states and in a ten month stretch from August, 1902 to April, 1903, alone. 145 out of 200 towns of 16,000 or less population that came to a vote, voted “dry”. By 1913, nine new state prohibitionary laws were also secured and in 1913 the federal Webb-Kenyon Act barred shipments of spirits into states with prohibitionary measures.

---


How do we explain the ASL and revivalism as political force capable of securing farm votes? Certainly, there were aspects of temperance arguments that farmers found appealing. Farmers chaffed at taxes—this is very clear in farm periodicals. Though land loans achieved through the Federal Farm Board exempted farmers from taxation on land, many farmers who had dealings with unscrupulous county officials or shady land dealers were taken by surprise by taxes due on land. At the same time, papers note the continuous demand for new public improvements, but also less taxation. Simultaneously, the public raged at corporate tax dodging which had become a hot issue by the 1917. Meanwhile, the ASL unscrupulously downplayed the weight of taxes paid by the alcohol industry.

In addition, Sunday’s stories contained all the qualities of a morality play complete with offerings of renewal and redemption. This certainly had its appeal for desperate and politically jaded farmers. One argument in the revived temperance farm economy claimed that the consumption of alcohol by farmers took money from farm families and directed it to alcohol interests. With an expense to families estimated at $30 per capita, combined with loss of efficiency and the untold cost of heartache, one writer

1236 Odegard, Pressure Politics, 51-52.
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for the Chicago Live Stock World concluded that savings from prohibition would be so great that little else would matter. Notably, this sentiment grew with the political failure of the Populists. The paper states:

... the minimum wage wouldn’t matter, and there would be enough money to pay them [laborers], and the trusts wouldn’t matter, for we would be so happy we wouldn’t worry about them; and the currency wouldn’t matter; for prosperity would be so general that we could thrive under any currency law. // In reckoning with the high cost of living the cost of John Barleycorn must not be ignored.\textsuperscript{1238}

Low wages, depressed farm markets, trusts, and a problematic money form that benefited creditors at the expense of farmers were all part of the Populist critique—a politics that now lay in ruins. In 1892, John B. Weaver ran for president under the Populist ticket and won many votes. The rise of the Populists had threatened to undo the two party system. In response, the Democrats, looking to expand its base ran William Jennings Bryan, an evangelical politician from Nebraska in 1896 and effectively hijacked the Populist platform. Meanwhile, the Republicans, with the help of Industrialist Mark Hanna, marketed their candidate, William McKinley, as the supporter of the eastern moneyed establishment. McKinley won and the Populist threat faded from the political scene.

In the absence of the Populist political vehicle, farmers looked for succor elsewhere. Media suggestions that “moral law” reigned as the ultimate authority above human law had a strong comforting affect in the face of the failure of other types of political organizing.\textsuperscript{1239} This hype underscored this sentiment and Sunday’s role as a


“modern John the Baptist” aiding the coming kingdom of God. Then there was the Grange, which could be counted on to urge locals to support the League in passing local option bills as well as the defunding of state fairs that featured gambling or liquor sales.

Furthermore, Sunday’s life and his treatment of it was not only entertaining, it “validated the American myth of success.” This involved the process of reimagining of the frontier at the turn of the century. In this spirit William Thomas Ellis, one of Sunday’s first biographers, claimed in 1917 that Sunday was an “American type,” one of the “folk” that emerged from the pioneers who “wrested that empire from the wilderness.” This trope, very reminiscent of Frederick Jackson Turner, did neither justice to the realities of subsistence farmers, nor their harsh treatment by the forces of the improvement ethic. Sunday’s fame is a reminder that icons are a reflection of their creators and the social context in which they are forged. As a rural icon of respectable middle-class culture in late Victorian society, Sunday is remarkably self-referential. He represents the bourgeoisification of rural life.

The power of the temperance message was in its delivery, context and packaging. Notes Martin, “He instinctively knew how to use music, humor, melodramatic stories,
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extraordinary athleticism, and the plain speech of the common people to manipulate audiences to achieve desired ends.” Mass evangelism shared traits with mass media: the cult of celebrity, conventionality, and banality. Sunday’s sermons read like a series of sound bites, talking points previously propagated in mass print. In function, revivals confirmed what was already “known,” but they were unique because they utilized elements of unconventional showmanship to confirm conventional perspectives. In this case, Sunday had much in common with other showmen of his time, including circus huckster P.T. Barnum.

It would, however, be an exaggeration to argue that the ASL and the likes of Sunday had total control over the narrative. Farm periodicals reveal that farmers, like others, were divided over the League and Sunday’s religious approach and methods. The “latent power” of the farmer vote was not always easy to mobilize. As of 1911, the Ohio Farmer mourned the fact that the Grange remained the only major farm organization that faithfully turned out in defense of prohibition measures. With caustic language the paper assaulted farmers for their “lack of organization and co-operation” and “lack of education, self-appreciation, and general intelligence relating to their duty as citizens.” Most farmers, the paper claimed took “no interest in politics,” quoting one farmer’s attitude that “it pays me better to stay home and work.” There were, of course, other explanations for a lack of interest in politics.

---
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In key battle states, ASL tactics could fail because the organization relied too heavily on quick conversions for the rural vote and did not take into consideration that rural communities, like other voters, weighed their options. The 1910 battle over Illinois, for instance, ended in many “wet” victories in local option elections because the League wrongly expected a flurry of temperance activity, including Billy Sunday revivals, would secure sufficient votes. Dry forces counted on the rural vote, but hard fought campaigns in Danville, Aurora, Bloomington, Woodstock, Freeport and even the dry “stronghold” of Rockford lost to the “personal liberty” campaign of the wets.\footnote{1246} League methods struggled elsewhere. League field secretary, H.G. Furbay, noted fairly easy victories in Southern California. Northern California with its extensive grape culture was, by far, more resistant. As of 1903, the League touted victories in Oregon, New York, Washington, Virginia, Tennessee and Wisconsin, however, the League only won all of its attempts at dry legislations in Virginia. In other states, notes Furbay, “the result was but a small part of what was attempted.”\footnote{1247} In addition, when it became clear that the local option strategy was expended, the ASL shifted its attention to state-wide laws, but avoided laws that required a popular referendum because, as historian Peter Odegard made clear, “rural dry voters” were “more difficult to organize than… the wet voters in the cities.”\footnote{1248} As it turned out, the widespread mobilization of farmers was like herding cats. Indeed, state bills repeatedly failed because the League could not galvanized large
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numbers of farmers simultaneously. The League did manage to pass a state law in Oregon, but only through meticulous organization.\(^{1249}\)

Enthusiasm gave way to critiques as the revivalist strategy exhausted its potential. As years passed, papers criticized Sunday as divisive. Bitter contests were reported in Indiana where county populations varied by ethnicity.\(^{1250}\) The Illinois-based *True Republican* satirized Sunday’s mixed messages, stating “Billy Sunday has got half of Pittsburgh afraid of going to hell and the other half afraid of going to heaven.”\(^{1251}\) Jokingly deriding Sunday’s penchant for spectacle and the wealth he was accumulating, *Chicago Livestock World* noted, “Billy Sunday cleaned up over $70,000 saving souls during the last year. Viewed merely from the monetary standpoint, evangelism of the slapstick type is better than baseball.”\(^{1252}\)

Overtime, revivalist methodology also lost its edge, primarily because it lacked sustaining power. This is epitomized in a piece penned by farmer Wroe Compton, which appeared in *Prairie Farmer*, 1911. Compton weighed the typical “Farmer’s Sunday” of “welcome smiles and greetings of friends” that “warm up a fellow’s heart after a week almost alone in the fields” with the value of the revivalist Sabbath. For this farmer, at

\(^{1249}\) Odegard, *Pressure Politics*, 122-123.


least, Billy Sunday was an ill-fit for religion informed by the daily activities of farm life. Compton states:

Religion cannot be taken like an injection of anti-toxin, all at one dose, and give immunity from evil for the rest of our days. I have listened to Billy Sunday pouring red-hot maledictions on my faults and follies until I could almost feel the quench of the flame that is not quenched. I have been held spellbound by Mott as he pictured the nobility of Christian living in such a way as to cause a glow of high resolve to live such a life from then on, to creep over me. But somehow in the humdrum of everyday life the temperature of Hades, in my immediate vicinity, at least, cooled down and the glow of emotion faded.\(^\text{1253}\)

The author then considers common daily trials on the farm—the horse that breaks loose and gets into the corn, ill-weather, a harsh word, a smashed thumb—and the patient response required. Compton concludes that the

...teachings of each Sunday and the influence of association with good people, stays with a fellow more in every day [sic] life, and while it doesn’t produce any sudden marked change, it has an influence making him a better man.\(^\text{1254}\)

For Compton the best way to build country religion was “the mingling together of friends and neighbors to study the word of God” so as to “make a neighborhood more kindly and extend an influence for brighter, nobler, happier lives over all the people of the community.”\(^\text{1255}\) What’s more, when Compton evokes the everyday he confirms Lefebvre’s claim that “Man must be everyday, or he will not be at all.”\(^\text{1256}\) Lefebvre’s statement emanates his pondering of novelist Jean Cassou’s assertion that “there comes a moment in every man’s life when he has to, when he’s got to throw all the tricks and
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mumbo-jumbo away.”¹²⁵⁷ To be human was to dignify the present and the local. While the “superhuman event” or “higher life” of the “metaphysician” has its pull, it is the ordinary that rehabilitates everyday life for the ordinary is situated here and now. It is local and unalienated. It is the mundane, not the bourgeois. It is equality, not the work of the “exceptional and the dominant.”¹²⁵⁸

Criticisms of the ASL and Sunday flowed from others. Members of the “wet” faction vocalized similar objections. For instance, lawyer Clarence Darrow, a speaker for the Anti-Prohibition League, opined that “The privileges of eating and drinking and sleeping are natural instincts. They are all we have to live for and without liberties it is death.”¹²⁵⁹ But even temperance reformers grew weary of reformation trends. By 1915, splinter organizations such as the National Prohibition Brigade, pointed out the failure of the local option to secure new ground for temperance as the strategy played itself out. Members could be scathingly critical of what resulted. They complained, “Why has twenty years of tremendous local option work, nine hundred dollar men drawing $2500 salaries, entering churches, silencing preachers, fleecing congregations, resulted in increasing it [alcohol] 107,000,000 gallons last year?” According to this group, the movement had grown stale and entrenched because it offered little more than “the same old dry rot” that had been fed audiences for “fifty years.”¹²⁶⁰

¹²⁵⁷ Lefebvre, Critique of Everyday Life, 1:127. Quote of Jean Cassou’s Le Centre du monde.
¹²⁵⁸ Lefebvre, Critique of Everyday Life, 1:29.
Try as they might, the ASL also made only limited headway with Catholics and Germans. The League claimed a non-denominational footing and repeatedly reinforced this claim by paying tribute to Catholic Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Minnesota who embraced temperance as a part of progressive politics. It should be noted, however, that this move could actually run counter to trends in American Catholicism. As demographics shifted from urban and Irish to German and Southeast Europeans (both rural and urban), Catholic circles in the US that prized the maintenance of German language and ethnic traditions and opposed American individualism, denounced Ireland for trying to “Americanize” the church. In 1899, Pope Leo XIII condemned Ireland’s brand of liberal Catholicism in his *Testem Benevolentiae Nostrae*, resulting in the suppression of the Americanist movement in the US.\(^{1261}\) As historian James J. Hennesey observes, the rejection of Ireland’s “Gaelic Revival” represented a “revolt against the ‘ibernarchy,’ the dominance of Irish priests and bishops in the American church” alongside shifting demographics—growing numbers of Italian, Hungarian, Slavic and German Catholics who wanted more say in the American church and provisions for the preservation of their cultural roots.\(^{1262}\) Outside of the Catholic liberal set and the rather miniscule Catholic Prohibition League, American Catholics were repelled by ASL fanaticism as absurd and an assault on ethnic enclaves.\(^{1263}\) For some farmers, these developments provided a religious defense for their products. Ohio grape growers,
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quoting Archbishop Moeller, were quick to denounce the Catholic Prohibition League as “misleading, unwarranted … unauthorized” and even “heretical” according to the Catholic hierarchy.  

The Farm-Saloon Nexus

The saloon has long been associated with the urban immigrant set, but the battle over the saloon could not be so easily reduced because of lengthy and traditional roots of similar facilities into multiple aspects of rural life linking food, alcohol, socializing and farm economies in a comprehensive whole. Notably, the word “saloon” evoked pioneer settlements and “wild west,” thus contributing to the lawless association of drinking spaces regardless of the setting. In contrast, the realities of production and distribution of food and drink connected farms to drinking establishments both rural and urban.

As facilities that served food and drink, saloons tended to many daily needs of travelers and workers for sustenance and companionship. Much like pubs in Britain, urban American saloons grew in association with “commuter needs” as workers patronized establishments near their work, though in the US, saloons also served as the social centers of ethnic neighborhoods. Over the nineteenth century, in response to demand and competition such facilities grew in number and extravagance. Facilities also proliferated with European ethnic groups accustomed to social drinking outside the home. Competition and the expense of high-license laws running as high as $500 annually by
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1890 per saloon, increasingly linked establishments with major breweries, which paid for licensing in exchange for a retail outlet for specific brands. In this tied-house system, brewers invested in the architectural embellishments, fixtures, furnishings, and food served in saloons to attract customers and project respectability. Some of these moves such as the serving of food with drink and consolidated control initially found support among some reformers who anticipated a reduction of saloons and a general reduction of drinking when combined with meals. Much to crusader chagrin, establishments continued to multiply over the course of the nineteenth century. Reformers were equally galled when the “free lunch,” the contrivance of dry reformers for moderation in drinking, became a popularized sales pitch for proliferating saloons by the late nineteenth century.

According to reformers, the combination of free food (with purchased drink, of course), heated rooms, and comfortable furnishings diverted men and money from family and household needs. But the saloon and its accompanying “free lunch” was nothing new, especially for farmers who had long been in the habit of mixing business, food, and drink. Pioneer taverns of the early 1800s provided food and drink with lodging. The mix of European immigrants in the West also arrived with customs of public drinking in which drinking establishments functioned as neighborhood social centers. In the field, farmers often drank beer, cider, or liquor during breaks and with lunch. Free lunches


were also a common feature of farmer’s auctions which frequently offered sandwiches, pickles, coffee, or something more to drink for any farmer that arrived equipped with his own tin cup.\textsuperscript{1269} Likewise, taverns were often central to small towns and rural folk weren’t necessarily enthusiastic about their elimination. For example, rural communities in Wyoming incorporated en masse in response to a 1909 legislative measure to prohibit saloons in unincorporated regions. In fact, the smallest towns extended their borders to gain sufficient population to achieve incorporation.\textsuperscript{1270} Hence, we should recognize that the idea of the saloon (and the attendant free lunch) as new and urban was a construction of temperance politics in the quest for a powerful symbol and spatial locus that served their political designs.

The intense focus on the saloon at the close of the nineteenth century also speaks to changing dynamics of space. Prior to the Civil War, reformers could confront producers as members of their congregations or simply walk into these businesses. But big brewers were not as accessible as the small producers of the past. The size and public nature of saloons made these sites approachable targets. In addition, the eradication of the saloon also served another function; namely, the erasure of certain countervailing spaces as the loci of alternative drinking cultures and their place in daily life. Concomitantly, the elimination of saloons and reorganization of space was a way to reorganize leisure and the private lives of workers-- farmers included. By consequence, a wide range of drinking
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establishments-- beer gardens, taverns, and lowly drinking holes to finer lounges and nightclubs, urban and rural-- were subsumed in an image of the ubiquitous alien urban saloon.

As the inhabitant of the saloon, John Barleycorn became the associate of a unique species of human degradation: the ubiquitous tramp.\textsuperscript{1271} Aside from distracted working men from their homes, saloons were seen as sustaining a loafer class the image of sloth which had long irked middle-class sensibilities. Known as the “free-lunch men,” the patrons of saloons were imagined as those who “toil not, neither do they spin, yet they ‘get along.’”\textsuperscript{1272} According to reformers, the poverty of bar patrons could be found in that which sustained them. It was assumed that big money bought-off tramps with cheap beer and free food and received, in return, political support. Additionally, the fact that large brewers in cities like Chicago and New York effectively distributed more food than urban charities was found especially galling.\textsuperscript{1273} Thus brewers fed the so-called “unworthy” poor. This practice, among others, made the fight against the saloon and its customers a fight against big business, the liquor men, who were supposedly worth millions and who paid for licensing and the free lunch counters of brewery tied-houses.\textsuperscript{1274}

\textsuperscript{1271} See the image in Johnson, \textit{John Barleycorn Must Die}, 83.


\textsuperscript{1273} Crawford, “Brewery-Tied Houses,” 12. Crawford notes that a 1900 investigation of Chicago’s West Town revealed that brewers via saloons distributed more food “than the combined efforts of hunger charities.” Also see “Gossip of Gotham,” \textit{New York Times}, Jan. 13, 1895, 16, which points out that the free lunch counters in New York did “much more for suffering humanity” than all the charities, and did not reduce men to begging.

In the far West for instance, in its association with immigrants, the free lunch and saloon represented an unholy alliance between machine politics and the followers of Denis Kearney, leader of the Workingmen’s Party. The fight over the saloon and free lunch was a fight over “the labor field” where Irish immigrants and tramps who “were never known to do a day’s work or have a dollar… reap[ed] their harvest” with each city election. As claimed by the New York Times, Kearney and his “sandlot agitators” had led a caustic campaign against “industrious” and “sober” Chinese immigrants by selling their votes for whiskey and free meals. “How do all these idle people live?” queried one journalist; “They don’t live, they barely exist,” the reporter replied to his own question. “It is the free lunch system that keeps them alive. Take away that peculiarly California institution and they would all starve.” Rhetoric like this inspired the Grange of Washington State to support local option legislation in 1909 with the disciplining of farm laborers in mind.

Similar complaints were made in regards to tramps elsewhere. In New Orleans, “thousands of men” reportedly lived on “bountiful” lunches that attracted such crowds that the “free lunch counter” served as a “great leveler of classes.” Extravagance, in this instance, made the free-lunch damnable for potentially disrupting the spatiality of the social hierarchy. But the “cheap free lunch” was equally condemned for inducing hunger.

and thus the sale of more beer, specifically to the lower orders. Indeed, saloonkeepers complained that all attempts to meet the demands of temperance agitators only resulted in a new round of complaints.

In the late-nineteenth century temperance era, farmers and the free lunch were linked in complicated ways. In disparaging the saloon, temperance advocates and organizations targeted the food of saloons as unfit for eating and in doing so some of their claims were comical, if not outlandish. For instance in 1894, New York City was rife with rumors that “grimalkin” (cat) was being employed in the hasenpfeffer (a traditional German rabbit stew) in saloons in the Eastern District of Brooklyn. Rumor had it that Italians were supplying the cats, which were assumed to be pilfered family pets.

But by and large, the most frequent criticism of saloons involved claims that the food was unsanitary and thirst-inducing. On the first count, reformers complained that many dirty workhands that frequented the saloons exposed plates and utensils to innumerable microbes which, according to critics, made the saloon a hive of disease. In addition, while the type of fare served in saloons actually varied widely from soup or stew to lavish buffets, temperance criticisms focused heavily on fermented foods which in the hygienic cooking language of the time implied not only thirst-inducing salt but also the concentrated flavors that were assumed to cultivate cravings for the stronger stimulus

of alcohol. For a temperance advocate, the following menu was a road to perdition:

“sliced onions and cucumbers, smothered with vinegar; sliced tomatoes, treated ditto: pickled beets, sauerkraut, potato salad, cold baked beans, leberwurst, bologna sausage, and smoked fish cut into slices.”

Of course, many of these and similar foodstuff also qualified as comfort foods for immigrants of rural and urban backgrounds. In contrast reformed “sanitary” tavern models and soda joints, served plain or sweet items that were supposed to deter the consumption of alcohol. This included “sanitary soda water” and vanilla crème or sarsaparilla as drink options and free lunch as simple soup and sandwiches, minus the pickled and fermented fare.

The passage of Raines or “Sunday” laws—the forced closure of saloons on Sundays, and the elimination of free-lunch services in many areas beginning in the mid-1890s, hit many associated economic interests hard. In New York, for instance, aside from the brewers who were the hardest hit, caterers also complained about loss of commerce as did many firms that did business “on an unpretentious scale,” providing “soups, salads, baked beans, fritters, and other articles of food.” So too, were other tradesmen that supplied staple provisions: “bologna, sausage, ham, corned beef, frankfurters, pickled pigs’ feet, and other supplies of a similar nature.”

Elsewhere, the closure of saloons had the potential to undermine specialty products from family farms. In Pennsylvania, the combination of saloon closures and anti-German sentiment leading

1283 “Free Lunch Microbe,” 8.


up to World War I resulted in a glut of nearly 400 tons of unsalable sauerkraut annually.\textsuperscript{1286}

In fact, battles over the saloon’s place in the temperance farm economy, once again highlighted internal contradictions of prohibition for farming. This time, the issue arose in New England where farming had made the transition from cereal crops to specialty products; namely, vegetables and dairy within a regional market. Barley and other grains were no longer a mainstay of farmers. Consequently, many farmers adopted a temperance stance. In 1897, they even fought a notable battle against the reintroduction of barley as an agricultural product. In a move that baffled the Chicago press, farmers of Aroostock country, Maine, “took up arms against a proposition to increase their prosperity by the cultivation of barley as a crop” – an idea hatched by brewer Frank Jones of New Hampshire, and the State Board of Agriculture seeking to re-localize barley production in lieu of imports from Canada, with Jones providing the seed at his expense. “One would have supposed that the tillers of the soil would have been grateful for such aid and opportunity thus gratuitously offered them,” states the \textit{Chicago Daily Tribune}, “But they were not. Far from it. Instead of meeting with gratitude and commendation the State’s agent… had to face what is described as a ‘storm of opposition.’” The farmers in their anti-barley efforts were supported by Aroostook and Houlton Grangers, the county temperance league and local clergymen in “‘a crusade’ against what was intended to be a

beneficent project.” Unfortunately, these farmers forgot that their economic well-being was tied to the saloon in other very important ways.

In 1903, over 500 New York saloonkeepers formed a “protective association” to deal with the increase in taxes, the consequence of temperance agitation. They debated raising prices on drinks and charging for sandwiches, and finally voted in favor of a ban on cheese, a product of up-state “dry” farmers. The point was to boycott foodstuff from upstate counties “so that they w[ould] in the future be careful of the welfare of the saloon-men in the cities.” This was no small threat. As of 1896 it was estimated that the complete prohibition of free lunches in saloons in the city would reduce cheese sales by 30,000 pounds annually, with a loss of approximately one million dollars in income New York dairymen. If nothing else, the incident was a reminder that farmers and the alcohol industry remained connected, even if the workings of the market obscured those links.

In sum, the saloon as an extension of alcohol production and food distribution could not be easily separated from rural America, nor could legislative strategies of the ASL rely on the farm base to achieve their ultimate goal: prohibition. Savvy campaigns combined with religious revivalism only offered partial and short-term success. Ethnic


division, enduring rural drinking traditions, and the ever looming economic discrepancies of temperance economics denoted lingering, deep, and systemic divides between farmers and reformers.
Chapter 9:
The Promise of Industrial Alcohol

Every farming community will be interested in finding out just what crops may be raised to advantage for this purpose.

—“Denatured Alcohol,” *Farm, Field and Fireside* (1906)

The day of John Barleycorn indeed seems to be passing, never to return. But why not use the liquor factories, especially and whiskey and gin distilleries—as well as the army of men which they now employ—for making ‘engine booze,’ as one chemist called it.

—“Prohibition and Fuel,” *Gas Power* (1916)\(^{1291}\)

One of the primary reasons why farmers balked at the idea of temperance entailed farm dependence on alcohol production as an outlet for grain. The idea of farmers making alcohol profitably for industrial purposes encouraged renewed allegiance between western farmers and temperance organizations from 1905 onward when temperance sought gains in the form of new state laws. But, as many suggested, this could only work if production was fully divorced from older farm traditions. Or, as one paper stated, “without stirring up John Barleycorn.”\(^{1292}\) Thus newsprint suggested that farmers come to understand that their reputation and historical association with alcohol could hinder the formation of a type of production landscape that would best benefit farmers. Moreover, the need to bury John Barleycorn once and for all suggested awareness that this shift in production meant doing something that was taboo in older farm traditions. That is, take as much from the land as possible without giving anything back.

The latest temperance-farm project involved farm produced industrial alcohol or what is now called ethanol. This idea was not altogether new. In the 1840s camphene—\(^{1291}\) “Prohibition and Fuel,” *Gas Power* 14, no. 6 (Dec. 1916), 8, accessed Nov. 4, 2014, https://books.google.com/books?id=Omo3AQAAMAAJ

mixture of ethyl alcohol and camphor oil, was a favored fuel and by the outbreak of the Civil War, thousands of small distilleries supplied Americans with over 90 million gallons of alcohol annually for lighting purposes. Camphene sales, however, were rapidly eclipsed by kerosene, a product of a growing petroleum industry, after the passage of the 1862 excise tax on whiskey eliminated camphene from the market. The excise was supposed to be a temperance, as well as revenue measure, but it failed to discriminate between the many uses for alcohol. By consequence, products like camphene were priced out of existence and many industrial uses for alcohol fell to the wayside.

Resurrecting Ethanol

The circumstances around of calls for ethanol production in the early twentieth century stand out as one of the great ironies of the temperance movement. Although politicians passed the 1862 excise under the rhetoric of temperance, the movement widely rejected the excise due to both real and imaginary problems. Heavy taxation was blamed for enhancing the industry’s political influence. In reality, a weighty excise promoted industrial consolidation. Large brewers and distillers did hold political clout though not nearly as much as temperance advocates suggested.

Antebellum crusaders knew alcohol burned and many lecturers played on this unique trait of “fire water” to underwrite its demonic associations. For instance, Baron Stow, pastor of the Middle-St. Baptist Church of Portsmouth delivered an address in 1832 that insisted that the blood, breath and bodies of the intemperate had an unsettling

inclination to burn “as rum or brandy burns.” Indeed, Stow, calling forth images of divine intervention and retribution, insisted that the intemperate when “full of liquor” exhibited “numerous … instances of spontaneous combustion.” This notion was likely an extension of well-circulated stories including one eighteenth century tale of a German who burst into flames after imbibing too much brandy.

Temperance documents reveal a lurid fascination with the idea of spontaneous human combustion which became the common fare of essays, lectures, articles, and medical and scientific treatises, most of which claimed to bear witness to the proliferation of evidence. In truth, most repeated the same story of a twenty-five year old Canadian man who burned to death in a blackshop after a night of drinking. Numerous temperance publications had effectively served as a media echo-chamber, repeated the account which first surfaced in a prize winning essay by one Dr. Harvey Lindsly, who assured his audience that the youth had perished after thirteen days of agony, “shrieking as if suffering the torments of hell.” Others to follow claimed such instances of spontaneous combustion as “evidence of God’s displeasure on account of his abused mercies” with frightful Providence making itself known via the characteristics of fire.

---


Some teetotalers lauded camphene and industrial uses of alcohol and they did so even when these products proved volatile and dangerous in their own right. One temperance writer insisted rum was “ten thousand times” more dangerous than camphene, known for its explosive nature to be a source of fires, injury and death that otherwise sparked alarm voiced in the broader press. For instance, the famed temperance reformer, Edward C. Delevan, did his best to downplay industrial dangers in light of the “true” threat of beverage spirits. “Let a domestic be burnt to death, or seriously injured by the bursting of a camphene can or lamp,” states Delevan, “and the press sounds the alarm for protection… But the injury to life, character and estate, from the inward burning of intoxicating liquors, is ten thousand times greater, than the outward burnings from camphene.”

The temperance crusade, though wedded to industry as the path of progress, also could, in some instances, become radically opposed to the production of alcohol in any form, including those used by medicine and industry. One unnamed Ohioan, on the fifteenth anniversary of the ATS, called for the complete banishment of alcohol’s use and production “from the face of the earth… till no one shall dare to manufacture a drop… Let the art perish!” Likewise, John Bartholomew Gough, reformed alcoholic and New

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~


England temperance orator, vowed to oppose alcohol regardless of its use, as drink, medicine, or even burning fluid. Gough justified his stance with anecdotes of desperate alcoholics willing to drink anything, even camphene, for their alcoholic content.¹³⁰⁰

Extreme temperance militancy created fissures in the movement, alienating commercial interests that equated temperance with modern enterprise. For instance, a resolution to oppose the manufacture of all alcohol at the Vermont State Temperance Convention of 1858 provoked an outraged response by business interests. According to the latter,

…this Resolution would pull down the very interests Temperance would build up. Its very ends and aims are antagonistical [sic] to those of Temperance. This Resolution strikes directly at the arts and science, chemistry and industrial progress with only the blind eye turned to Temperance. Temperance men have a single aim, the suppression of the traffic and use of strong drinks, conscientiously and scrupulously yielding and defending the right of chemistry and mechanics.¹³⁰¹

Notably, temperance in this response was equated with business. Moreover, the redirection of alcohol into the chemical and mechanical arts is highlighted as a temperance goal. In their opposition, the business sector noted the good performed by alcohol as a valuable solvent and antiseptic and necessity for everything from photography to medicine. For producer and consumer alike, temperance, taken too far, was a serious threat. As stated,


¹³⁰¹ An Argument Against the Resolution Adopted by the State Temperance Convention, at Northfield, Jan. 1858, 5. No publishing information listed. This item was deposited by the heirs of George C. Dempsey in the Harvard College Library. Accessed July 15, 2014, https://books.google.com/books?id=NlcfAAAAYAAJ
Both the users and makers of camphene and burning fluids must yield their business and their lights. The painter, the hatter, the clothes and carpet cleanser, the jeweler and the dentist must give up an important agent. The mason and carpenter must surrender their spirit-level, and Ross and Kane their thermometer. Stop the sale and use of but one form of alcohol, and that form never drank, and you throw out of important and useful employment more than one hundred thousand free citizens of these United States.\textsuperscript{1302}

What this opposition realized was that taken to its logical end, the fundamental principles of temperance engendered a scorched earth mentality. Sugar, molasses, fruit juice, and even sour or yeast bread dough could be viewed as a potential threat as could ethanol, the 185-plus proof variety, stripped of most of its water through double distillation. Notes the previous piece, sugar, molasses, currents, and the juice of raspberries and elderberries could all be used to make “a better intoxicating liquor to drink,” than industrial-grade alcohol. The author quipped mordantly,

to compass the pretended object of this Resolution, by keeping alcohol out of the reach of people, they must outlaw everything that contains sugar or starch. All grains and seeds, potatoes and beets—cut down their maple trees and devote their bees to the bugs.\textsuperscript{1303}

In light of its history, industry’s defense of maple trees and “pure alcohol” comes off as rather disingenuous. Since alcohol was so easy to produce, wasn’t any beverage ban rather futile? Plus, farmers had long used alcohol for a wide range of applications, long trivialized or disparaged by teetotalism. Industry could complain only because of its privileged position in the movement.

In addition to the above double-standards, the creation of US Revenue Commission in 1865 for the evaluation of revenue measures had a sobering effect on

\textsuperscript{1302} An Argument Against, 8.

\textsuperscript{1303} An Argument Against, 6-7.
temperance zealotry. The Commission revealed two stark realities. First, temperance calculations of per capita consumption of spirits had long been overstated. Using numbers from the quarterly reports of the US Bureau of Statistics, since the 1840s, societies had crunched statistics using the total quantity produced, or aggregate supply, which they equated with beverage consumption. The results were shockingly high. From the 1830s through the 1850s, temperance estimates figured that every man, woman, and child was consuming between 4 to 10 gallons of distilled spirits annually. Reformers also suggested that consumption dropped but remained high despite the passage of Maine Laws. Thus, during the 1850s, depending on the year, one and a half to two and a half gallons of strong waters were consumed per person annually. But the Commission noted that these numbers did not wash with actual patterns of consumption. Taxable production as of 1860 was a little over 90 million gallons. 25 million gallons

---


went to burning fluid production alone. An additional unknown amount of alcohol went into the mechanical arts, paints and varnishes, medicine, and other industrial uses. For this reason, the Commission concluded that only approximates of pre-Civil War drinking patterns could be made, and even a gallon and a half estimate to be “somewhat exaggerated.”

With the excise at $2 per gallon, consumption patterns in the mid-1860s broke down thusly: approximately 39 million gallons for beverage purposes and 3-6 million for industrial use.

The second sobering fact revealed by the Commission entailed the consequences of the 1862 excise. The tax had reduced consumption, but “the first and undoubtedly the largest element in such reduction,” notes the Commission had been “in the disuse of burning fluid.” There was also a simultaneous decline in the use of alcohol for other industrial purposes: “varnishes, hat stiffening, furniture polish, perfumery, tinctures, patent medicines, imitation wines, transparent soaps, percussion caps, picture frames, and dying, cleaning, lacquering, bathing and for fuel”—all of which had relied on alcohol’s “excessive cheapness.” The results were disheartening. As the Commission points out, “In some instances entire branches of business have been destroyed in consequence of the great advance in the price of alcohol.”

Inexpensive alcohol at 24 cents per gallon had,

\[\text{\footnotesize 1308} \text{ Hoxie, “Consumption of Liquors,” 130. Quote of the 1866 US Revenue Commission Report, 161.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 1309} \text{ Hoxie, “Consumption of Liquors,” 130. Quote of US Revenue Commission Report, 1866, 161.}\]
in fact, contributed much to the early industrial revolution. The shear importance and size of distilling and the other fermenting arts was, after all, the reason why distillers had “ranked first in importance” when it came to government revenue, surpassing proceeds from other major commodities including cotton and tobacco.¹³¹⁰

In the late nineteenth century, the temperance movement transitioned to viewing alcohol as a chemical agent. Hence reform advocates increasingly treated alcohol as belonging to the realm of industry. The impetus for this had roots in the antebellum period. Dr. F.R. Lees of Leeds, editor of the *British Temperance Advocate* published his *Illustrated History of Alcohol* (1846) included this work a section on the chemical history of alcohol which identified alcohol as the intoxicating principle of all spirituous beverages. From works like Lee’s, the women’s movement had promoted temperance by teaching youth chemistry and physiology in public schools.¹³¹¹

By couching alcohol as a chemical, reformers implied that drinking alcohol was akin to downing other nasty chemicals. For example, Seventh-day Adventist John Harvey Kellogg and his wife Ella, the owners and operators of the Michigan Battle Creek Sanitarium, claimed that ethyl alcohol (hydrated oxide of ethyl) found in beer, wine and whiskey, resembled “such chemical compounds as naphta, turpentine, benzene, fusel oil, and burning fluid”¹³¹² The last item was, in essence, ethyl alcohol but scientific accuracy

---


¹³¹¹ For information on Lees’ history and the WCTU see Peter Turner Winskill and Frederic Richard Lees, *The Temperance Movement and Its Workers: A Record of Social, Moral, Religious, and Political Progress* (London, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Dublin: Blackie & Son, 1893), 156.

was never a temperance strong-point. What mattered most was the appearance of continuity. As a chemical, alcohol was unfit for the body. “No one would think of making habitual use as a beverage of sulphuric [sic] acid, aqua ammonia, or any similar substance,” note the Kelloggs and by this they meant substances understood to be poisonous to life, but nutritive to industry.\textsuperscript{1313} This understanding of alcohol found reinforcement elsewhere. Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson’s \textit{Temperance Lesson Book} (1879) proposed that the microscopic arrangement of alcohol disclosed it as ruinous to the body. According to Richardson, alcohol was similar to water in its chemical formula, but differed on the atomic scale because it contained carbon, not unlike the “black soot” emitted from a burning candle.\textsuperscript{1314} We are to assume that this microscopic blackness defiled alcohol’s chemical formula and that understanding this disclosed meaning in the workings of the world. Thus contaminated by black carbon, alcohol was unfit for consumption.

Other tracts insist that a “superabundance of carbon” made for bilious, diseased bodies. In such tracts carbon is portrayed as the substance that “nature is incessantly endeavoring to throw out of the body.” In contrast, “A person who drinks water, sends into his blood-vessels the only liquid nature requires, and the purest and most purifying

\textsuperscript{1313} Kellogg and Kellogg, “Forty Scientific Arguments,” 10.

stream that can be obtained.” Never mind the fact that all of life on Earth is carbon-based. Racial implications, in this instance, trumped logic.

What these writers had singled out and misrepresented was in fact the most essential atom for life on earth. The carbon atom with its multiple attachment sites, makes it an atomic keystone for innumerable molecular combinations included sugars, fats and proteins—all the ingredients of organic life. Through photosynthesis, plants bond hydrogen from water with carbon to make sugars, the most basic package of chemical energy on the planet. And, through the carbon cycle, carbon moves through the biosphere, from air or water to plant life to soil and every living thing that eats. The plants, in this instance, are the supreme alchemists, converting solar energy to chemical energy. The signature of this process is carbon, the signature of life.

In time and with scientific clarification, alcohol’s carbon abundance increasingly meant something else to the movement. Alcohol was “energy from the sun,” a “vast store of energy” … “stores of capital” and thus “one of the most potent and valuable sources of commercial efficiency that can be named.” In many more ways, modern industry needed alcohol. States Temperance: A Monthly Journal of the Church of Temperance Society in 1916,

So important has this substance become, there is scarcely anything which it will not dissolve; therefore, when we want a solvent of oils, or of fats, or of varnishes,

---


or of shellac, which is indispensable for covering copper wires and a host of things which are necessary for the modern world, alcohol is essential for these purposes. In making drugs, we cannot do without alcohol, not as a drug in itself, but as a means of extracting by its solvent power the things we want from their sources, or as a state on the way towards making the thing we are after.\footnote{Saleeby, “Alcohol and Commercial Efficiency,” 8.}

Regarding manufactures, alcohol played an important role in formulating ether and anesthetics; and was essential in the making of textiles, artificial dyes, explosives and munitions. In sum, alcohol was central to “key industries” that were the bread and butter of economies.

The question yet to be determined was this: to whom did alcohol and associated potential capital belong? In agrarian civilizations, wealth consisted of the products of the land. It was the gift of each growing season’s sunlight. This fact made agriculture the primary source of energy prior to the advent of fossil fuels. Kinship networks controlled and consumed the bulk of this wealth. Markets remained marginal because, while kinship networks prioritized human need, commerce operated outside of local systems of control.\footnote{Polanyi, “Economy as Institutive Process,” 127-132; Chris Hann and Keith Hart, \textit{Economic Anthropology: History, Ethnography, Critique} (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011), 25.} It was Adam Smith’s political economy that made the argument for the pursuit of self-interests via market transactions as the way to break through old limitation to increase the wealth of nations.

Returning to the tax, for farmers the excise meant a loss for the long suffering corn farmer who, as the \textit{Chicago Daily Tribune} pointed out, were denied the ability to ship corn “in the most profitable way”-- that is, in condensed form as alcohol. The paper intimated that the corn growing states of the west could sell their product domestically,
and theoretically also export their corn to the far reaches of the globe to “the Turks, the Egyptians, to India, and South America,” if not for the excise.\textsuperscript{1319}

European nations lacking natural gas and oil reserves continued to pursue alcohol fuel options even as these diminished in the US. By the 1890s, British, French, and German officials and laboratories broke new ground for expanded production and use of alcohol fuels that were put on display in European auto races and at the alcohol fuel exposition held in Paris, 1902.\textsuperscript{1320} From that point forward production expanded rapidly in France and Germany. In the latter, Kaiser Wilhelm II, to counter oil trusts, offered cash rewards to industries that adopted the alternative fuel supplied by many of the country’s eight million farmers.\textsuperscript{1321} Tens of thousands of farm-based and cooperative stills inhabited the German countryside alone. Meanwhile western Corn Belt farmers looked on enviously, reassured by the papers that they could out-sell European domestic alcohol producers if only given the chance.

“Free Alcohol”

In the anti-monopoly fervor of the turn-of-the-century, the National Grange, representing 800,000 farmers in North, West and Midwest, at their 39\textsuperscript{th} annual convention in November, 1905, voted in favor of an alteration in the excise revenue laws to make the distinction between beverage and industrial alcohol. The Grange wanted the


\textsuperscript{1320} Kovarik, “Henry Ford, Charles Kettering.”

elimination of $2.07 per gallon tax on alcohol for industrial usage to make domestic product and export competitive with that of Germany, France, and Great Britain. Aside from off-setting imports from these countries, the Grange argued that elimination of the tax would create jobs and aid farmers by expanding the market for their product. The organization also sought for farmers the capacity to produce “free alcohol” for the operation of farm machinery, as well as in lighting, heating and cooking. Together with the support of a consortium of manufacturers and President Theodore Roosevelt, the farm lobby forged a bill for a repeal of the tax.

Arguments for a legislative measure were carefully crafted to appeal to the temperance movement. These arguments claimed that by freeing industrial alcohol from taxation, a dangerous substance could be redirected into productive work for the benefit of farmers and manufacturers alike. For instance, the Southern Planter asserted that “Alcohol in its abuses constitutes a danger to mankind,” but as an economic source of energy it “rival[ed] gas, acetylene and electricity.” Likewise, the paper claimed “That which causes disorder of the stomach of man agrees perfectly well with the internal organisms of stoves, lamps and motors.” Thus “repugnant” alcohol might propel “the farm motor, the automobile and the launch,” for the “private citizen” from his own farm or factory labor.

Free Alcohol evoked all appealing associations of freedom. It would liberate farmers and industry from taxes while discouraging the drinking habit. Free Alcohol

---


1323 “Alcohol for Trade Purposes,” 54.
offered the “freedom” to light vast cities and even fuel the growing automobile industry using an endless supply of corn in contrast to limited fossil fuel reserves. It could even free up enterprise by contributing an inexpensive material to the production of thousands of industrial products that used alcohol in their manufacture. Agricultural newspapers enthusiastically voice their support for the bill because it seemed to bridge temperance and the interests of both farming and manufacturing. \(^{1324}\) Temperance leaders responded in kind. John G. Wooley, the Prohibition Party presidential candidate in 1900 and a major publisher in the temperance press, voiced support for Free Alcohol to counter claims made by Standard Oil and the wood alcohol industry lobbyists that the initiative was a threat to temperance cause. \(^{1325}\)

Temperance and Free Alcohol complemented each other in several ways. Most notably, Free Alcohol was founded on the idea that “waste” contributed to rural poverty. Waste, in this instance, meant farm surpluses as well as farm by-products that had no clear industrial application to date. Once converted into an alcohol fuel, farm waste would contribute to the betterment of farmers, industry and consumers by performing work and producing more goods. Many papers marveled at the novelty of using “waste” to perform work. “Potatoes, beets, corn—the stalks as well as the grain—and the waste products of our molasses factories will run our engines, cook our meals, heat and light


our homes,” reveled the Los Angeles Times. Indeed, Free Alcohol amounted to an “immense source of energy” just waiting to be tapped.1326 The Ohio Farmer was particularly enthusiastic over alcohol as fuel since it could be “easily produced from all kinds of vegetable waste.” With an ironic twist, the Ohio Farmer also argued that industrial alcohol, the product of fermentation and distillation –processes that presumably destroyed grain and thus property-- did nothing of the sort. Rather, this industry-oriented ferment contributed to society by generating wealth.1327 Consequently, farmers could mass produce grain and even alcohol without concern because industry would absorb the surplus and keep prices for coarse grain high. John Barleycorn’s intractable spirit might thus be contained and even employed, if the project proceeded without a hitch.

Free alcohol also offered a way around the problems the temperance movement associated with taxation and the great combinations that emerged in distilling states of Kentucky, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Missouri which churned out bourbon or rye whiskey as a high-priced beverage or a cruder version, of sufficient economic and political weight to form a trust. Doing so served to protect their trade from legislative infringements and granted the industry a “degree of strategic advantage” and “prestige.”1328 In addition, Standard Oil had cornered fuel production so much so as to dwarf every so-called whiskey giant.


Proponents argued that Free Alcohol would liberate markets and unleash demand in a way that would reign in the worst attributes of existing market dynamics. The *Los Angeles Times* figured that all of America’s six million farmers would soon use a host of farm machinery equipped with internal combustion engines which raised the question of future fuel supplies with some anticipating that gasoline reserves would be rapidly exhausted by growing demand. Removal of the tax would liberate demand, allowing it to grow without limit. In this equation, Free Alcohol would act as a “balance-wheel to maintain an equilibrium in the price of the material used [grain]” and thus help eliminate “the present severe fluctuations in these prices.” To maintain the competitive playing field, individual farmers or farm cooperatives would perform the distilling, eliminating the expense and power of large distilleries. As an extra benefit, the remaining mash was re-imagined, not as spent grain, but rather a “highly digestible food requiring little mastication to digest” – the perfect feed for livestock. Consequently, the paper suggested the US might be visited by a new progressive alcohol landscape with distilleries popping up next to corn and wheat fields and the feedlots of cattle.\(^{1329}\)

Newspapers cheered on Free Alcohol, envisioned as an epic David and Goliath scenario that set farmers, armed only with “Potatoes and Cornstalks,” against fossil fuel and alcohol monopolies.\(^{1330}\) The bill was assumed to be necessary to relinquish farmers from their reliance on the kerosene, wood or coal which would save farmers money and


allow them to mechanize with less expense. As stated by Nahum Batcheldor, of the National Grange, Free Alcohol would complement farm mechanization by lowering farmer expenses and increasing farm productivity. In the process, alcohol would be transformed from destroyer of business and ruin of the nation to its salvation.

Having tapped into anti-trust sentiment and earning the support from the temperance movement, the “Free Alcohol” or Denatured Alcohol Act (DAA) became law on June 7, 1906 with a great deal of fanfare. Its passage also marked a major transition in the use of alcohol, as noted by the Wall Street Journal. While alcohol had previously served as a fuel, the DAA eliminated the tax burden on distillation only so long as the alcohol was “denatured” or rendered poisonous, “so as to destroy its value as a beverage or its use for medicinal purposes, quite a different economic status [for] … one of the most ancient product of industry.” Of course, it was truly ironic that assumed-to-be poisonous alcohol needed further poisoning to deter its consumption. But irony and industry aside, the very term “denature” notes the divestment of natural qualities or character or soul. John Barleycorn—the spirit of the corn, had endured in the people that cut the sheaf in the field and consumed barley bread and spirits. And, early Baltic peoples had long understood that stalks and surplus grain was anything but waste. Every part of the plant had its use and Barleycorn would only rise again by returning sheaf (or something greater) to the soil. In addition, as scholars Bernton, Kovarik, and Sklar note, there are problems in allocating agricultural resources to energy use; namely, the


expansion of monocrop production that degrades the environment and exhausts soil while doing little for either the urban or rural poor.\footnote{Bernton, Kovarik, and Sklar, The Forbidden Fuel, Chapters 8 and 9.}

The \textit{Wall Street Journal} was skeptical the act would live up to the expectations of its champions and anticipated little more than an increase in acreage of potatoes, corn, rice, sugar beets, and barley. The USDA also warned farmers not to read too much into the idea. Bulletin 268 cautions farmers in their understanding of the act:

\begin{quote}
It is especially to be desired that the farmers of the country be not imbued with mistaken ideas respecting the character of this act and the relations which it bears to our agricultural interests. It is evident that so far as agriculture is concerned, the chief, and perhaps the only direct interest in the act is in respect to the materials which are to be used in the manufacture of industrial alcohol.\footnote{“Industrial Alcohol: Sources and Manufacture,” \textit{United States Department of Agriculture Bulletin}, no. 268 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907), 6.}
\end{quote}

In other words, Free Alcohol should not be construed as a panacea for farm issues. The limits of the act became evident shortly after its passage. Three months in the papers noted that Standard Oil and wood alcohol interests were still doing well despite prophesies of their demise and that farmers were still using their waste for other purposes, such as building soil. Moreover, the limited amount of denatured alcohol that was produced was pricey: 35 to 40 cents per gallon. This would need to drop to 15 to 20 cents to compete as a motor fuel, especially in light of a recent oil boom in Oklahoma and declining price of gasoline.\footnote{“Three Months of Denatured Alcohol,” \textit{Scientific America} 96, no. 14 (Apr 6, 1907), 286, American Periodicals; In regards to the oil boom, see Hal Bernton, William Kovarik, and Scott Sklar, The Forbidden Fuel: A History of Power Alcohol (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 11.}

\begin{flushright}
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In addition, major industrial interests proved uncooperative in allowing the expansion of the production of Free Alcohol. Through vertical integration Standard Oil controlled the wood-alcohol plants that produced the denaturizing agents. These plants sat idle as did many distilleries associated with the whisky trust which might have facilitated the process if the trust hadn’t found the idea of independent farmer distilleries so threatening. Meanwhile farmers, to the great extent, had done little to make farm distillation a reality.\footnote{Potato Alcohol Farmers’ Hope,} The price of grain had to remain low to make alcohol fuel viable and many corn producers opted instead to deposit their harvest at the co-op and wait for commodity grain prices to increase. Still, there were hopes that Free Alcohol would spring to life in the course of time. Potato farmers, whose crop remained local due to its weight and perishability in transport, remained interested. Theoretically, local alcohol factories could put this crop to work and cooperative distilleries could provide potato farmers a “home market” outside of the control of any large corporation. If German potato farmers could manage this, certainly American farmers could too.\footnote{Potato Alcohol Farmers’ Hope; Big Trusts in Line Against Alcohol Bill,}

But one and one-half years later the statute had proved “non-effective as the farmer is concerned.”\footnote{Denatured Alcohol Law: No Present Use to the American Farmer,} By the end of 1907 only ten stills were in operation and few followed.\footnote{Farmers Neglect Making of Alcohol,} Regulation was problematic. Members of the whiskey trust insisted that

\footnote{Potato Alcohol Farmers’ Hope, \emph{Chicago Daily Tribune}, Aug. 18, 1907, 8. ProQuest Historical Newspapers; ‘Big Trusts in Line Against Alcohol Bill,’ \emph{Chicago Daily Tribune}, Feb. 22, 1907, 8, ProQuest Historical Daily Newspapers.}

\footnote{Potato Alcohol Farmers’ Hope, 8; ‘Big Trusts in Line Against Alcohol Bill,’ 8.}

\footnote{Denatured Alcohol Law: No Present Use to the American Farmer, \emph{Los Angeles Times}, Oct. 12, 1907, I13, ProQuest Historical Daily Newspapers.}

\footnote{Farmers Neglect Making of Alcohol, \emph{New York Times}, Dec. 23, 1907, 2, ProQuest Historical Daily Newspapers.}
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farm stills only operate under constant government supervision. And while temperance advocates celebrated the idea of Free Alcohol, neither they nor the Commissioner of Internal Revenue could brook the idea of six million American farmers churning out alcohol from equally numerous unmonitored stills. The Bureau of Internal Revenue bulked at what seemed to be an impossible regulatory task—an issue which the original bill failed to address. And the regulations the bureau put to print were too difficult for most farmers to comprehend. An amendment and remedies were devised: special stills could be fabricated with lock boxes whose spirituous contents would remain secure until the arrival of an IR agent. Meanwhile, Secretary Dr. H. W. Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry and author of the pure-food law, determined to get the “ball a-rolling” with distilling, developed lessons in still construction and the art of fermentation and distillation for land-grant college programs. In pondering the 27,000 stills that graced French wine country, Wiley sincerely believed in the American project. But he also admitted that in the US, to be cost effective, farmers would have to learn how to utilize unmarketable crops which required more skill and refined equipment. Pot stills would not do and the cost of specialty stills ($4000 in 1908) remained prohibitive.

Most importantly, Free Alcohol suffered from the schizophrenic combination of temperance concerns and farmers’ goals which came to light in the years following its legislative incarnation. Farmers agreed that stills must be registered because, as one journalist noted, “we must guard strictly against ‘moonshine’ whiskey,” the production


process for which was far simpler. But in his industrial form, John Barleycorn could never truly be “free” given the landscape of commodity markets, established industrial giants, and regulatory demands that associated alcohol with degradation and lawlessness. Likewise, while American farmers wanted the same privileges as European farmers, they lacked the degree of government support that made farm distillation a reality elsewhere. Finally, traditionally farmers used grain for distillation, but the distillation of marketable cereal crops proved unprofitable and the distillation of things like cornstalks required technical equipment and skills farmers lacked. “Waste” was not so easily defined, nor could many by-products of the farm be transformed easily into fuel. Most were best used as feed for animals or turned back into the soil. Consequently, Free Alcohol limped along until its ultimate demise with the passage of national prohibition.

Section 4: Appalachia

Introduction

When the logic of history hungers for bread and we hand out a stone, we are at pains to explain how much the stone resembles bread.
--Aldo Leopold

I say unto you:
It's all down in the cellar
better come on down
and come on down with
your rattling shoes your tattering coat
an old lover's booze and a dead lovenote
that sweet guitar and your silver spoon
(for peaches in jars hang fat as the moon).
Stoop through the lintel and stir up the air,
we're all going down in the harvest lair.
-- Rosanna Nafziger

At the foot of the twenty-first century, in a back room at the Godbey Appalachian Research Center in Cumberland, Kentucky, more than a dozen students meet to grapple a larger-than-life mason jar. Over six feet tall, this three-dimensional mosaic sculpture in the make lists side-to-side in the hands of these youth as they smear mortar to its form in preparation for hundreds of small ceramic tiles. These tiles, once applied, would complete the jar’s iconic form with its spiraling metal rim and contoured shoulders. Moreover, the careful arrangement of each tile would give voice to members from the community on topics of self-sufficiency, heritage, and resourcefulness –qualities that have kept people in the southern Appalachians going through tough times over many generations.

---


1344 Albala and Nafziger, The Lost Art, 49.
The sculpture also speaks of the layered, often contentious meaning of symbols. One hundred years ago, glass canning jars were the consummate badge of an emerging modern food system. They have since come to represent the unpretentious security of farm life as well as the celebrated container of the moonshiner’s craft, best drank straight from the jar. It’s a reminder that symbols are cultural loadstones; meaning is contextual.

Robert Gipe, the project’s director, stands by watching, still bundled against the winter cold. According to Gipe, projects like this are more important than ever. As the population of Harlan County’s towns shrink with the coal mono-economy, these communities find themselves at a crossroads, trying to piece together a future from yesterday’s fragments.

Dwindling population in the southern mountain region is symptomatic of larger problems. This crossroad is defined by a convergence of environmental and social crises. A little over one hundred years ago reformers entering the southern mountain region promised health, progress and prosperity via temperance, modern farming, and industry. Today, the region struggles with the staggeringly destructive potential of technologically sophisticated industrial capitalism in which success ultimately spells failure and environmental degradation; the very mountains that define Appalachia have become the sacrifice. It’s a classic scenario of extractive industries: Bread for today, hunger for tomorrow.

Virginia native Daniel Lemons sums the state of the southern mountains thusly, “Its land is being flattened. Its streams are being buried. Its air is being polluted. Its animals are disappearing. Its people are leaving because their culture is slowly eroded
This ancient mountain range, the most biodiverse landscape in North America, is hurting. And so are its people. Mountain populations suffer high rates of obesity, cardiovascular disease, cancer, depression, and substance abuse, the result of what one doctor has termed, “disparities within disparities.” Food desertification, the consequence of the decline of home food production and “mom and pop” stores, affects the economically vulnerable populations in rural Appalachia most: the miners and families of miners, who pulled the coal from the earth with little to speak of in return and farmers, who weathered the boom and bust economies of timber and coal only to ultimately lose land to strip-mining and floods and other aspects of environmental ruin. Perhaps not surprisingly, poverty in modern Appalachia maps the counties where coal and timber interests operate, and absentee owners of land and minerals have historically made off with the riches of the land, leaving the region exhausted and tax starved.

Mountains left flat are just that… flat—a profound spatial metaphor for a leveled ecology. Sam Adams, Kentucky resident and volunteer with Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative, notes that industry callousness has leveled approximately 500 mountains, leaving 741,000 acres of Appalachia barren with “soils… compacted like a

1347 Troy Blanchard and Thomas Lyson, “Food Availability and Food Deserts in the Nonmetropolitan South,” Southern Rural Development Center, no. 12 (April, 2006).
Wal-Mart parking lot.” Adams’ analogy articulates a stinging reality. While mountain top removal allows coal companies to extract more coal, it undermines community and environmental well-being as workers are replaced by heavy machinery and the ecological base of the mountains is leveled. As rationale, today’s mining projects are accomplished in the name of alternative development--the creation of flat terrain for airports, highway projects, prisons, and big-box stores. But aside from such highly suspect forms of development, the resulting landscape in its entirety is little more than a moonscape.

According to studies by the National Resources Defense Council and Appalachian Voices, only 6-11% of reclaimed sites serve any recognizable economic use. A bird’s eye view of such sites reveals leveled roads and “gleaming shopping malls” with their monocrop lawns, amidst a vast pitted no-man’s land—Appalachia’s despoiled, deforested and abandoned hollows.

For Lemons, Appalachia needs “to be saved and preserved” for Appalachia is being “consumed.” To preserve evokes something deep in the region’s culture and history. Perhaps it is no wonder that many seek to reclaim not only the land but also the rural ethic of its agrarian past and, along with it, the kitchen, canning jar, and the cellar, and for some even, long taboo practices of fermentation. For the purposes of this project,

---


the farm or homeplace of mountain communities offers revealing insights into mountain subsistence culture as a culture of fermentation long under assault. As one of the last remaining haunts of John Barleycorn as embodied in a subsistence ethos, the southern mountains offer insight into place of a well-honed temperance crusade in capital’s process of enclosure and accumulation by dispossession.

The following pages explore a history that speaks of the breakdown and usurpation of southern Appalachia’s home economy and the social cohesion it provided prior to the onset of industrialization. This history places land, its use and control, at the center of this Appalachian drama. Here, ownership of land in its broadest sense determines the quality of life, human and otherwise. This history also challenges the logic of existing claims that alcohol prohibition at the dawn of the twentieth century pitted a rural American ethic against the rising tide of hard-drinking urban immigrants. In contrast, this section shines light on a lesser known assault on alcohol within a broader war waged by the temperance movement, middle-class journalism and industrial giants against a rural subsistence economy. Deemed degenerate, the environment, production system, cooking and drinking habits of rural Appalachia were subjected to “modern” and “hygienic” uplift associated with industrial inroads into agriculture, food, and medicine.

The definition and control of space so dominates this modernization project in Appalachia that it seems fit to focus on the production of space as a force in itself. As sociologist Henri Lefebvre demonstrates, space is a product of history that is not only part of signification along with language but also part of human interplay with their
As a product of the nation state, the handmaiden of capitalism, space is a major organizing force of the modern world. As such, space serves as a tool of domination in the production of class and social relations. Space is appropriated, conceptualized and experienced in its construction or, in the words of Lefebvre, space is produced as it is perceived, conceived, and lived.\(^{1352}\)

Equally important are prohibitions in their capacity to alter the relational dimensions of social space. Prohibitions arguably create “gulfs” and “dislocation” that shatter the integrity of a wide range of relationships-- of humans to environment, and of bodily integrity, preventing “the never fully achieved restoration of these relations in an ‘environment’ made up of a series of zones defined by interdictions and bans.”\(^{1353}\)

Moreover, in creating restrictions and bans in some areas, and allowances in others, prohibitions dislocate and displace for the purpose of creating new linkages and cohesions in the “passage of one mode of production to another”.\(^{1354}\)

Despite its reputation as a forgotten elsewhere of the modern age, the story of Appalachia can be viewed as a foundational story in the production of space for the modern United States, of prohibitions and relegations in the transformation of rural communities into industrial centers. It is a cornerstone of twentieth century prohibitionary policy that would facilitate spatial practices in modern American society towards a twenty-first-century landscape where powerful corporate giants dominate the production

\(^{1351}\) Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 14.

\(^{1352}\) Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 23, 26, 39.

\(^{1353}\) Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 35.

\(^{1354}\) Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 36, 46.
of alcohol, food and drugs. Notably, drug policy in the US was built on the perceived American relationship to alcohol and local and state apparatuses of alcohol regulation and prohibition.

To disclose this process we must look beyond the urban narrative of prohibition, to the rural drama of the mountains, where the relics of the sometimes obscure relationship between the perceived, conceived, and lived, persist. As Lefebvre notes, “codes” that have been part of this process need not be destroyed and, in fact, exist as “relics” in the form of erasures, foci, contradictions, abstractions, illusions, the decentering and recentering of knowledge, evident in the built environment and its ruling ideology.\footnote{Lefebvre, Production of Space, 28.} In Appalachia’s history of space, the “spatial code” of transformation is apparent in the erasure of subsistence farms with the genesis of the company towns. For the purposes of this project, Harlan County offers a revelation in how systems of production seek to restrict production in certain spaces while prohibiting them in others to affect the control of resources and people.
Chapter 10:
The Deep History of Mountain Subsistence

Yes, we had plenty. We had lots of good things to eat. I guess things that people wouldn’t notice now… but you know, it didn’t cost a thing.
-- Nora Garland

Saddle up the grey, who’ll be the rider
Down to the stillhouse to get a little cider.
-- Folk song by Ernest V. Stoneman and the Blue Ridge Cornshuckers

In the late nineteenth century, the southern mountain region was largely defined by subsistence agriculture. For several reasons, Appalachia did not follow commercial agricultural trends of the North and South. Attempts to clear hillsides for mass production resulted in the rapid degradation of soil, so most areas remained wooded. Social patterns followed the geography of mountains with communities settling in coves, hollows, valleys and ridges, providing a degree of isolation between communities and from the outside world. Beginning in the eighteenth century, this geography attracted waves of highlanders. Scotch-Irish and German pioneers settled the area as did, to lesser extent, English, French, and Dutch peasants, seeking different land than the plantation culture or petty commodity producers who typically sought expanses of flat land that fit their forms and understandings of agriculture. Inexpensive fertile land, made increasingly available with Cherokee removal in the 1830s, encouraged settlement by indentured servants and other migrants of lesser means, drawn largely from the marginalized


populations of Britain and Europe. As Ronald D. Eller notes, “The natural protection, arable soil, good water, and abundant timber of the coves and hollows were ideal for the support of the cultural traditions and simple agricultural technology of the Scotch-Irish and German pioneers who settled the mountains.” Similarly, Mary Beth Pudup highlights the fact that the operative rules of production “were those permitting rural households to subsist outside a market economy—that is,… towards family maintenance rather than competitive commerce,” i.e. the antithesis of social relations based on extractive industries.

Regional culture, while it varied from place to place, was defined by the ecology of localized subsistence economies in which the household with the collaborative efforts of community produced almost everything from the food consumed annually to one’s home, furniture, and tools. Eller describes a kinship-based economy that was remarkably stable in its mixed-land use with the average 187 acre farm broken down thusly: 25% cultivated with patches of corn or other seedcrop as well as gardens and orchards, 20% pasture, and the rest “virgin forest,” maintained as such for forest products. Even with clearing for regional agriculture and timber harvesting, 75% of the mountains remained forested at the end of the nineteenth century. Indeed, in this ecology, residents engaged all aspects of the landscape from the tallest old-growth trees to microbes in the


1360 Pudup, “The Limits of Subsistence,” 69.

1361 Eller, *Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers*, 16.

soil. The result provides insights into the place and value of ferments in subsistence economies.

Mountain Farm Culture

Subsistence being a rather broad term for a diverse range of localized economies, it might be best to further qualify pre-industrial farming methods employed in mountain communities. Notably, Appalachian farming shared traits with horticulture and generally speaking represents a form of agroforestry. Horticulture is an intensive form of cultivation of fruits, vegetables, and other plants on a small scale, primarily with “the hoe, not the plow,” mixing crops in a manner that encourages succession and allows existing ecosystems to function.\textsuperscript{1363} While both hoes and plows were employed in Appalachia, “hoeing corn,” for many who lived there, defined farm work. Plowing was limited to patches of potatoes, corn, oats, rye, or tobacco, hoes often being the most suitable tool for the uneven terrain of the mountains. And, aside from such patches, gardening—the quintessential horticultural form, as Eller notes - provided “the mainstay of the food supply.”\textsuperscript{1364}

In the days of virgin forests, the southern mountains, while unfit for commodity grain production, provided a remarkably edible haven for settlers. The natural forest was a succession of layers: High canopy nut bearing trees towered over shade tolerant species of various qualities, below which thrived shrubs and herbaceous and horizontally

\textsuperscript{1363} Toby Hemenway, “Redesigning Civilization “ (presentation, UCSC Common Ground, University of California, Santa Cruz, April 13, 2013), accessed May 10, 2013, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aUCgfOOSORg

\textsuperscript{1364} Eller, \textit{Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers}, 18.
spreading plants. On this living scaffolding flourished a vertical layer of vines and, underground, populating the rhizosphere, were microorganisms and plant roots of practical significance. Moreover, the earth as a springboard for life embodied Aldo Leopold’s assertion that “Land …is not merely soil; it is a fountain of energy flowing through a circuit of soils, plants, and animals.”\textsuperscript{1365} It is the long recognized catalyst of life, the beginning and end of all things. As expressed in the wisdom of poet Bulleh Shah, the “soil is in ferment;” it is the “horse” and the “rider.”\textsuperscript{1366} Here, at the base of all things, in what ecologist call the “bottom-up” effect, the alchemy of plant and microbial life fed the food web in its abundance above ground, including human settlers.\textsuperscript{1367}

Using a combination of existing balds and newly cleared patches of land, mountain communities settled into the forest ecology, fed themselves, built homes, bore children, lived and died, passing on land and ways. These settlers deliberate incorporation of cultivation with the existing forest system that served their needs, while intercropping of companion plants like beans and maize in the manner of their Cherokee predecessors and ancestors, created a practice that would have limited soil exhaustion in cleared spaces. Soil was also enriched with resources from the farm and forest: “Every scrap of chicken and animal manure that could be collected was put back in the soil” along with

\textsuperscript{1365} Aldo Leopold, “The Land Ethic,” in \textit{A World of Ideas: Essential Readings for College Writers}, ed. Lee A. Jacobus (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2010), 757.


ashes from the hearth and leaves from the woods. Steeper slopes were also terraced. The resulting system of cultivation was thus integrated with forest ecology in a manner that provided the farmer with reliable ongoing sources of fuel, clean water, rich loamy soil, wild game, medicinal plants, edible fruits, and nuts.

Arguably, the existing “food forest” made this system of agroforestry viable. As with many old growth forests around the globe, Appalachian forests had developed in association with human inhabitants spanning centuries, beginning with indigenous peoples. The result was species distribution with a high percentage of food producing plants, timber species, and medicinal plants: forests of walnuts, beech nuts, hickory nuts, chinquapins (chestnuts), oaks, and berries, including red and white mulberries, strawberries, dewberries, huckleberries, blackberries, and serviceberries, among others. Other useful North American and naturalized plants of old world origin included wild beans and seeds such as nut grass, kidney beans, and hog peanuts; annual greens such as poke, creases and lambsquarter; valuable medicinals such as ginseng, wormwood and rabbit tobacco; wild fruits like cherries, pawpaws, maypops and hawthorns; starchy and savory roots such as Jerusalem artichokes, ramps, sweet potatoes and garlic; edible mushroom such as morels, lion’s mane, and maitake; and sugary sap producing trees including maples and birches. The Foxfire Project has documented seventy-three wild medicinal plants and seventy-four wild plant species with food uses that were employed by mountain inhabitants. Indeed, while east coast food forests fell into disrepair with

---

the dispossession of Native American peoples, becoming the “tangled dark forest primeval” of Puritan nightmares, the mixed population of mountain emigrants and their relationship with their forests arguably sustained the established role of the forest.\textsuperscript{1370}

While not all forms of horticulture and agroforestry are ecological or sustainable, these forms of cultivation are, in general, more resilient and less ruinous to the environment than commodity grain farming which requires expansive annual clear-cutting of fields, a practice that prohibits ecological succession. The clearing and plowing of land can negatively impact an ecosystem if done excessively and if ecological succession (the reestablishment of wild plants, and in time, forests, in a damaged landscape) is obstructed. Indeed, some mountain counties revealed signs of environmental degradation from overuse and over-clearing by the late nineteenth century, largely due to population growth. Scale, of course, matters. The introduction of cattle and hogs also negatively impacted some native species.\textsuperscript{1371} Yet mountain agriculture could also allow for succession, evident in local accounts of indigenous trees reclaiming “worn-

\textsuperscript{1370}\hspace{1em}“Food forests” is a central concept of permaculture which recognizes the human role in defining the content of large forests, including the Amazon and old world growth of the Americas. For a brief exploration of old wood American forests as food forests, see Toby Hemenway, “How Permaculture Can Save Humanity and the Earth, but not Civilization” (presentation, the Nicolas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, Feb. 12, 2010), accessed July 2013, \url{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8nLKHfYHmPbo}

\textsuperscript{1371}\hspace{1em}Dwight B Billings and Kathleen M. Blee, “Agriculture and Poverty in the Kentucky Mountains: Beech Creek, 1850-1910” in \textit{Appalachia in the Making: The Mountain South in the Nineteenth Century} by Mary Beth Pudup, Dwight B. Billings, and Altina L Waller (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995); Donald E. Davis, \textit{Homeplace Geographies: Essays for Appalachia} (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2006), 140-142.
out cornfields” and spaces along roads.\textsuperscript{1372} This allowance benefited both people and animals, both domestic and wild, since pioneering herbaceous medicinals and nut trees--walnuts, hazelnuts and beechnuts, seemed to grow well in such sites.

Mountain farming though segmented into family farmsteads, maintained the principles commoning defined by historian Peter Linebaugh as production for subsistence or use value, fellowship or neighborliness, common pasture, usufruct rights, and the right to estovers or customary gathering.\textsuperscript{1373} Uncultivated forested space—the majority of space, which crossed the boundaries of individually owned land, served as a form of foraging, hunting, and grazing commons because forest was understood as a communal resource, open to local residents. Indeed, historian Ralph H. Lutts has dubbed these spaces the “chestnut commons” due to the prominence of chestnut trees both spatially and in the unique subsistence economy of mountain peoples.\textsuperscript{1374} Encouraged by native, then European-American management of undergrowth, extensive stands of chestnuts alone supplied farmers with quality wood for everything from homes to musical instruments and coffins, leaves for folk medicine, and a rich bounty of nuts for fattening hogs, human consumption, and trade. And, notes Lutts, no inevitable Hardinian tragedy can be blamed for the demise of the chestnut commons. Indeed, the chestnut commons gave life to the subsistence economy and the liberties they secured for small farmers and

\textsuperscript{1372} Farr, More Than Moonshine, 188. Farr recalls how nut trees and other useful plants grew well in abandoned corn fields and how these sites became favorite locations for gathering nuts.

\textsuperscript{1373} Linebaugh, Magna Carta Manifesto, 46-53, 249.

formerly enslaved Africans.\textsuperscript{1375} For the most part, the Appalachian farming system displayed tremendous resilience while maintaining the function of the mountain environment as a food forest. As Edgar Bingham notes, both Cherokee and old world settlers’ “lifestyle… represented a remarkably good adaptation to the natural environment.”\textsuperscript{1376} What finally brought down the chestnut commons, the subsistence economy and ecology was a combination of intrusions: the importation of Asian chestnut blight (\textit{Cryphonectria parasitica}), a timber boom, and regional industrialization.\textsuperscript{1377}

Fermentation was an integral part of the rhythm of Appalachian subsistence culture as it has been for millennia in subsistence cultures the world over. Fermentation served as a bridge between cultivation and Appalachian wildcraft, thus blurring line of “domestic” and “wild” abstractions. Fermentation also offers a window into themes of interdependence and symbiosis at the heart of an Appalachian subsistence ethic. For ferments, which have their own historical lineages, are not simple, passed on cultural products, but rather the products of cultural syncretism and a dialectic relationship of a local population with its environment.

Before proceeding, a note on the definition of fermentation is in order. While many contemporary westerners understand fermentation almost solely by its role in the breakdown of carbohydrates into alcohol, in the not-so-distant past, fermentation

\textsuperscript{1375} Lutts, “Like Manna from God,” 247-250.
\textsuperscript{1377} For information on the introduction of the blight into New York in 1904 and its rapid spread over the next few decades, see Lutts, “Like Manna from God,” 266-272.
represented a wide array of food processing techniques that predate agriculture and facilitated its rise. Using cultural adaptation, humans harnessed the power of fermentation as a food storage strategy, giving birth to a wide array of specialized culturally defined ferments. This entailed an intimate knowledge of the dynamics of decomposition and utilization of unseen microbial allies—a technology acquired through trial and error—to preserve an overabundance of distinct local foods. As Sandor Ellix Katz contends, “fermentation practices are the products of human beings’ co-evolution with our natural environment, arising within a web of symbiotic relationships with plants, animals, fungi, and bacteria. Successful coexistence with microbes is a biological imperative.”

This tillage of microbes contributed to something grander, as Katz notes, “More than incidental culinary novelties,” ferments are “tangible embodiments of culture.”

Many works on prohibition in the mountains briefly note that alcohol has long served as a way of storing calories. This notation, however, does not do justice to the complex relationship between fermentation and pre-modern agricultural forms in the mountains. In the Appalachian setting, fermentation played a pivotal role in saving seasonally abundant foods. In addition to over-winter storage, fermentation would have provided valuable enzymes and altered food chemistry to make nutrients more accessible while making stored food safe to consume by in its deterrence of pathogenic bacteria,
which perish in the fermentation process. In Appalachia, moonshine production was one aspect of a deep history of human and environmental interaction through fermentation. The role of preserved foods, especially ferments, in the mountains is a story of people written in things produced and consumed, including space.

The history of fermented food is “deep”—prehistoric in nature, but also tied to human and cultural interaction over time.\textsuperscript{1381} The wide variety of mountain ferments shared the mixed heritage of Appalachian society. Sauerkraut, a mountain staple, can be traced back to Han China, and thirteen-century Europe where it arrived with invading Huns, only to be carried, along with other forms of pickling, to the American mountains by Palatinate and Moravian German, Dutch and French immigrants beginning in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{1382} Aside from preserving a wide range of foods en masse with summer and fall harvesting in a simple and economical fashion, pickling added variety of flavors, aromas, and textures to mountain cooking. The original mountain pickle was the sour crunchy product of fermentation. Just about anything and everything was pickled—snap beans, corn, cucumbers, beets, turnips, and even bits of meat (beef or pork, brined in a manner similar to corned beef) found their way into the brining barrel. The technology employed was remarkably simple. Mountain resident and elder Eva Vinson describes the process of making kraut: “They didn’t put anything but salt [in with it], and as you chop


it in the barrel, it makes its own juice… And then they put on boards over that… Then put rocks on top of [the boards] to hold them down.”  

In this saline environment, the favored home of the genus lactobacillus, fermentation would naturally follow, evident in the bubbles of the percolating, burping barrel or crock.

Pannage, the fatting of pigs on the forest mast, dates to European prehistory. From centuries old Romano-British agriculture arrived the keeping of dairy cows and pigs and associated cuisine that became common rural household practice in manorial system of the Anglo Saxon era. With the arrival of Britain’s various peoples in the Americas, entered as well a range of dairy ferments. Raw milk, which naturally ferments when warm, could be “clabbered”—set out in a warm kitchen for two or three days to produce a cheesy-yogurt-like substance the consistency of mud, from which it got its Gaelic name. Buttermilk, too, is a cultured milk, a side product of processing cultured butter-- its telltale tanginess like that of clabber, the product of indigenous strains of lactobacilli (lactic acid bacteria, or LAB) that makes cucumbers pickle and cabbage sauer into kraut.

Clabbering was achieved through one or more processes, all of which speak of participation in an ecological system as well as enduring lengthy cultural threads. Clabber and other dairy ferments will naturally ferment due to existing cultures living in milk consequence of ruminant coevolution with their human partners dating to the

---


Neolithic. Clabber would have also been “localized” in taste and consistency through exposure to wild ferments, the native bacteria of mountain soil that drifted with each breeze, settling on leaves, bodies, and bowls of skimmed milk exposed to air. Milk was also clabbered by mixing it with a spoonful of buttermilk whose microbial culture was perpetuated with use. Thus, mountain people cultivated long-domesticated as well as regional “wild” microbiota as participants in an ecology that spanned time and continents -- the epitome of what Michael Pollan, in referring to cheese making, has called a “complex dance of taxonomically far-flung species”.

Using the transformative properties of naturally occurring enzymes, mountain women converted milk into cheese. This simple technology, which originated in the fertile crescent at the dawn of dairying when herdsmen first discovered curds in the stomachs of butchered calves, ultimately blossoming into an art and essential food in the Greco-Roman Mediterranean, diversifying as it traveled with Roman legionaries as they trekked the mountain of Gaul. Cheese making thus traveled with other dairy arts through the centuries, into the Americas following the Maritime Revolution. In the Appalachians, women perpetuated this home industry in making soft cottage cheese, a version of sourdough bread and hard cheese. The stomachs of butchered cows would be stretched and dried “like a banjo hide.” When needed, a “tiny piece of the stomach


lining… about the size of a thumbnail,” could be employed in bread starter, or warm milk, caused the milk to curdle.\footnote{1388}

Alongside dairy in the mountain legacy of ferments, came the keeping and curing of meat. In the old world, hogs and the occasional cow, fattened in the summer, were slaughtered with the first hard frost, and brined, smoked or salted into bacon, sausage and country \textit{hamms} (Old English for “thigh”). These foods, which had taken root in Roman Gaul-- the Romans being lovers of all things salty and cured, transported these preserves to the extent of its empire. In Europe’s great old growth forests, according to the commoning right to pannage, hogs were set loose to gorge on seasonal nuts and acorns prior to slaughter and curing, a practice that was carried over to forest of Appalachia.\footnote{1389}

In the Americas, salted meats and consumption of whole animals harked back to the medieval European and African foodscape in which salted meats and less desirable cuts kept the poor in meat.\footnote{1390} When it came to preserved meats, most families cured large animals that could not be consumed rapidly such as the shoulders or hindquarters of beef, deer, mutton, and hogs. Hogs, allowed to gorge on freshly fallen mast from the forest canopy, were staple. Butchered in cool temperatures, hogs were transformed into country hams, or ground into sausages for dry-curing with the aid of their own unique flora.

\footnote{1389}{Sheppard, \textit{Pickled, Potted & Canned}, 69-70.}
When it comes to the oldest ferments, alcoholic libations, once again Appalachian foodways stand out as a marker of cultural synthesis—the wines of the Mediterranean joining the meads and beers of pre-Roman Central and Northern Europe. Appalachian libations encompassed an amazing array of ciders, wines, mead, beers, brandies, and distilled beverages. Apples alone, the consummate fruit of the mountains, birthed ciders, vinegar and applejack. Easily transported, apple seed was carried by European settlers and widely dispersed by apple “aficionado” John Chapman (aka Johnny Appleseed) across the central mountains in the early nineteenth century, cross-pollinated to produce nearly 1600 apple varieties that were ultimately propagated by Appalachia’s homesteads.\footnote{Paul Gallimore, “Heirloom Apples in Central and Southern Appalachia,” Long Branch Environmental Education Center, 2005, accessed May 3, 2013, http://www.longbrancheec.org/pubs/apples.html} Apples aside, all products from mead to moonshine were originally crafted from the harvest of the corn patch and farm orchard or locally adapted drinks that employ available honey, native trees, flowers, or wild fruit from elderberries, blackberries, strawberries, pokeberries, blueberries, and wild “scuppernong” grapes that came with common foraging rights.\footnote{See Dabney, \\textit{Smokehouse Ham}, 153-161 for recipes.} As with cheese, prior to the sale of commercial yeasts, mountain ferments would have relied on the alchemy of “wild” ferments--Appalachia’s indigenous microscopic terrain.

Fruit or flower wines entailed crushed or bruised pulp, combined with water, sugar (if available) which was allowed to ferment in cask, jug, or stoneware. This seemingly magical process required little aside from the proper moist, temperate environment since the symbiotic colonies of bacteria and yeast (SCOBY) are ever-
present on fruit and flowers, conveniently distributed to their choice fare, by bees and other pollinators. Honey as well, carries its own fermenters, naturally occurring enzymes and live cultures that are activated with the addition of water. The work of these enzymes and cultures could be supplemented by bacteria and yeast from the air and apples or spices that were added in making mead-cider blends and metheglin, a medicinal mead.\textsuperscript{1393} So too, beer—brewed from persimmons, peaches, corn, sweet potatoes, sorghum syrup or birch sap, was encouraged to ferment for several weeks.

Of course, Appalachia is well known for its distilled spirits, tragically perhaps, since its reputation as an illicit commodity obscures the fullness of this craft and its cultural significance. Historically, distillation was a natural outgrowth of fermentation, its origins dating to the depths of antiquity, first arising in China and the Far East, transported by Arabians to the Mediterranean where it was first recorded in fourth century BCE Greece, when such spirits were a prized discovery of alchemists and apothecaries.\textsuperscript{1394} A door to the “fifth essence” or “aqua vitae,” spirits were not only valued for their mind-altering affects, they were the primary source of medicine.\textsuperscript{1395} How, exactly, distillation came to the British Isles is uncertain, but it appears to have arrived with Catholic monks in the sixth century, where Irish and Scottish Gaels took up the craft, producing \textit{usquebaugh} or \textit{whiskey}—Gaelic \textit{aqua-vitae}. The century-long production for home use and trade that followed blossomed as a “popular technology”

\textsuperscript{1393} Dabney, \textit{Smokehouse Ham}, 161.

\textsuperscript{1394} Dabney, \textit{Mountain Spirits}, 32-33.

\textsuperscript{1395} Moran, \textit{Distilling Knowledge}, 11, 49-50.
that was “open to everyone” due to its simple reliance on easily obtained natural ingredients.\textsuperscript{1396} This trend endured despite the machinations of empire: the seizure of monasteries by King Henry VIII in the sixteenth century and the dreaded excise of King Charles, an attempt to pacify the “wild” Irish while simultaneously raising money to fund the English Civil War.\textsuperscript{1397} Likewise distillation in the mountains persisted in United States despite similar regressive taxes that tried to shift the burden of wartime debt of the Revolutionary and Civil Wars onto small farmers while favoring financiers, land speculators and large distillers. As the “province of women,” distillation also survived through much of its European history along with food preparation and fermentation for putting food by, and the care for the infirm, making the still a necessary implement of any household.\textsuperscript{1398} These associations continued in the American colonies.

Among American subsistence farmers, whiskey held its original role as a medicine. Most families made whiskey for home and personal use as an analgesic or antiseptic for such things like arthritic pain. It was also “burned down” (set on fire, then extinguished) and drank to “stop the flux (loose bowels),” or employed as the primary ingredient in hot toddies to treat a cold or flu.\textsuperscript{1399} In addition, mountain communities relied on seasonal tonics made of nutrient rich roots and leaves from sassafras, bloodroot,

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{1396}] Moran, \textit{Distilling Knowledge}, 56.
  \item[\textsuperscript{1397}] Betty Boyles Ellison, \textit{Illegal Odyssey: 200 Years of Kentucky Moonshine} (Bloomington: 1st Books, 2003), 30. Also see Dabney, \textit{Mountain Spirits}, 35-39.
  \item[\textsuperscript{1398}] Moran, \textit{Distilling Knowledge}, 62-63.
\end{itemize}
and other plants. In the southern mountains, whiskey played an important role as an ingredient in medicines that included a wide range of naturalized and native medicinal plants many of which are now broadly recognized for their medicinal properties. Tonics, which consisted of boiled and soaked herbs that were gathered in the spring, provided a concentration of vitamins and minerals that were understood to rehabilitate the body, or “build blood,” following winter prior to intense summer activity. Sassafras was a mountain favorite, usually taken as a tea. Boiled down roots or fresh greens of medicinal plants were also eaten. As an alternative, herbs, like yellowroot, could be soaked in wine or whiskey, which would draw out the plant’s medicinal properties.\textsuperscript{1400} For example, a favorite spring tonic might contain wild cherry bark, queen of the meadow root, ginseng, bloodroot, all of which was boiled down, strained and blended with moonshine.\textsuperscript{1401}

While the making of medicines was not strictly gendered, in the mountains alcohol retained its historic association with medicinal remedies and thus with women. Betty Boles Ellison states: “In the 1770s, Kentucky women planted corn, tended young fruit trees and processed much of the food. They also did some of the distilling… Women prepared remedies, most of which had a whiskey base, for their families” for which “Women were probably the originators.”\textsuperscript{1402} While distillation was increasingly masculinized with commercial production, these practices lingered into the twentieth century, evidenced in local newspaper articles and oral histories that describe an enduring

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1400} “Wild Plant Uses,” 122.
\item \textsuperscript{1401} Rosa Cornett.
\item \textsuperscript{1402} Ellison, \textit{Illegal Odyssey} 89-90. Also see Meacham, \textit{Every Home a Distillery} for information on the role of women in fermenting and distilling alcohol in the Chesapeake.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
tradition of folk medicine, midwifery and distillation by men, women, Native, Anglo, and African Americans extending from the mountains into the piedmont. Indeed, despite common imaginings of moonshine as a masculine endeavor, many women continued to skillfully operated stills with the decline of subsistence agriculture, alone or alongside men folk, to support their families.

Equally important, it should also be recognized that many mountain practices were deeply indebted to the native inhabitants of the mountains whose agricultural practices (such as the use of fire to clear land), botanical expertise, and most importantly, tradition of corn cultivation, informed mountain culture. In the old world, the Scotch-Irish employed barley and rye to make whiskey. But most Old World grains were a poor fit for the mountain environment. For viable production, most required extensive clear-cutting on fairly level ground that could be turned easily and repeatedly. The tight water cycle of the mountains that produced predictable summer showers cause grains from wheat to rye to mildew when they need dry heat to ripen. Here, John Barleycorn became “Jonathan Maize.” Maize replaced such grains in moonshine production and took on great significance as a staple food mirroring native uses for corn not only as bread but


1404 Ellison, Illegal Odyssey, 90-100.

also in ferments, such as the Cherokee sour corn drink known as Gv-No-He-Ve.¹⁴⁰⁶ Both drinks would also function as symbols of hospitality in shared subsistence ethos.¹⁴⁰⁷ The processing of corn with lye water in indigenous fashion, ensured a very nutritional, soft and easily digestible corn used by mountaineers in an array of breads: hushpuppies, corn pone, cracklin’s and corn cakes.¹⁴⁰⁸ Not only was corn well suited to mountain farming, it carried over culturally as people mixed, in the overlapping diasporas of incoming old world peasants and exiled natives. For, although Mississippian peoples were annihilated by Spanish-borne pathogens, and while many Cherokee were displaced by early settlers or relocated west under Andrew Jackson’s presidency, native peoples and ways persisted with those that traded and intermarried with European settlers or resisted removal by disappearing into the hills.¹⁴⁰⁹

The Rhythms of Subsistence and the Homeplace

Subsistence-centered production on the farm, within the family and community, was spun out of the ecological web of the landscape. Production flowed with the seasons. Crops were worked in spring and summer. Spring opened with the gathering of wild sallet greens whose flavor also graced the milk of the cow now grazing on the first green shoots in the pasture. As noted by Tennessean Walter N. Lambert in his seasonally

---


¹⁴⁰⁷ For information on Gv-No-He-Nv, see Bill Neal, *Bill Neal’s Southern Cooking* (University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 25.

¹⁴⁰⁸ Dabney, *Smokehouse Ham*, 100.

arranged cookbook, “the surest sign of spring in the old days was the taste of wild onions in the milk”—a taste that carried over into cheese and other milk ferments.\textsuperscript{1410}

Sowing followed: corn, tobacco, and possibly, to a lesser extent, rye, barley, or oats using horse and plow, or more often, the hoe. The garden was planted with vegetables: potatoes, peas, beans, pumpkins, rhubarb, with the guidance of the sun’s position in astrological signs mapped out in the sky above and in the farmer’s almanac with added nuances attributed to phases of the moon. Laid out in human form, the almanac illustrated a cosmic order that equated the landscape of the human body with the zodiac from which was determined the most favorable days for the tasks of subsistence, from planting and harvesting to pickling, curing, and the distilling of liquors. Thus the sum of the natural world was intimated in the perpetuation of human life. Pisces, Aries, Taurus and Gemini correlated with the ideal springtime months for planting, while pickling was best done when the sun was in the “head” or “heart” and on a new moon. As stated, “Without it [reading the signs], you could not be sure of exactly where you were…,” a comment that elicits a sense of place in time and space and belonging as long as one acts in accordance with a natural order.\textsuperscript{1411}

Summers were defined by long days of labor. Dawn-to-dusk field work from May to June entailed plowing, hoeing, and growing all food for animals and people with the aid of horses or mules and locally crafted tools, which along with furnishings, musical instruments, fencing, buckets, kitchen utensils, bee gums (log hives) were fashioned from

\textsuperscript{1410} Lambert, \textit{Kinfolks and Custard Pie}, 19.

\textsuperscript{1411} Lambert, \textit{Kinfolks and Custard Pie}, 21.
the wood of the same chestnut, hickory, oak, walnut, cherry, maple, sassafras, birch, locust, pine, gum, and other tree native species, that were a source of fuel, food, medicine, selectively cut to preserve useful woodlands. 1412

Ferments, aside from preserving seasonal foods, were a carrier of seasonal and environmental flavors. The taste of meads varied with seasonal honeys of a farm’s bee gums, depending on which plants were in bloom: sourwood, basswood, or others. As, the long hard working days of summer bled into fall, both seasons were marked by an abundance of fresh food for eating and laying by. Here, the farm in its totality was enlisted in the grand dénouement of food preservation. For in the mountains there was little in the way of commercial space. By foot and hoof people and surplus for barter moved along creeks. In the bottom lands, one might find a general store or church, but the majority of construction was found on the family farm, which was the heart of production, the locus of family and social life.

Livelihood being explicit in the conceptualization of space, setters created space both material and social in the continuation of their subsistence heritage. Notably, while many fine works of scholarship have tackled the architecture of folk dwellings, remarkably few have addressed the combined features of the “homeplace” as a site of production essential to the subsistence economy. Indeed, the farm or homeplace offers revealing insights into mountain culture with fermentation at its core.

What is a homeplace? Michael Ann Williams describes it as a rural dwelling, a site of experiential and generational life in the mountains that reveal systems of meaning

and use as well as changes in those systems over time. For the purpose of this project, we can note the significance of houses—the centrality of the hearth and kitchen table in cooking, eating, warmth and storage in the mountain family-based production system. In the iconic single pen house and related variations—the open construction of a single multipurpose “big room” with its hearth or separate lean-to kitchen—families slept, cooked, and socialized. Here they strung dried beans known as “leather britches,” transformed milk into cheese, stored bins of cornmeal and flour, and boiled herbs for medicine. From a “convenient rafter,” women hung the stretched and dried cow stomachs used in cheese making, along with curds weeping whey. Once drained, the latter were pressed into wooden hoops and placed in the attic to age, their taste evolving with a succession of microbial growth. But life and work in the hills transcended the walls of one’s domicile, as did one’s sustenance. Below the floorboards, some stored apples and just outside chickens might roost on window sills. Patterns of life and production extended outwards, onto the land and into many “houses” or outbuildings of the farm, and beyond to include the expanse of the mountains. For, as Donald E. Davis has noted, the very term “homeplace” represents a collapsing of one’s natural surroundings and the notion of home in a manner central to Appalachian identity.

In addition to spatial dynamics of the house, we should consider a broader understanding of “homeplace” frequently found in oral histories. In this sense, homeplace

---


1414 “Cheese Making,” 385-393.

refers to a piece of land that bore a family name, a place that “meant” or was “dedicated to self-sufficiency,” a place where “[t]he farm buildings were just as important as the soil the crops came up from,” which generally included not only a house but also “a chicken house, barn, smokehouse, springhouse, root cellar, and in some cases, a hog scalder and sorghum mill.”

Several of these features represent dedicated space for food preservation and fermentation.

Fresh food was kept cool in the springhouse (aka dairy cellar), a stone or wooden structure that straddled a trough of spring water, utilized the natural cooling effect of running water for keeping food fresh. Mountain resident Oza Kilby states: “That is where my mama stored her milk and butter. It was convenient, and the milk would stay cold.” Other foods could be preserved or altered using techniques defined by degrees of microbial activity. On one end of this spectrum, the process of decomposition could be halted by the simple act of drying. In contrast, regulating temperature has long been employed to slow microbial growth, keeping food “fresh” longer, but also allowing for limited degrees of fermentation. Moving towards the opposite end of the spectrum, the creation of properly moist and temperate environments encouraged microbial bloom in a manner that lengthening an item’s shelf life with the additional benefit of altering and concentrating flavors, increasing nutrient availability, and enhancing medicinal and psychoactive effects.

---


1417 “The Old Homeplace,” 11, 15.
Hewn from rough timber, the windowless smokehouse was the primary site for curing meat. Smoke rising from a smokehouse was a tell-tale signal of fall. Freshly prepared sausages and slaughtered meat were transported to the smokehouse where it was hung from joists or set on shelves where these were smoked by burning green wood chips. As an alternative meat was also coated with salt, sugar and spices and hung to dry. Here staple winter meat was preserved, the process allowing for limited microbial growth that was ultimately arrested by the chemicals in smoke and dehydration facilitated by salt, sugars, or fungi. Farr states: “Among culinary delights in the south and in Appalachia is country ham, whose age is judged by its white specks.”

The ability to judge cured meat required skill and a certain sensory knowledge of certain appropriate sights and smells. “A cured and aged ham will be moldy and crusty—and looks anything but appetizing… The time-tested method of telling a good ham is to plunge an ice pick straight to the bone, then sniff the pick. If it has a clean, cured-pork odor, the ham will be a good one.”

The growth of mold, in fact, provided a useful measure for proper curing since mold played a vital function in drawing out moisture. Cured meat could be eaten as needed as it continued to cure for upwards of two years.

Shucked corn was stored in cribs that kept corn aerated and dry. Apples were smoked with sulphur or sundried as were other domestic fruits and the wide array of wild foods—dewberries, huckleberries, blackberries, grapes, cherries, elderberries, and

---

1418 Farr, More Than Moonshine, 62-63
1419 Farr, More Than Moonshine 63.
1420 Dabney, Smokehouse Ham, 193
bilberries.\textsuperscript{1421} Pumpkin, in the Cherokee fashion, were also cut into rings and air dried for storage in the root cellar.

Latin for “storeroom,” cellars served as the primary storage space for the farm. Cellars were constructed as basements in houses or, as separate underground or semi-subterranean structures with sod-covered roofs aboveground. Borrowed from Dutch pit houses, British and Irish field root pits, and the Native American practice of underground storage, cellars were remarkably simple to construct and efficient shelter for seasonal preserves.\textsuperscript{1422} Root cellars remained cool in the summer and above freezing in winter months, mimicking the climate of naturally occurring subterranean features of the landscape and soil. Their construction facilitated a wide range of storage possibilities. Placed in a cellar, or simply a large hill or hole, in bins or between layers of dry straw or pine needles (the acidic nature of which mimicked the environment created in fermentation), turnips, apples, potatoes, cabbages and beets kept for months and could be removed as needed. Root cellars also provided an ideal temperature range for storing a wide variety of fermented foods including hard cheese, aging cured or brined meats, pickles, wines and other beverages.

The cellar, in its earthy simplicity, has long functioned as a symbol of agricultural heritage, of bounty and the poetry of life and death on the land. In the mountains, the act of putting victuals in the cellar for winter spoke of conclusiveness and certitude—the culminating act of reaping a good harvest and trust in the land and simple handed-down transmission.

\textsuperscript{1421} “The Old Homeplace,” 11, and “Wild Plant Food Uses,” 152-160.

technology, honed through trial and error. The course of fermentation, the relinquishing of food to the earth in a form of guided decomposition, intimated both skill in fashioning the proper environment and trust in natural processes, perhaps best depicted by mountain resident Lake Stiles, who, curiously enough, cured meat on the dirt floor of his cellar, “allowing] the earth to draw the animal taint out of the meat, keep it cool, and prevent souring or spoiling.”1423 In tune with planting by astrological signs, the cellar and its contents verified a favorite biblical saying, “To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: a time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted.”1424 As Pollan notes, the crypt-like nature of the cellar is a reminder of life’s morality but also of ritualized transformation of the commonplace into something more enduring and meaningful—the creative destruction at the core of fermentation.1425 This is a fitting vision for the deep spiritual sense of place of regional pluralism and people that viewed their land as a locus of providence and religion from the bottom up. For many, folk forms of preservation worked because they were part of a natural order, laid out by God, communicated by the seasons and firmament of the sky. As long as farmers followed the signs and seasons their chances of successful harvests and full larders were good. Practically speaking the consequence of these


1425 Pollan, Cooked: A Natural History, 371-372.
patterns of subsistence was survival through winter. To ferment and to store meant coming through to spring.

In a barter economy in which money was scarce, wealth was measured in land and the contents of one’s larder. Regionally, though people had little money they did not see themselves as poor, rather, they saw themselves as “good livers”—people who had land and ate well. “My family were good livers,” notes Green C. Jones, author and long time resident of Harlan County, “We raised nearly everything we ate, and plenty of grain and fodder for our stock.” Food dominates Jones’ memories of a hard-working but comfortable subsistence existence. So too, many of the generation old enough to recall old mountain ways wax eloquently about food—the virtues of sauerkraut, the taste of a hot bowl of shuck bean and ham in the winter, real butter, barrels brimming with pickles, “true” Appalachian elderberry wine, and unique salubrious qualities of moonshine.

Distillation was woven into the extended geography of the homeplace in a space loosely referred to as the “stillhouse.” While distillation could be done in a kitchen over a hearth or stove using small stills, larger runs required additional space and resources. That space could be a formal structure, but more often than not the stillhouse was simple and ephemeral, or simply the location of one’s kettle. Often deep in the woods, mountain farmers located their stills next to running water—springs and creeks found in coves and hollows, a practice that over time became an increasingly fluid and covert practice, took

As with production in general, distilling was built into the natural landscape out of necessity. Forest provided fuel to heat the mash, clean cool water to make the mash and to flow through the barrel that housed the worm, a coiled copper tube where alcohol vapor condensed into liquid. The process was an intricate dance of the classical elements and the fundamental powers of nature: earth, fire, air and water, in transmuting matter into “spirits.” Earth provided the red clay and rocks of the fire box as well as the enzymes and microbes of the initial process sprouting corn to make malt and of fermenting mash or fruit. Fire brought mash to a boil, causing steam and alcohol vapor to rise, which was then condensed by cool water as it passed through the worm, resulting in whiskey or brandy, their “head, heart and tail” defining the spirit’s quality. Heads and tails were weak, while hearts that emerged in mid-run represented the core essence or best and strongest shine.

Finding a location, constructing the still, and running it was nothing short of an art. Success meant locating a thick base of red clay to build a furnace, the proper variety of corn, and knowledge of required seasonal adjustments. It require good relations with neighbors and a local miller who could be trusted milling your sprouted corn, quality wood fuel (ash, oak and hickory preferred), well-timed runs (too late and your beer will turn to vinegar), and the small personal touches that distinguished one farmer’s whiskey from the next.1428


1428 “Moonshining as a Fine Art,” 336-7
Fermentation and distillation was part of a corn’s cultural life cycle and, by proxy, the broader landscape of mountain foodways. Grown in fields, harvested corn became bread and its shucks, stored in the barn over winter, was fed to cows and ultimately transformed into dairy and meat. Corn was sprouted and cooked to make the beer that was distilled to make whiskey. And when done, the mash from the still could be used to make a fine cornbread, or to fatten hogs. Indeed, the alluring “cornbread” smell of a still could unintentionally attract rummaging hogs or reveal its location. Abiding the folk rules of the ecology and according to mountain folklore, moonshining, like cultivation, was often done according to the signs.

Likewise, all ferments were linked to highland craft culture which inhabited the farmstead. In each community someone specialized in the making of mills and presses for cider, ceramic or wood butter churns, stoneware crocks, and pickles barrels that could house fifty to sixty gallons of kraut or other pickled vegetables, in addition to a variety of slatted tubs, berry buckets, copper kettles, cheese presses, and stirring sticks, fashioned from choice local materials that would not adversely affect taste or outcome. For instance, mountain craftsmen avoided iron which corrodes and tastes bad, as well as other metals that might contain lead; hence copper’s place as an iconic metal of distillation. As for woods, yellow poplar and cypress were the preferred woods for stirring sticks used in apple processing.\textsuperscript{1429} Distillation involved related craft culture, such as the making and use of thump barrels for holding fresh beer, as well as other specialized items: caps, collars, and thumping rods; and ingenious touches, such as the use of curled poplar bark.

for piping water to the still or other features that revealed in a variety of ways, the personal ingenuity, skill, and exactness of the craftsman.

Ferments were a family and communal product which in turn reproduced social relations, evident in spatial use and understandings. Seasonal labor merged fluidly with social gatherings, with the acknowledgement that any repetitive and onerous tasks could be made light and pleasant with many hands, good company, and good food and drink, for houses were built and harvests taken in with the aid of John Barleycorn, aka, moonshine. Upon harvest, farmers invited neighbors to a shucking as described:

We used t’have them old shuckin’. They’d just pile up their corn in their barnyard, y’know, instead a’puttin’ it in their crib. And then they’d ask all their neighbors around t’come in. And they’d always bury a drink right in th’middle a’that pile … Then we’d have t’shuck all th’corn t’find it. We’d shuck all night t’get t’that half-gallon a’liquor. Then we’d all have a drink and probably have a dancin’ th’rest a’th’night, if we got the time.1430

Events like these were the social highlights of a community, a recipe for sweet memories. Women laid out tables full of food and the big room would be cleared for dancing. Arriving visitors at the home entered space that was “socially open”—the “heart of family activity”; for solitude could be found in the fields and forests or, as Williams notes, “aloneness” in mountain communities was non-architectural.1431 In contrast, the homeplace was a place of sociability, food and drink that extended to the community that largely consisted of extended relations.

1430 “Corn Shuckin’s, House Raisin’s, Quiltin’s, Pea Thrashin’s, Singin’s, Log Rollin’s, Candy Pullin’s, And…,” in Foxfire 2, ed. Eliot Wigginton (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1973), 363. Quoted from the description provided by Florence and Lawton Brooks.

1431 For architectural aspects of privacy versus sociability, see Williams, Homeplace, 60-61.
Without insurance and money to pay labor, this ethic of mutual assistance ensured tasks were completed in an enjoyable, economic, and timely manner. It also ensured that the consumption of things like alcohol had a social context and function. Work swaps or “frolics” spanned the breadth of food processing and other labor. People gathered to chop and pack cabbage into barrels to make sauerkraut, strip cane, cut apples, string beans, kill hogs, hoe potatoes, thrash peas, raise houses and barns, among other things. Such activities were an on-going aspect of life into the early twentieth century, as detailed by A.E. Turner of Harlan County. According to Turner, they’d hoe all day and dance in the evening, then move onto another house for another “frolic” and do it again, “right up the valley.”

Thus mountain communities, their foodways, and the structures and practices that went with these, reproduced the commoning principle of neighborliness.

Linked to material and craft cultures, remedies, cuisine, and the structures of homeplace, work or play, the central element of mountain culture was food, with fermentation pivotal to subsistence. As many people in the region have noted, food conveyed much more than nutrition. Locally evolved foodways were part of a rich history, self-sufficiency, neighborliness, and a social ethic: a “reverent relationship with the land and the belief that God owns and provides all” as well as a “source of pride” in knowledge of place. Such food speaks of terroir—the unique qualities of place, its water, soil, flora and fauna, both large and microscopic in nature. As Sidney Mintz, in reference to culturally specific preserves, states


1433 “Wild Plant Uses,” 121.
preserved food, once committed to memory, became beloved markers of pleasure, the calendar and the round of seasons. If once tied to family, co-operative labor, seasonal smells and the pleasure of the familiar—tastes that ‘came back in season’ each year—then they were like returning schools of fish or flocks of birds.

In the mountains, these associations would have created the unique tastes of food produced and consumed in the homeplace—flavors that many residents testified could not be reproduced anywhere else. The result was a pronounced attachment to place as an extended sense of self. As expressed by Farr:

> it’s possible to put one’s roots down so deeply they cannot be satisfactorily transplanted anywhere else. People who have lost an arm or a leg complain that they still feel phantom pain. I used to fancy it was that way for us mountain people. Take us anywhere in the world and there will always be pain in the missing part buried so deeply in hillside soil.  

The primary purpose of farm products was consumption, secondarily barter, and thirdly, sales for cash. Cash was generally rare given the lack of banks and difficulty of transporting farm produce off the mountain for sale. Notably, while most communities featured a small general store, remarkably little money actually changed hands at these establishments. Many items for purchase were instead acquired through trade or paid for with labor. Eggs, hogs, gathered nuts or herbs, and distilled spirits were bartered and occasionally sold for cash which was then used to purchase the few items the farm could not produce such as coffee, white sugar and gunpowder, or salt if the farmer did not have

~~~


1435 Farr, More Than Moonshine, 7.
access to a salt spring. Most importantly, farmers sold surplus goods—including whiskey—to acquire sufficient money to pay the taxes on their land.\textsuperscript{1436}

It is here that the demands of the nation-state, wedded to capital and increasingly to industry, clashed with subsistence. The passage of the liquor excise by Congress in 1862 placed rural distillers in a conundrum, as summed up in a 1914 account:

Their corn at that time [Civil War] brought only from 25 to 40 cents a bushel; apples and peaches, rarely more than 10 cents at the stills. These were the only crops that could be grown in their deep and narrow valleys. Transportation was so difficult, and markets so remote, that there was no way to utilize the surplus except to distill it. Their stills were too small to bear the cost of government supervision. The superior officers of the Revenue Department (collectors, marshals and district-attorneys or commissioners) were paid only by commissions on collections and by fees. Their subordinate agents, whose income depended upon the number of stills they cut up and upon the arrests made, were, as a class, brutal and desperate characters. Guerrilla warfare was the natural sequence.\textsuperscript{1437}

The Revenue Act of 1862, in its totality, tended the needs of a simultaneously fractured and expansive nation. In mimicking the British system of taxation, the act bolstered a newly created income tax by levying the excise. It also brought into being the Bureau of Internal Revenue for purpose of tax collection in order to raise funds for a protracted Civil War. Geographically caught in the middle of this conflagration, mountain communities suffered military raids, battles, and deeply felt partisan conflicts. In the years following the war, tax enforcement efforts added insult to injury. Mountaineers unable to afford the tax on their stills and equally unable to compete with


commercial distilleries that passed on the expense to consumers were at risk of losing their land.

For many mountaineers the production and sale of spirits was part and parcel to one’s right to subsistence as guaranteed by political rhetoric dating to colonial times—a rhetoric that existed rather uneasily alongside the right to land for profit. But on a national scale, the Civil War affectively marked a shift as trends in farming paralleled trends in manufacturing with transitions from hand labor to the use of machinery, and subsistence to commercial agriculture. And despite the passage of the Homestead Act in 1862, the same year as the excise, federal generosity increasingly favored the transfer of public lands to railroad monopolies, large landholders and opportunistic speculators.  

As a widely opposed tax by mountain Democrats and Republicans alike, the excise smacked of a breach of the republican ethic of no taxation without representation. The conflict between state interests and subsistence found form in the mountains where revenuers hunted illicit stills that were run out of necessity since legal production meant paying regressive taxes that effectively canceled out one’s earnings, and thus one’s ability to maintain a farm. The law be damned, moral compasses often favored distillation as the honorable choice, especially given the cultural role of alcohol. Simmie Free, who was taught to distill by his father at age nine, explains,

I made th’best line a’liquor that’s ever been made in Rubin County. I tried t’make it honest. Tried to make it taste as good as I could ‘cause I loved it anyhow…I’ll


do that anyhow as long as I live. I believe if a man can make it right, the judge out
t’let him make what he wants to for himself.\textsuperscript{1440}

Indeed, what was tax fraud in the eyes of the state was a necessity for many mountain
residents for the maintenance of farms, custom, home doctoring, and honest labor.

Money may have been a necessary to keep the farm, but its acquisition carried a
degree of apprehensiveness, especially if it lacked a clear social role. In many oral
histories, whiskey is defended as “special,” but money was “the root of all evil.”\textsuperscript{1441} To
navigate the tension surrounding the sale of whiskey for cash, folk rules informally but
sometimes imperfectly governed whiskey production and sale, even when illicit. Honest
illicit whiskey production meant producing “pure corn” whiskey out of their own grain,
using their own stills and labor, and it was a given that a good producer consumed his or
her own product. In contrast, production only for sale, in a manner that infringed on
another’s land, or for money for its own sake, was considered a breech of ethics, and a
dangerous one at that since the outcome was often a lesser and possibly hazardous
product, as Free explains:

\begin{quote}
The thing people ought to do is first calm down and say, ‘Well, I’m gonna make it
honest, straight and right, and I’ll live as long as I can and die when I have to.’
That’s what I say. I don’t believe in makin’ liquor to kill anybody, do you? I’d
make liquor to drink, and if I didn’t drink it, I could sell it to somebody and go to
bed and not cry about it. I’d know they wouldn’t be hurt.\textsuperscript{1442}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1440}“Simmie Free,” in \textit{Foxfire 3}, ed. Eliot Wigginton (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1975), Interview of

\textsuperscript{1441}“Simmie Free,” 29.

\textsuperscript{1442}“Simmie Free,” 28.
Thus the economy of moonshine as it initially existed was ensconced in family and social needs, contained within the larger mountain environment. To defy the excise “blockade” was respected within social norms. Abiding by generally accepted folk ethics of production afforded an illicit moonshiner, or “blockader,” of the late nineteenth century a degree of protection. Distributing one’s product freely to neighbors and other members of the community, and producing it in a manner that was respected, discouraged informers who were also generally frowned upon as “traitors.” People who sold out others for a monetary reward could be as taboo as “dishonest” distilling. Speaking in the practical language of the mountains and acting honorably meant better treatment if caught by local authorities and better outcomes in court. As author Joseph E. Dabney points out, “The average moonshiner of the [Post-Civil War] era … would be dressed in homespun, had long hair, an unkempt sandy beard, and smelled of the mountains, of the leaves and wood soil that permeated his clothing.” And, while “unschooled” in urban sense, when put on trial he “exhibited a natural knack for common sense. Often, they appeared in court as their own counselors, defending their cases with humor, shrewdness and, on occasion, amazing success.” It should be noted that common sense is a form of social nous—recognizable traits of authenticity or accepted behaviors—the vernacular law of commoning. Perhaps it is no wonder that those who made and ran moonshine successfully at this time were often highly respected members of their communities.

In the Post-Civil War age of revenuers, people knew if their neighbors were distilling, the locations of stills, and who to go to for whiskey. Transactions in most

---

communities were low-key and protected by a culture of silence regarding who was producing and where in the face of outsiders. Gun shots, hoots, and even small children raised the alarm when revenuers were spotted, as stated: “if somebody stranger come in the hollar and see kids going two or three different ways, hollering for a dog you know…that was a warning sign to daddy that somebody was up in around there.”

Hidden under loads of pelts and other items for sale, whiskey also continued to make its way over the mountain by horse or mule teams. Likewise, when revenuers came around, mountain people utilized the homeplace and hills they knew so well to hide their craft. Moonshiners evaded the law by constructing stills in holes, caves and laurel thickets, or little-utilized buildings such as old silos, smokehouses, abandoned homes or sheds. Stills shifted about the mountains, deeper into the hills. In the woods operators bent saplings over their operation and took to only entering the still at night and often by using naturally occurring rocks to access the woods, so as not to leave a trail or “sign” that might be traced. On the farm, jugs or jars of moonshine were hidden in corncribs under piles of corn, buried in fields, stashed in bee gums, and deposited in ponds or lakes.

Farmwomen aided the process. Farr recalls her mother carefully hiding jars of moonshine from agents in freshly dug cucumber hills in her garden: “She dug a hole in each hill and buried a jar of moonshine, carefully smoothing the hill into shape again. She hid all the jars this way, then calmly went about her chores.” Harlan County resident Grant

---


1445 “Moonshining as a Fine Art,” 309-311 for a list of hiding places.

1446 Farr, More Than Moonshine, 107-108.
Baker recalls his mother dumping a “whole lard bucket full of slop” on a revenuer that was “sneaking around by the house.” On another occasion Baker’s mother hid pints under brooding hens on the side of their home.\footnote{Grant Baker.}

Many scholars have noted that the place of ferments, as markers of group identity, can be enhanced when those ferments are rejected, attacked, or forbidden by people outside of the community.\footnote{See Twitty, “Stinking Fish, Salt Fish,” 333, as well as Johathan Brumberg-Kraus and Betsey Dyer, “Cultures and Cultures: Fermented Foods as Culinary ‘Shiboleths’,” in \textit{Cured, Fermented and Smoked Foods: Proceedings of the Oxford Symposium on Food and Cookery 2010}, ed. Helen Saberi (Blackawton: Prospect Books, 2011).} Arguably, for many mountaineers, moonshine served as a cultural touchstone and unifying element against what was perceived as the impositions of a distant federal government. The result was a form of cultural cohesion, especially in light of historic assaults on home distillation by the British crown in the process of enclosure and violent suppression of American backwoodsmen that opposed the 1791 whiskey excise. Oral narratives voiced by small still operators frequently open with stock phrases like, “In the beginning [there was] the traditional hatred of Britons for excise taxes,” followed by stories of outrage and resistance to tax agents empowered to invade home and hearth in search of family stills.\footnote{As seen in the oral histories provided in “Moonshining as a Fine Art,” 302. For more on the politics of the excise see Dabney, \textit{Mountain Spirits} and Hogeland, \textit{The Whiskey Rebellion}.} Thus the expressive culture of the region suggests that the intrusion of the state excise marks a genesis of regional identity. Even

\footnotetext[1447]{Grant Baker.}
\footnotetext[1449]{As seen in the oral histories provided in “Moonshining as a Fine Art,” 302. For more on the politics of the excise see Dabney, \textit{Mountain Spirits} and Hogeland, \textit{The Whiskey Rebellion}.}
today stories of moonshiners serve to transmit and validate the folkloric tradition of distilling as a form of resistance to outside imposition.\footnote{A wealth of popular culture echoes these themes of moonshine lore as seen in local reenactments and tours in Franklin County, Virginia, in songs and paraphernalia, print and even television series like the docudrama “Moonshiners” (Climax, VA: Discovery Channel, 2011-present). See also Charles D. Thompson Jr., \textit{Spirits of Just Men: Mountaineers, Liquor Bosses, and Lawmen in the Moonshine Capital of the World} (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2011), xv.}

While most farmers continued distilling discreetly, the combination of post-Civil War bitterness over expanding federal authority and the temptation of big money--the artificially inflated price on whiskey made possible by the tax -- proved volatile and socially disruptive. Informers were lured in not only by tempting rewards but also by the possibility of eliminating competition, just as revenuers and official found it lucrative to work both sides of the fence. In less common worse case scenarios, wildcat distilleries and “moonshine kings” ruled places such as Chestnut Flats, in Eastern Tennessee, and North Carolina’s Dark Corner, with violence and intimidation, and at times, support of vigilante groups like the Ku Klux Klan, while using their knowledge of the mountain terrain to evade arrest.\footnote{Miller, \textit{Revenuers & Moonshiners}, 46-56.} These dynamics are worth noting, since they would repeat time and again with other prohibitionary policies.
Chapter 11: 
The Architects of a New Industrial Order

Tell me what you eat, and I’ll tell you who you are.
--Jean Anthelme Brillat-Savarin (1825)

What a hunting-ground for local color and the wherewithal for humbug! As each peculiarity exists somewhere in the mountains, humbug feels free to make each particular mountaineer a museum of them all, a ‘type’ so ‘typical’ that his own mountains would scarcely know him.
--Rollin Lynde Hartt (1918)

As the Bureau of Internal Revenue agents ascended the ridges to crack down on illicit distilling, a rapidly expanding array of print culture, born of the growing urban middle class, discovered rural Appalachia. In scholarly studies, popular science, and local-color literature, middle-class representations of rural space characterized, in the words of Lefebvre, a “knowledge (savoir)” that entailed a “mixture of understanding (connaissance) and ideology” that played an important role in defining and transforming rural spaces.\footnote{Lefebvre. Production of Space, 41.}

Within the context of a new chemical age and microbio-politics of the Pasteurian Revolution, media perceptions of the southern mountains merged with a discourse of hygiene and temperance. The result was a deep suspicion of a spectrum of rural foods, especially ferments, ranging from pickles to alcohol enlivened by fears of social decay. Ideologically, middle-class perceptions of the rural evoked the crusading discontent of progressivism in its quest to purify, transform and regulate American society according to its own class-defined aspirations of progress.
Progressive Rural Uplift

On a national scale, the great exodus of the late nineteenth century from the American countryside into swelling, tumultuous cities aroused the concern of urbanites. Complex farm crises associated with the growth of volatile global export markets made possible by locomotive and steamship had also inspired the rise of agrarianism in the form of Granger movements, the Southern Farmers’ Alliance and Populism. These developments, along with the close of the frontier, expansion of farm tenancy, and ballooning consumer prices, in the eyes of American urbanites, pointed to deteriorating rural conditions within their own nation. Some, like Harvard political economist Thomas Nixon Carver, feared immigration had debased native stock and that survival of the American countryside and nation necessitated the revitalization and modernization of agriculture. Others, like horticulturalist Liberty Hyde Bailey produced more environmental and democratic visions of rural renewal. Ultimately, urban concerns about the state of rural America fostered various strains of uplift in form of the extension and 4-H programs of the Country Life Movement, the formation of agricultural experiment stations, the rise of rural sociology, and a breed of urban-agrarian reformers whose interests in all things rural swung between nostalgia and suspicion, the ecological and the eugenic.1453

On the domestic front, the Progressive era focus on social health for many reformers coalesced around sustenance and its relation to chemistry and fermentation as defining the human landscape and thus the body politic. Interest in the invisible world of chemical agents and microbial pathogens and their capacity to alter the human form spun out of the new chemical sciences and nascent germ theory with its focus on human pathogens, and in turn spawned a host of popular expositions to meet the wants of the public on new discoveries. The result was the hygienic movement throughout the western world, defined by Bruno Latour as “an accumulation of advice, precautions, recipes, opinions, statistics, remedies, regulations, anecdotes, [and] case studies”, all of which sought to address the source of contagion in any number of things and places including water, soil, housing, and food.1454

In Britain and France centralized governments monitored and shaped populations as resources and a potential source of political disruption. In contrast, the hygienic movement in the US built on the biopolitics of early nineteenth-century which began, as Kyla Wazana Tompkins argues, as a “collective ideological effort” of cultural reformists rather than a “project of state intervention.”1455 And it was through reform efforts, particularly the efforts of late nineteenth-century Progressives that the state ultimately took up a host of reform efforts for the policing of bodies. Biopolitics, in this sense, speaks of Michel Foucault’s study of “biopower”: a “set of mechanisms through which


1455 Tompkins, Racial Indigestion, 5.
the basic biological features of the human species became the object of a political strategy, of a general strategy of power” in modern Western societies beginning in the eighteenth century. Tompkins details the role of food reformers in the redefinition of architecture, advertisement and other texts as sites of American antebellum biopolitics for dietetic reform bent on managing that vexing “porosity between bodies” associated with eating. Central to her work is Amy Kaplan’s notion of the “paradox of … imperial domesticity” and quest to maintain the fiction of an essential individual self and national identity complete with definitive class and racial boundaries in the face of imperial expansion.

In the early 1800s, the struggle to maintain a gendered, classed and racialized domestic order found form in a middle-class obsession with cleanliness centered on the eradication of dirt, stale air, and bad odors. The call to temperance reflected the broad ambivalence of reformers to sensual indiscretion that might undo class and racial purity. These themes hold true in the later nineteenth and become particularly overdetermined in the face of US expansion, global migration, and the end of slavery. The difference between early and late nineteenth century lay in both this historical moment and evolving scientific vision where the chemical agent and microbe – the invisible microscopic threat spurred a new upsurge of hyper-vigilance.

1456 Foucault, Security, Territory, Population, 1.
1457 Tompkins, Racial Indigestion, 17.
1459 Tompkins, Racial Indigestion, 42.
At the same time, the hygienic movement sought to negotiate, as noted by Latour, the “conflict between health and wealth.” On some level, hygienists recognized illness as a problem of modernity. The production of wealth also produced disease, poverty and wretched hovels. Worse still, deteriorating conditions in city and countryside alike threatened wealth’s production as the lower orders swelled and seethed like a frothy, proliferating contagion. In their attempts to combat disease and save modernity from itself, hygienic activists necessarily expressed marked cultural prejudice in their use of microscopic dynamics (themselves flawed in their sweeping treatment of all bacteria as pathogenic) as a cipher for social relations and relationship between humans and nature.

Mid-century treatises could be nebulous in divining the external cause of disease in the microscopic realm, but nevertheless situated sustenance as one primary locale of scrutiny. The Chemistry of Common Life (1854) by English Chemist Dr. James F. Johnson for instance, explored the organic constitution of “liquors we ferment,” “narcotics we indulge in,” “odours we enjoy,” and “smells we dislike” as products of the deleterious or “sanitary arrangement” of things. For Johnson, order was a function of “the soil we cultivate and plants we rear as the sources from which the chief sustenance of all life is obtained.” While it is true that people develop a physiological as well culture attachment to place, Johnson’s interest was not rooted in ecological webs or the role of food in weaving social fabric, but rather in a form of environmental determinism that

---

1462 Johnson, Chemistry of Common Life, ix.
might be located in the inherent qualities of foods. Notably, this determinism tapped into a unifying thread of the Progressive Movement in its quest for the fundamental reorganization of society as a safeguard against domestic disorder. In the mindset of environmental determinism, Johnson asserted that the nutritive quality of anything consumed was not only a function of its content but also by the internal arrangement of its molecules that were in turn the consequence of climate and natural vegetation. Indeed, Johnson asserted that people took on “a chemical or physiological likeness” of their food, the product of their environment. Thus he claimed, “The Hindoo who lives chiefly on rice, the negro who live on the plantain, the Russian soldier who consumes sour soup, and the Irishman who lives exclusively on the potato, are all described as being more or less pot-bellied” – a “deformity” ascribed to “the necessity of eating a large bulk” of inferior food. He likewise concluded that the addict’s body took on the qualities of plant from which teas, narcotics, and ardent spirits were derived so that its indulgence became “a kind of second nature” that made it difficult to give up. Indeed, the influence of place and its food determined the qualities of a nation’s people, separating the “excitable” Irish from the sober English. The reputed sobriety of England differentiated it from the intemperance of the Scots and, worse still, the Irish; for, while light beer nourished the Englishman, liquors proved poisonous to the northern country in the manner liquor squandered grain, as Johnson notes: “All that the distiller’s fermented wort contains,

1463 Johnson, Chemistry of Common Life, 87.
1464 Johnson, Chemistry of Common Life, 139.
except alcohol, remains behind in the still, and is lost as food for man.”Thus, Johnson concludes that “It is probable that the quality and quantity of the national food has a material influence upon national temperament,” and, by association, its geopolitical ranking.

Johnson’s *The Chemistry of Common Life* was well received in the US and reverberated in the works of others like Richard A. Proctor, an English astronomer by trade, who made money on the side writing for popular magazines in addition to scholarly periodicals. Proctor’s “The Influence of Food on Civilization” (1882) claimed that the differences between classes and races lay in alimentation. Specifically, the condition of any “one set of men” was rooted in their dependence on agriculture and pasture—methods of food acquisition that were bound by “law and order” and the lawlessness of men reflected “… the absence of law and order in the workings of nature.” National progress required nature be “made the servant of man” and national stability, growth or conversely, decay, rested on food categorized according to its nutritive ranking. In light of this, Proctor recommended the production of wheat and beef as the most nutritive foods. Likewise, both Proctor’s “The Influence of Food on Civilization” and his “A Remedy for Poverty” printed in *The Cosmopolitan* (1887), suggested that if Americans wanted a work force that could offer sustained and steady growth.

---


labor, philanthropy must counter the cheap and pleasurable foods the working class
relished. Couched as the equivalent of a predictable natural law that could be measured as
the astronomer or naturalist measured the growth of world with dust and minute changes
over time in layers of soil, so too the scientist could track social change in the forces of
food in determining the fortunes of the classes.  

Similar assumptions emerged with microbiology, but this time with added
emphasis on fermentation. Modern microbiology itself expanded with two pressing
problems: the need to understand contagious disease and the need to comprehend
fermentation and putrefaction in providing an expanding urban population with sufficient
food. Initially attributed to chemical process, fermentation and putrefaction became the
province of microbiology through the cumulative investigations of Franz Schultz,
Theodor Schwann, H. Schroder and T. von Dusch in the early 1800s. These scientists
linked fermentation and putrefaction to microscopic organisms, but it was Louis Pasteur
who, in the early 1860s, concluded that putrefaction was a form of fermentation and that
the microbes responsible for fermentation, broadly speaking, were ubiquitous in the
environment.  

Over simplifications of Pasteur’s discoveries in popular science and literature,
however, equated fermentation with putrefaction. Pasteur was partly to blame in the
manner he wed science to industrial needs, recruited disciples and allies in industry,
cultured bacteria in controlled settings to make it appear particularly virulent, and

---

fostered the mystique of the laboratory as the site for battling invisible armies of microbes.\textsuperscript{1471} What Pasteur offered was a route to the mass production and standardization of food through sterilization that could be applied to everything from dairy to wine.

Hygienists disseminated Pasteurian truths by mixing and matching earlier ruminations on the chemistry of food with Pasteurian generalizations to produce a pathogenic terrain of food that encompassed ferments and the provisions of foreign, poor, and marginalized peoples. In the US, food hygienist expressed marked concern regarding all forms of fermented food and drink. James Henry Salisbury’s \textit{The Relation of Alimentation and Disease} (1888), offers a superb example of this trend. A New York chemist and physician and author, Salisbury’s magnum opus, the sum of thirty years of research with the Chemical Laboratory of the New York State Geological Survey, connected demographics with middle-class reform culture and nascent germ theory. Armed with the recent discoveries of Pasteur, Salisbury surmised that all human disease resulted from improper “alimentation.” Specifically, Salisbury blamed foods inclined towards fermentation such as vegetables, fruits and sweets, as well as the products of fermentation, for human degradation and disease. In Salisbury’s mind, diseases like consumption (tuberculosis) were symptomatic of families “in the habit of living too exclusively upon the fermentable foods” which in the course of generations cause the “organization of the body and mind” so as to “render the system easily liable to take on

\textsuperscript{1471} Latour, \textit{The Pasteurization of France}, 71-73.
the disease.”¹⁴⁷² Thus disease became an “heirloom in families” consequence of feeding “out of the same trough.”¹⁴⁷³

Salisbury’s results were obviously influenced by potpourri of ideas regarding the inherent value of staple foods dating to the early nineteenth century as well as the geopolitics of his time. As Tompkins notes, the mass production of wheat with the purchase and conquest of the Great Plains situated wheat as a metaphoric staple of American progress and civilization.¹⁴⁷⁴ Likewise, antebellum food reformers had long targeted stimulating foods they associated with racialized others. The broader realm of geopolitics of Salisbury’s time involved a fascination with tuberculosis (a disease prominent in the non-western world and among poor Anglo-Americans), “malarious regions” and assumed superior health of the British in their capacity to conquer a global empire, all of which suggested to Salisbury that the British military diet, which largely consisted of boiled and canned “bully beef,” was the most salubrious. Likewise, Salisbury claimed that wheat, the staple of the western world, was superior to cornmeal and that corn should not be eaten; neither should beans, pickles, preserves, alcohol nor vinegar, though leaven wheat bread as a staple of western civilization was exempted from this rule.

To frame the shift in dietetics another way, we can view Salisbury’s prescriptions as for the banishment of ferments as a call to eliminate not only live culture foods from

---


¹⁴⁷⁴ Tompkins, Racial Indigestion, 4.
the modern diet but also living culture-- as in the active and unpredictable-- from the body of the imperial nation. The fact that Salisbury paired his assault on ferments as part of an exposition on domesticating empire reveals on-going fears of contagion by the subjects of the expanding nation and the sense that the British diet disclosed the key to the management of a the imperial body and global power.

Theoretically, Salisbury’s work was complemented by the work of self-taught nutritionalist, entrepreneur, and American author Horace Fletcher, whose most influential work was titled The New Glutton or Epicure (1906). In writing and his lecturing circuit that spanned the western world, Fletcher called for social regeneration through a new “dietetic economy.” In Fletcher’s mind, one could not separate the “hygienically unwise” function of tradition and hospitality with what he viewed as central problem of social decay: the gluttonous consumption of large quantities of food and drink by American. According to Fletcher, society was in need of thrift, but the “old corpse of tradition” had “constipated” the social body, resulting in widespread disease and its outgrowth, crime. As a remedy, Fletcher recommended a new dietary regime that would train the stomach, society’s digestive workhorse, to be inclined to efficient and “profitable” eating. This would be accomplished through what he called “menticulture” or “mentinutrition”: nutritional reform through extensive and compulsive chewing. Hence Fletcher’s handle: the “Great Masticator.”
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1475 Horace Fletcher, The New Glutton or Epicure (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1906), v and viii.
1476 Fletcher, The New Glutton, xi.
1477 Fletcher, The New Glutton, x, 5.
For Fletcher, the action of bacteria and ferment in the dark, interior recesses of the human form, resulted in unforgivable sin of waste. Insufficiently reduced food formed clogs and blockages that, instead of fueling the “furnace” of the “Mind Power-Plant,” fermented in a manner that slowed the body and sullied the gut.\textsuperscript{1478} In contrast, food thoroughly “masticated” and “insalivated” could increase food economy and produce interior and exterior purity, while the workout of chewing ensured that the body “earned” its appetite.\textsuperscript{1479} Thorough mastication could thus “save an undue waste of food” and ensure the “human weal.”\textsuperscript{1480} In this thinly veiled metaphor for modern society, body and food take on the trappings of the factory, fuel and labor, while waste is defined by a narrow vision of productivity that served the socio-political nerve center. As a sidewise response to the question of labor in industrial America, Fletcher endorsed social stability through a reduced and insipid foodscape.

Aside from the workings of the mouth, Fletcher was equally fascinated with the other end of things, specifically the product of the rectum. He surmised that a temperate diet should produce inoffensive human waste and that one’s “tell-tale excreta” served as an indicator of “right or faulty feeding.”\textsuperscript{1481} For Fletcher, an odor-free and significantly reduced discharge that was as inoffensive as a “hot biscuit” fresh from the oven, revealed that with sufficient reduction by chewing, the digestive tract need not resort to bacterial

\textsuperscript{1478} Fletcher, \textit{The New Glutton}, 154.
\textsuperscript{1479} Fletcher, \textit{The New Glutton}, 7.
\textsuperscript{1480} Fletcher, \textit{The New Glutton}, 73, 75.
\textsuperscript{1481} Fletcher, \textit{The New Glutton}, vi.
decomposition in extracting the vital qualities of food.\textsuperscript{1482} Indeed, the mechanics of the body put to its full potential could effectively eliminate the need for organic internal processing. Going in and coming out, properly assimilated food in Fletcher’s worldview involved no fermentation. And we might suspect, so too might modern society function under more centralized (as compared to messy and organic democratic) control.

On the topic of food processing and production, Fletcher argued that his mechanized vision outlined the path of progress for man, the “Cultivator.” As co-creator of Mother Nature, mankind had the opportunity to surpass both fractious contention and loathsome decay in a revolution of eating. In the foodscape of his time, Fletcher juxtaposed two types of diet: the “traditional” and the “temperate.” In replacing traditional fare with a “temperate diet,” he concluded that alcohol should not be drunk though it could be sniffed or sipped in the manner of a wine taster.\textsuperscript{1483} Beyond that, Fletcher assigned taste as a gatekeeper in differentiating temperate and intemperate foods. Taste, according to Fletcher, served as a “faithful servant of appetite” for those who understood its workings.\textsuperscript{1484} While savory foods might inspire gluttonous gulping, an extended spell of chewing aided the eater in developing the fine art of self-control and food discrimination. In the process, the consumer could play the gourmand or epicurean but ultimately, according to Fletcher’s logic of mastication, any food or drink that could not be reduced to a tasteless fluid by extensive chewing was deemed not fit to swallow.

\textsuperscript{1482} Fletcher, \textit{The New Glutton}, ix, 3, 145.
\textsuperscript{1483} Fletcher, \textit{The New Glutton}, 185-186.
\textsuperscript{1484} Fletcher, \textit{The New Glutton}, 152.
Indeed, the completion of this “process of dissolution” signaled when food could go down without clogging the system or encouraging microbial growth. Moreover, in espousing the idea that good food properly chewed should “swallow itself,” Fletcher provides us with an image of the perfect imperial subject as one that goes down willingly. People posited as analogous to food absorbed by the body politic must be assimilable, malleable and unresisting of incorporation and, in fact, participants in the process. Above all, they should not agitate or ferment. Those that would not abide this process would be chewed up and spat out. This is arguably the ultimate expression of biopolitics.

In response to such treatises, advertisers, journalists, industrial exhibitions and middle-class educators of “domestic science” across North America drove the notion that national development required a new, modern and scientifically defined “hygienic” cooking. Journalists found in Johnson, Proctor, Salisbury, Fletcher and similar theorists, answers for social problems that “made sense” in terms of a prevailing ideology of segregation that defined class, race and human interaction with the larger natural world. As revealed in colonial relations, poor diets made for either inferior easily conquered peoples or a volatile “surplus” of laborers that proliferated, like germs, in the wrong environment. Likewise, newspaper journalists assumed traditional and working-class cooking was by nature less nutritious than more “scientific” fare and that traditional
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1486 Fletcher, *The New Glutton*, 76.

comestibles resulted in the “devitalization” of workers, while the concentrated flavors typical of fermented foods were assumed to foster fierce passions associated with socialist “ferment.” The source of ingredients was equally important in eliminating the evil influences of a poorly laid table on all Americans. Proper “hygienic shopkeeping” meant frequenting modern stores with their array of reliable brands, rather than unbranded foodstuffs in open-air shops. The modern storefront could boast the sanitary benefits of refrigeration, a technology that emerged initially in commercial sector at midcentury in Chicago’s slaughter yards. By 1900, commercial refrigeration in transportation and general stores was commonplace. Home refrigeration followed in the 1920s with patented synthetic chemical chlorofluorocarbon refrigerants such as Freon a DuPont trademark. Advertisers for this burgeoning landscape of commoditized foods, quick to employ sanitation in courting receptive middle class consumers, cast each new appliance and products as hygienic. This included General Motors’ refrigerators and modern iron stoves (well-established in middle-class domestic spaces by the Civil War) as the key to truly sanitary food, and for the most progressive, new “electric” stoves

1490 Sheppard, Pickled, Potted & Canned, 301.
showcased at the Chicago World Fair in 1893.\textsuperscript{1491} Even beef, made more available with the expanding beef industry, was lauded as hygienic and medicinal.\textsuperscript{1492}

Contradictions within the discourse of hygiene raised questions. Some queried the hygienic quality of leavened wheat bread and looked to journalism and industry for solutions to this quandary. Southern Cultivator affirmed that fermentation was both difficult to manage and as a “destructive process,” eliminated the sweet and nutritive qualities of wheat. This magazine offered two alternatives: the production of light bread dough by repeated pounding, or through the inclusion of cream of tartar or baking soda.\textsuperscript{1493} Cyrus Eson, writing for the Congregationalist, insinuated that not only was the warm, moist interior of bread the perfect breeding ground for “fermentation germs,” the process of fermentation and kneading could equally convey the “cutaneous [sic] diseases” of the “naked hands” of their bakers. Like Eson, he recommended forcing air into the dough mechanically by beating it for an extended period, or using a quality baking powder or cream of tartar and soda with an obvious plug for Royal Baking Powder.\textsuperscript{1494} And, for those who did not want to part with leaven bread, the Fleischmann brothers offered up commercial yeast cakes at 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition.


\textsuperscript{1492} For example, see Robert Sagiovanni, “Roast Beef as Cure for Deadly Consumption,” North Montana Review, April 25, 1903.

\textsuperscript{1493} “Rural Hygiene,” Southern Cultivator 19, no. 3 (1861), 81-82.

In the years that followed, the brothers successfully divorced their product from all fungal associations by selling it as a “tiny plant” that was “pure,” “fresh,” and “wholesome.”

Cookbooks spinning out of modern print culture were peppered with these ideas and advertisements. Their authors often went to great lengths to define their books as “scientific” and “hygienic” treatises that would assist the housewife in capturing the power of modern cooking—a power described as “mightier” than the ballot-box in protecting the home and building society. In referencing the publication of chemists and physicians as food experts, cookbooks also disseminated and contributed to a form of hygienic food faddism that expressed some remarkably sweeping generalizations about the potential dangers of all things fermented. For instance, Mattie M. Jones’ The Hygienic Cook-book (1881) surmised that the “starting point of intemperance” could be found “in stimulating or gross foods and drink at a fond mother’s table.” Pickles, relishes, sourdough, preserves, spices, tea and coffee, asserted Jones, were to blame for generating the “perverted” cravings of the “drunkard” for a “stronger stimulus.” Jones, in referencing Dr. James F. Johnson and other so-called experts, deemed fermented foods as particularly deleterious in that they shared the same “bad material” found in the seductive quality of the distiller’s wort. And, just as bacteria could “sour” food, so Jones concluded that fermented foods could sour people, proliferate disease and foster addiction. In this albeit problematic strain of thinking, Jones cast pickles, sourdough and the like as

1495 Mary Ellen Snodgrass, Encyclopedia of Kitchen History (New York: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2004), 1066; For an example of a Fleischmann advertisement see the Milwaukee Sentinel, Apr 15, 1928, 40.
1496 As seen in Maud C. Cooke’s The Twentieth Century Cook Book (The Educational Co, 1912), 5.
1497 Mattie M. Jones, The Hygienic Cook-Book (New York: M.L. Holbrook Publisher, 1881), iii-iv, 5, 18. As a note, the curing process of coffee beans, tea, and some spices entails fermentation.
essentially a gateway drug for alcohol and ultimately, social unrest. This conflation of biological and social ferments as the assumed source of the abnormal conditions of the physical body and body politic, anthropomorphized microbial agents as having the countenance of German and Russian urban immigrant socialists, and vice versa.

When it came to the rural sector, Jones reiterated notions that farmers were at fault for many social problems. Jones accused farmers of laziness and failing to provide markets with an abundance of fresh fruit; and, in addressing farm women, Jones specified processes of sterilization such as canning or drying as the only hygienic methods of preserving fruits and vegetables.\(^ {1498} \) As an alternative preservation method to traditional preserved foods, canning first emerged in early nineteenth-century France amidst the political ferment of urban famine, food riots and demand for sufficient rations for an expanding military, especially the ever-expanding French, Dutch and British navies that spent extended periods of time at sea and in a wide variety of climates. Initially a novelty, canned foods were primarily the mainstay of English and French armed forces as well as Union and Confederate troops, not the general population. It took half a century for the public—the urban working class and rural farmers alike, to warm up to canned food, in part because it was expensive but also because canned goods had the reputation of being overcooked, flavorless, and potentially dangerous—a reality the advertizing industry tried to counter with every turn. In truth, eating canned foods was a gamble. Cumbersome and

imperfect canning methods often resulted in deadly cases of food poisoning by botulism, a problem that was rare among traditional preserves.¹⁴⁹⁹

One side note is in order: Historically, improperly cured meat made sausage and smoked hams the main culprit of poisoning by the Clostridium botulinum neurotoxin—a problem that was prevented by the curer’s intimate knowledge of salting and drying and in the seeding new sausage with friendly cultures from the old. But with widespread commercial and home canning in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, canned food became the primary source of “botulus” or “sausage” poisoning.¹⁵⁰⁰ Indeed, an improperly sealed tin or jar, or one insufficiently heated, provided the perfect air-free liquid incubator, void of all other bacterial competitors for heat resistant C. botulinum.

Regardless, the consumption of canned goods expanded rapidly in the US after the Civil War with training in home economics, the invention of the glass mason jar in 1858, and can-openers for tins in 1870, and the expansion of railways that could deliver jars to rural America and tin cans to urban centers and factory towns. As such, canning was also one of the greatest boons for factory-made food. For the consumer, the appeal of canned food lay in its ability to keep food “fresh” for out-of-season consumption. Preservation had always entailed extending food and, thus, human life. But canning liberated both producers and consumers from locally and seasonally defined limits; granting the urbanite “a regular Arabian Nights garden, where raspberries, apricots, olives, and pineapples, always ripe, grow side by side with peas, pumpkins, and

spinach…”\cite{Sheppard2002} And, despite its checkered reputation, the concept behind canning made it the ultimate hygienic preservation method. Milk pasteurization could eliminate bacteria from dairy for a time before spoilage and chemical additives could replace microbes in bread-making, but canning (at least theoretically) through total sterilization had the capacity to store food in a state of indefinite suspended animation. Fermentation, now associated with decay, became the enemy and canning the weapon of choice against it. As expressed in newsprint, canning had the potential to “defeat entirely the march of fermentation.”\cite{FieldingStar1899} By killing all the “germs of fermentation,” canning made preservation efforts limitless.\cite{FieldingStar1899} Canned food could be tucked away for years or shipped all over the globe because canning had the ability to put a stopper on death, decay and perishability. Once refined it had the potential to provide inexpensive and transportable foodstuff to not only soldiers but also the urban working class. As with other industrial food products canned foods were advertized as capable of preserving the “hygienic properties of food,” making for wholesome, nutritious and scientific fare in comparison to foods preserved with traditional methods.\cite{FieldingStar1899}

To diffuse sanitary knowledge, reformers created educational space in the form of exhibitions, educational institutions, and model modern kitchens. Internationally, the


\cite{FieldingStar1899} Many advertisements and articles carried the phrase “killing the germ of fermentation” or something similar. For an examples, see “How to Preserve and Can Fruit,” \textit{The Pittsburgh Press}, July 6, 1901, 18; “Secrets of Success in Canning Fruits,” \textit{The Neppel Record}, July 31, 1914, 1; “Perfect Sterilization a Perfect Seal,” \textit{The Milwaukee Journal}, June 12, 1922, 5; and even “Canning Fruit,” \textit{Sydney Mail}, Nov. 27, 1880. ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

National Museum of Hygiene opened in London in 1871 followed by the 1883 Berlin Hygienic Exhibition, and a London exhibition in 1884. Drawing attention from American visitors and medical personnel, the Berlin exhibition offered a food exhibit that featured an array of appliances, a photographed “army of bottle-fed babies,” displays of food preservation by desiccation and canning, as well as model kitchens and a pathology section that included a section on the study of the effects of fermenting on “the souring of milk and moulding of foods.” Two years later the Pharmacy Fair held in the Mechanics Association Hall in Boston offered free lectures and dietary talks for the general public and specifically for schooling women as to their domestic obligations in creating hygienic homes and hygienic food. Older health oriented institutions like Michigan’s Battle Creek Sanitarium offered lessons in the new landscape of hygienic food, often with their own unique insights on health food. Regular educational programs were also offered, as of the mid-1890s, at the famous Boston Cooking School which opened classes in hygienic cooking to students at surrounding institutions. All of these efforts pointed to the goal of promoting a modern kitchen in every home—a space dedicated to food production that was also “a refinery, a laboratory and a disinfection station and a factory.” Replicated in households across America, the foodscape of


modernity would be industrial, mechanized and sterile, a progressive improvement of what it was replacing.

When it came to the continuation of localized and fermented foodways, disdain for the product became disdain for the producer. By definition, that which made urbanites modern was also what made many farmers backward degenerates. With the understanding that contagion proliferated in certain environments, so too hygienists imagined criminals, paupers, and socialists proliferating with improper sustenance, surroundings, and conditions. It took only a short leap in logic for people to equate the production and consumption of ferments with the dangerous and disorderly elements the middle class feared. This precept cast rural space as a danger to modern society.

Early rural sociology reinforced such notions. Richard L. Dugdale’s *The Jukes: A Study in Crime, Pauperism, Disease and Heredity* (1877), the product of New York Executive Committee of the Prison Association statistics and penology, located the spatial genesis or “cradle of crime” in specific corners of rural America where log and stone “hovels,” hard drinking, and “intermittent” or seasonal labor produced hereditary inclinations towards feeblemindedness, pauperism, and “crimes against property.” Similarly Henry H. Goddard’s *The Kallikak Family: A Study in the Heredity of Feeble-Mindedness* (1912) claimed that rural drinking and living habits ultimately led to mental ineptitude. Goddard’s home institution, the Vineland Training School, an asylum founded in the famed Vineland Temperance Colony, stands out as a ground-breaking research
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institution for the promotion of eugenics. Goddard pulled his subjects from remaining pockets of New England’s “hill” people. In working with the New Jersey Department of Research laboratory for the study of feeble-mindedness, Goddard derived his research from institutionalized children and reports of domestic agents sent into regional homes. His conclusions echoed Dugdale— that hereditary feeblemindedness of both rural and urban zones, could be traced to “bad stock” in an ancestral “mountain hut,” and familial degeneracy consequence of “an appetite for strong drink” cultivated in its rural origins where “such practices were common.”

As for reform, for Dugdale opined that rural conditions including isolation and lack of personal privacy necessitated “organizing the environment” for proper industrial and domestic life, training in the use of sewing machines and the setting of a proper table, and the need for such training in the penal system, and for employers and reformers capable of correcting the environment so as to produce the proper hereditary habits, including “desire for a well-ordered home.”

Goddard offered similar recommendations after surmising that the “unmolested” rural family, left to its own accord, would not “improve” and ultimately would “propagate … and fill the world with degenerates.” Given this, Goddard found promise in the transfer of so-called feebleminded children into good homes and training schools, and of

\footnotesize


land to “good English blood of the middle class” in the manner indigenous Americans were subjected to boarding schools and relocation.¹⁵¹³

The Birth of the Hillbilly

While the manner by which literature broadly targeted a (and often immigrant) “peasant” stock that might live in any number of locations throughout the United States including its cities, the image of the backward farmer coalesced most notably in the Appalachian hillbilly stereotype, a definitive product of local-color literature. The primary medium of this genre encompassed many new middle-class magazines, but especially *Harper’s New Monthly*, whose owner J. Henry Harper, found a market in magazines by “telling their middle-class audience what it wished to hear: that it was the center of the universe and the true bearer of American culture.”¹⁵¹⁴ As scholars have noted, writers seeking local color --corners of America that stood in contrast to their vision of a homogenous nation-- defined Appalachian culture as a world apart.¹⁵¹⁵ By the late nineteenth century subsistence economies were much reduced nationwide, and the southern mountains harbored one of the last intact examples. Cast as a space that was “remote” yet within the nation, Appalachia was constructed as a stage on which writers
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explored what they viewed as a growing and impassable gulf of modern civilization and lingering “primitive” peoples as examples of the deterioration of country life.\textsuperscript{1516}

Local-color literature contained broad cultural critiques of Appalachian society with two prominent features of primary interest for this dissertation project: the definition and criticisms of Appalachia as a place and the wide-spread middle-class obsession with the region’s food and drink as markers of a failed production system. Scholars have frequently noted the local-color fascination with place as an outgrowth of Civil War journalism in its catering to a demand for vivid reporting on places and events, and the colorist critiques of mountain fare as a strange example of the extent of the cultural criticism that can be found in this genre.\textsuperscript{1517} In reality, the middle class being a class of consumers, local-color writers catered to class-based obsession with patterns of consumption as related to what they viewed as a backward or seriously flawed society. While a comprehensive overview of local-color literature is not necessary, a few choice examples from some widely read authors is helpful in understanding how this class-defined literature shaped perceptions of Appalachian otherness using references to food and drink as embodiments of place and people, a reflection of mountain life as an anomaly within the modern nation.

One common theme of local color involved anarchic and racialized visions of the incestuous mixing of people and things in space, cued by food and drink and its location. For example, Rebecca Harding Davis, writing for \textit{Harper’s New Monthly} magazine used

\textsuperscript{1516} Shapiro, \textit{Appalachia on Our Mind}, 28-29.

sustenance to link her vision of human degradation to the mountain environment. Davis’ literary career focused largely on the impact of industrialization on laborers, but trends in social uplift of the post-war South and tourism also drew her into the mountains and it is through these lenses that she composed her essay, “By-Paths in the Mountains” (1880). The story traces the path of two New Yorkers who enter the mountains to study nature, bask in picturesque scenery and ponder the state of the hill farmer. As they proceed to a warm spring resort they bear witness to the transgression of humanity from quaint young maids decorating pickle jars and young men who come a-courting with legs of mutton instead of flower bouquets, to the dwellers of the darkest peaks, the “half-savage bear hunters and moonshiners.”

Davis contends that throughout the region, people were “educated by the mountains,” the consequence being a physical and human landscape characterized by a sort of “wild confusion”—a place of wild flowers and dark pines and towering trees; fine for the visiting tourist but not for living. The results were a promiscuous mixture of people that, at times burst forth, as if from the very trees, “rushing wildly from the woods—young men and women, children and a baby, a thin, grey-haired man, and a horde of laughing, shouting blacks.” Likewise, farming could be picturesque, but also seemed too intimate with nature, resulting in unfinished “half-tilled patches” and a kind but homely people marked by “ignorance and ugliness and solitude” on the mountains, standing “alone in the sky,” set apart from the nation, “above
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1519 Davis, “By-Paths in the Mountains”, 364.

1520 Davis, “By-Paths in the Mountains”, 362.
it [all], in pure ether,” the “birth-place of color.”\textsuperscript{1521} Mountains, like fens and forests, as “wasteland” had long served as the “absolute Other, of civilization.”\textsuperscript{1522} And in this instance, color signified otherness amidst whiteness. In addition, this otherworldliness stemmed from an unsanitary mixing of people and things:

There the family life of the mountaineers goes on the year round, open to wind and weather; there hang the guns, harness, hams, and apples and onions; there is the spinning wheel, and the loom, built out of huge timbers, on which the butternut clothes which the men wear are woven; there the men and women, with their finely moulded Huguenot faces, sit smoking corn-cob pipes in dirt, poverty, and good-humored content inconceivable to Northerners.\textsuperscript{1523}

As evident in this quote, Davis did not limit racial associations to a strict black-white dichotomy, but rather played upon the narrow white Anglo-Saxon Protestant conceptualization of whiteness of her time, which found the amalgamation of mountain peoples particularly baffling. Additionally, by design Davis utilized middle-class assumptions regarding space and anxieties that arise from an inability to locate the touchstones of modern, urban culture - namely, separate sites of domesticity and production. Proper sanitation, in the urban sense, entailed a compartmentalization of people, things, and activities. The open design of the mountain home and its productive functions stood in stark contrast to the middle-class home, designed to enhance privacy and to shelter the familial from all forms of contamination. Food—the pickle jars, the mutton leg, the hams and onions - stand as markers for a progressive rupturing of space – the “germ of fermentation” in its literal and social sense, at work in this environment and

\textsuperscript{1521} Davis, “By-Paths in the Mountains”, 355-356, 365.

\textsuperscript{1522} Di Palma, \textit{Wasteland}, 4.

\textsuperscript{1523} Davis, “By-Paths in the Mountains,” 363.
to its discredit. Indeed, the line between quaint and savage farm life was thin--measured in a continuum of ferments that shifted with higher elevation. The further up the mountain one travelled, the more the “snug farm-house” became, in Davis’ words, a “log hut” or “shed” with “walls gaped open.”1524 All semblance of domesticity disappears with complete exposure on the lonely peaks inhabited by “bear-hunters and moonshiners,” and what remained of the Cherokee. Here resided whiskey, at the end of all things where all semblance of order vanished, where the farmer had gone native.

Similarly, Massachusetts-born, New York journalist Charles Dudley Warner, also an acclaimed essayist for the Atlantic Monthly and Harpers, found in food a convenient way to convey, in coded fashion, the languishing condition of mountain life. Warner’s Atlantic Monthly piece titled “On Horseback: A Tour in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee” (1885) related the course of two reformers -- “the Professor” and Warner, in the narrative voice, as the “Friend of Humanity,” on a tour of the mountainous region to survey the state of the mountain farmer and promising mineral deposits.

“On Horseback” begins with a honeymoon period as the travelers take in the pleasant valleys and settlements while relying on the hospitality of scattered farms for their daily bread. Their first culinary encounter was an “abundant” dinner served, no less, by a barefoot and comely young farmer’s daughter. Thus their adventure began with homage to the simple Arcadian life and its “freedom and primitive luxury.”1525 In short time, however, the travelers grew weary of mountain fare--the corn pone, salted pork,

1524 Davis, “By-Paths in the Mountains,” 533.

pickled rootstock and buttermilk, with each gastronomical encounter described as
displaying the same incongruous frontier qualities of the landscape—monotony served up
in profusion. For want of variety in this “wilderness of corn-pone and rusty bacon,” the
characters long for the provisions of civilization: beef-steak, ice, and wheat bread.
Moreover, the travelers concluded that such impoverished food must drive people to
“long for the maddening bowl.”\textsuperscript{1526} And to this Warner attributed the region’s reputation
for lawlessness, illicit whiskey, and “wild orgies,” though his characters encountered
nothing to substantiate such claims aside from the rough and tumble boom-town
conditions around the occasional mica mine.\textsuperscript{1527}

Warner’s “Comments on Kentucky” (1889), went on to paint existing subsistence
communities as a relic of colonial and revolutionary America that had decayed into a
society of backward gender dynamics where young men grew up rough and “liked to
lounge about with shot-guns rather than work” and where young women would “work
like galley-slaves… fade, lose their teeth, become ugly, and look old.”\textsuperscript{1528} This image is
juxtaposed with several pages of industrial boosterism in which he describes the eastern
quarter of the state as mountains stuffed with coal, iron ore and timber like a gift package
that had captured the imagination of travelers, speculators, corporations and capitalists in
a “race for the prize.”\textsuperscript{1529} As for the “primitive” and “illiterate” mountain inhabitants,
Warner upheld loose claims that the region was inhabited by “vicious men” and counties like Harlan-- the sites of the best coking coal - he cast as plagued with lawlessness that could only be remedied by industrial reform. Warner ponders the source of reputed regional violence as rooted in either an influx of bushwackers during the Civil War, or conversely, the lack of proper nourishment on the basis that “good wholesome cooking is unknown and civilization is not possible without that.” From what he portrayed as a physically haggard population and their assumed drunken and murderous ways, Warner concludes in the fashion of the hygienists of his time, “I have no doubt that the abominable cookery of the region has much to do with the lawlessness.” In this way, Warner’s depictions of mountain, true to trends in local-color literature increasingly took on the qualities of a genre that that was informed by the broader assault on farming populations and their production systems via their misrepresented and maligned patterns of subsistence.

Borrowing from other local color writers and especially from Warner with whom he worked at Harper’s, James Lane Allen, went to even greater lengths in depicting mountain fare and thus farmers, as an extension of a deviant topography. Allen’s “Mountain Passes of the Cumberland” (1890) is particularly striking in its concept of national history, perception of space and promise of transformation of space for “stunted” mountain people. Allen describes the mountains as a “natural fortress line” that consisted of the “immense, bony, grisly mass of the Cumberland Mountain.” Like the land, the inhabitants of the region were described as a tough “thin, half-starved, [and] weary,
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toiling line of pioneer civilizers,” which Allen envisioned as a line of ants that happened to make its way over the castle wall. Their passion was for self-government, but, Allen argued, in their lopsided development towards “pasturage and agriculture, whiskey, hemp, tobacco, and fine stock,” these frontiersmen ultimately produced a backward race of shiftless mountaineers. Thus the qualities of revolution; namely, democratic fervor and an agrarian livelihood that linked land to independence, in the absence of industry were imagined to produce, in time, a criminal race. In voicing this, Allen exemplified industry’s center in a modern, urban national identity.

One of the most conspicuous images of “Mountain Passes” casts Allen himself as an omnipresent narrator standing at the edge of these mountains surveying the landscape before him. From this position Allen describes “two distinct geological formations”: the vast coal fields of Appalachia, and to the south, land rich in iron ore.\footnote{James Lane Allen, “Mountain Passes of the Cumberland,” \textit{Harper's New Monthly Magazine} 81 (Sept. 1890), 563-564.} Here was the making of the industrial empire of the US, a future that was already in the make thanks to northern capital. Without industry, this space and the cornbread it produced could only beget a hardened people with a passion for liquor and homicide. But industry would convert “The passion for homicide… into a passion for land speculation.”\footnote{Allen, “Mountain Passes,” 566.}

Most importantly, Allen couched industry as the producer of social and personal health that mountain inhabitants needed and wanted. This understanding of industry took symbolic form in a man in an ox-drawn wagon, plying his way up the Cumberland Gap, a space that Allen characterized as “the epitome of past and present tendencies”—a passage
that bridged past, present and future, from yeoman Jeffersonianism to extractive capital. “Kindled into an expression of passionate hunger and mental excitement,” Allen described the man as grasping “with a dirty claw-like hand” at the unknown contents of a paper sack containing “some sweetmeat of civilization which he was about for the first time to taste.” Thus food becomes a metaphor for all that industry had to offer the “starved mountain child.”

Allen suggested that all the assumed negative attributes of mountain society from the inedible food to the whiskey it produced, and all associated antisocial behaviors, would be swept away with mining and manufacturing towns and their bounty: milk, butter, eggs, fresh fruit and vegetables (which we are to assume mountain people lacked) and beef—the meat of civilization. All of this allowed Allen to believe the purchase of mountain lands by speculators positively affected Kentucky highlanders who were summarily forced to descend from their mountain fortress.

In addition to these noteworthy journalists, one of the most celebrated New York reporters, best-selling author of the region, John Fox, Jr. took Allen’s contributions to local-color literature to the level of the novel, which perpetuated mountain stereotypes even as it fostered romanticized images of the mountaineer and the pristine Appalachian landscape. Fox’s work, from his original articles with Harper’s to his many novels, included casts of gallant but old-fashioned mountaineers, charming in their sense of
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political duty and rugged independence, set inevitably against a backdrop of violent feuds, poverty, and hard drinking--a society that had deteriorated in time from its colonial origins.

Indeed, all of Foxes stories set at odds what Fox referred to as the two “extremes of civilizations”—the mountain “relics of mediæval days” against bluegrass civilization that had “rebuked barbarism.” Themes often play on the inability of mountain people and flatlanders to comprehend one another over a chasm of cultural differences. Borrowing from Allen’s vision of Kentucky, Fox’s bluegrass characters have mountain ancestors and represent the potential of the mountaineer when removed from the hills.\footnote{1536}

Fox, as part of the naturalist movement saw environment as the primary shaper of humanity. From his perspective, Kentucky was a land of “contrasting soils, social sections, and divisions of vegetation on which the devil was said to have slyly put a thumb of reservation when he offered the earth to his great Conqueror.”\footnote{1537} In his isolation the mountain man had lost out: “His mountains had swallowed him, as they swallow everything that passes their blue summits.”\footnote{1538}

Fox’s stories often center on love triangles where a man from the mountains and more refined flatlanders competed for the love of an angelic female character, a metaphor for forces competing in and for domestic America. In the end, the mountain man cannot win. His is a tragic and fated tale: “…the mountaineer’s strange predicament: his duty lay


\footnote{1537} Fox, Jr. “The Kentuckians,” 251-252.
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where he was; and if he could shake himself free, what then? The instincts that go with
birth, the traits of character that grow with the training of childhood, the graces and
culture that come with later associations, could never be his.”

Such romances conveyed the notion that America had moved on from its crude colonial roots, like a fine
young woman of the Bluegrass aristocracy.

In Fox’s writings, food and drink was not only symptomatic of mountain poverty
but also stifling conditions for women. Women, once removed from the mountains could
never again be happy with mountain life. This is perhaps best seen in the character of
June from *The Trail of the Lonesome Pine* (1908). After being carried away to school
where she was educated in finer things, June found herself discontent with life in the
mountains during a return visit:

The fire scorched her face, that had grown unaccustomed to such heat, and she
burned one hand, but she did not let her step-mother see even that. Again she
noticed with aversion the heavy thick dishes and the pewter spoons and the
candle-grease on the oil-cloth, and she put the dishes down and, while the old
woman was out of the room, attacked the spots viciously. Again she saw her
father and Bub ravenously gobbling their coarse food while she and her step-
mother served and waited, and she began to wonder. The women sat at the table
with the men over in the Gap—why not here? …Something began to stifle her,
but she choked it down. There were the dishes to be cleared away and washed,
and the pans and kettles to be cleaned. Her back ached, her arms were tired to the
shoulders and her burned hand quivered with pain when all was done.

While mountain society was patriarchal, Fox’s gender critique did not embrace
ture gender equality or political actualization. In line with other local colorists, Fox
couched the liberation of mountain women as freedom from their economic roles in

1540 John Fox Jr. *The Trail of the Lonesome Pine* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1908), 204-205.
agricultural systems, and, in its place, the freedom of the consumer and the status of moral guardianship against the evils of bad food and alcohol. In his books, civilization offered women sweets, flower gardens, porcelain dishes, schooling and husbands of means that could offer them the world. This vision of freedom, aside from its obvious limits, also emerged from a doubled-edged vision of mountain gender relations. As drudges, women were assumed to be caught in a form of slavery, but this vision also held women responsible for the failure of farms to produce food beyond subsistence and the lack of effective professionalized medicine. This representation of women is probably best seen in the filmic version of *The Trail of the Lonesome Pine* (1936) which associated women with strange herbal concoctions and a general lack of food aside from unsavory bowls of clabber cheese.\(^{1541}\) In contrast, the influx of mining was associated with the end of moonshine and with it, male laziness and the violent feuds that caused Fox’s female characters so much grief.

In short, Fox provided the middle class with romantic fatalism that spelled the extinction of mountain life as unfortunate but inevitable, consequence of the forward march of progress. The resulting literature was highly consumable and left its own mark on the land in the form of twentieth-century place names such as Kentucky’s Kingdom Come Park State Park. For Fox’s best-selling novels, alongside other works of local colorists, greased the flood of missions and industrial development into the region he had mined for literary substance.

\(^{1541}\) *The Trail of the Lonesome Pine*, directed by Henry Hathaway (1936; Hollywood, CA: Universal, 2009), DVD.
Cumulatively, media portrayals of mountain life produced an intertextual cabinet of curiosities replete with iconic caricatures of mountain agriculture, food, and drink, evoked and echoed with each representation. While not always logically consistent, the flow of ideas conveyed a way of perceiving a “truth” or “science” of space that defined production and social relations in the southern mountains as peculiar and in need of systematized planning and technological uplift. Here, food and drink perceived to be inedible or deleterious served as the signifier of the capacity of a system to nurture a national identity and national goals. Concern with habituation suggests a larger anxiety with the willingness of a population to forego the localized in the name of national cohesiveness. In this vision, alcohol and, in a broader sense, fermentation could be cast as an impediment to progress. Subsistence, with its reliance on ferments, was viewed as incapable of supporting modern aspirations with its impulse to bend the world to human will. Moonshine in this genre was not only implicated in the assumed backwardness of mountain society but also served as the ultimate measure of all things wrong and in need of change.
The women and children do nearly all of the work. A majority of the men are idle most of the time. Their most serious employment is hunting or fishing or running illicit distilleries and imbibing the blood of John Barleycorn. In some regions a young man has reached the summit of his ambition when he has learned to pick the banjo, owns a large dog, and carries a pistol and a bottle of whiskey.

--“Work Among the Mountain Whites”¹⁵⁴²

I want to go back where they make sausage and souse meat; where pumpkin is sliced and hung on the quiltin' frames to dry; where germs, vitamins and termites have never been heard of.

-- James Hutchins¹⁵⁴³

This is the eight-hour death, the daily burial
In a dark harvest lost as any dead.

-- James Still, “Earth-Bread”¹⁵⁴⁴

In 1918, journalist and congregational minister Rollin Lynde Hartt, hailing from New England where he wrote for the Nation, Century, and Atlantic Monthly, offered a frank criticism of media portrayals of languishing mountain farms as the consequence of “shiftlessness, ... moonshine that trickles from the very tree-trunks,” and “cooking that kills.”¹⁵⁴⁵ Emphasizing the diversity of the region in contrast to the cherry-picked shocking (either rare, skewed, or altogether fictional) traits of mountain life common in local-color literature, Hartt surmised that “teaching them [mountaineers] modern farmin [sic], the principles of improved housing, [and] the niceties of enlightened hygiene” was
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“less benevolent than patriotic, for it would ‘induct Appalachia into the Union’ not for Appalachia's sake, but for the Union's.”

Of the literary fiction produced by mass media in the latter years of the nineteenth century, hundreds of organized denominational missionaries ascended the mountains to perform, in Hartt’s words, their patriotic duty. They saw this as their responsibility to convert and modernize communities under the guise of benevolence, while serving what they believed to be the needs of an industrial nation. The drive to uplift and transform the region continued to borrow from existing literary themes while also promising a remarkable transformation of mountaineers, especially children as representatives of the future, through food and alcohol reform and education. As stated in one promotional pamphlet:

> You will, when you see them and their wives and their progeny, wonder how such a country can produce such specimens of humanity, but it is easily understood when explanation is at hand. In that region are reared the best of cattle, sheep, poultry, and fruits, but the moonshiner disdains them. He prefers, or habit and poverty compel him to prefer, soggy hot biscuit, vile coffee, cadaverous, greasy bacon, assassinated in a frying pan. He drinks too much of his own fiery decoction and too little of the salubrious water that leaps, gushes and sparkles on every hand. If one could capture young moonshiner girls and boys, feed them on civilized diet, girdle them with proper comfort, garment them decently, treat them amiably and educate them wholesomely, the transformation would be thorough, startling, and supreme.

Mountain whites, notes the pamphlet, were not necessarily interested in uplift. Their preference for their subsistence existence was written off as “habit” compelled by poverty, a wayward diet, and as the epigraph above suggests, the consumption of “the

---


591
blood of John Barleycorn.” Like Native Americans, the presumed wild progeny of these mountaineers were targeted for “capture” and the civilizing process.

Settlement Schools and Company Towns

In Appalachia, where “moonshiner” came to signify a breed or “type” of people, cultural uplift initially took form in hundreds of mission schools built with charity appeals written in the local-colorists vision of mountain people to solicit funding by non-mountain patrons. To accomplish this, their publications employed themes that were familiar to many readers. A prime example of this can be seen in the Board of Missions’ of the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Nashville vision of the land and people. According to the Board, pioneers, whose wagons gave out in the mountains, left their descendants stranded while all around them the world moved on with manufacturing in the East, cotton in the South, and the booming western “wheat lands” followed the “road forward on a wave of prosperity and progress.”

Unheard of and out-of style mountain farming practices identified by the board included grazing sheep on “vertical” hills, pasturing “razor-backed hogs,” curing one’s own pork, and using wooden plows. Signs of progress were seen in the construction of mills, railways, and lumber camps as well as coal mines, dressed lumber, silos, cattle, the education of children by schools, and teaching of domestic science. Young men at the mission school were taught “the new reigning order in the highlands,” spelled out in modern agriculture in methods for judging
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cows and the use of gasoline tractors so they might become prosperous farmers.\footnote{Felton, “A Race of Rip,” 28-29.}

Mission school girls are trained in “hygiene, nursing, dietetics, cooking and all the branches of domestic science.”\footnote{Felton, “A Race of Rip,” 31.} The school organized health campaigns, better baby campaigns, community fairs, and courses in food preservation by canning. The mission school buildings served as a model for the whole community for the construction of bigger and better houses. Moreover, at least one missionary agricultural college instructed its charges in Fletcherism as a standard of dietary economy to reduce “drafts on the commissary.”\footnote{Fletcher, \textit{The New Glutton}, Preface to the 1906 Editions.} Behind all of these activities was a specific mindset: the need to educate children to live “above the level of their environment”… to instilled in them a “desire to live better than their surroundings.”\footnote{Felton, “A Race of Rip,” 25.}

Discouraged from engaging the land in the dialectic of localized subsistence, and especially fermentation, the next generation of mountaineers was raised on a vision of their environmental and cultural landscape as something to surmount.

Educational institutions associated with post-Civil War Reconstruction contributed to the mountain reform. William Goodall Frost, president of Berea College in Berea, Kentucky, raised money for the college by alluding to this strain of uplift. Frost’s speech, “The Ladder of Success,” delivered at an educational rally at Big Stoney Gap, Virginia, in the 1890s, emphasized the need for bringing the “gifts of science” and education to the mountains. With success depicted as a ladder whose primary rungs were
hard work and temperance, Frost lectured men in plowing straight so mechanical reapers could be used to bring in “big crops,” and farmers could make a “surplus” of money that could be placed in the bank. For women, Frost presented two contrasting sisters, “One of them has never learned how to do many useful things” and whose “kitchen was dirty and full of disorder,” and the second who had “taken an interest in the great business of housekeeping” which meant clean, bright rooms, flower gardening, and learning “all the rules for dressmaking, fruit canning, and the care of the sick.” Each step of the ladder coached farmers into a modern market economy where women kept house and men grew cash crops; where the gathering of money in the bank replaced stocking the cellar as the definition of success.

Alongside the mission schools, settlement schools, modeled after the settlement houses of urban America, also entered the mountains with the goal of imparting elements of progressive reform while also preserving rural mountain culture, especially craft culture, in the face of the encroachment of heavy industry. Hindman School in Knox County, Kentucky and Pine Mountain Settlement in Harlan County, Kentucky, both established by May Stone and Katherine Pettit with support from women’s clubs and the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, laid the foundations for the mountain settlement movement complete with its emphasis on teaching modern agriculture, hygiene, and temperance. Similar to the mission schools, settlement schools operated model scientific


farms in association with state run agricultural experiment stations, and programs in health and sanitation.\textsuperscript{1555}

Settlement schools arrived in the years just prior to industry, often moving just one step ahead of the trains, seeking to preserve the “good” qualities of mountain life and imparting skills needed for life in an industrial age. Katherine Pettit and May Stone established Hindman, the very first settlement school, in Knott County in 1902. Pettit went on to found Pine Mountain Settlement to the south in Harlan County in 1913. As young, educated, middle-class women from prosperous blue-grass families, working in association with the Kentucky Federation of Women’s Clubs and Women’s Christian Temperance Union, they dedicated their lives to mountain revitalization with a definitively liberal progressive sense of reform. Both attended college, Stone at Wellesly in Massachusetts and Pettit at Sayre in Lexington, Kentucky; experiences that evidently place these prospective reformers among other socially progressive career-seeking women.\textsuperscript{1556} The reform they offered mountain communities, as historians Whisnant and Elizabeth S. D. Engelhardt remind us, began with cooking classes, genteel socials, and temperance songs and pledges.\textsuperscript{1557}

The most infamous early experiment in such reform efforts involved the so-called “beaten biscuit crusade.” Performed at industrial summer camps that preceded the construction of Hindman School and later at these newer institutions, the crusade was


\textsuperscript{1556} Engelhardt, “Beating the Biscuits,” 152.

\textsuperscript{1557} Whisnant, \textit{All That is Native}, 25, 48.
part of the lengthy drive to convert locals from their traditional mountain staple of corn to “light” wheat bread. As Englehardt points out, this transition associated success in domestic science with whiteness, middle-class consciousness, and a consumer ethic. Light bread represented purity and standardization through the acquisition and use of proper utensils, since achieving the perfect biscuit involved the purchase of an array of “necessary” tools: a table or board for beating, a mallet, and a modern temperature regulated oven.\(^{1558}\) Wheat bread was also gendered in the manner it relegated women to the kitchen by replacing corn (frequently grown by women) with wheat and by increasing labor required to produce bread. Reformer bread choices were equally racialized, evident in the beaten biscuit’s association with plantation owners who, in the not-so-distant past, used slave labor to produce such luxuries.\(^{1559}\) But May Stone and Laura Campbell, another volunteer of the troop, though blue-grass women, had also received training in hygienic cooking at Battle Creek, Michigan.\(^{1560}\) Notably, by the early twentieth century the ranking of breads encoded the chemical and microbial associations of northern hygienists. Surely the pairing of beaten wheat biscuits with temperance songs was no accident, especially given corn’s dubious association with the assumed to be chemically inferior grains and with whiskey production. The beaten biscuit, a wheat bread “lightened” by mechanical force as compared to a sourdough starter or even yeast, ranked highest among breads in the minds of these activists, followed by bread made with yeast.


or baking soda. So too, did the cultivation of wheat as Engelhardt details. In light of this, the continuum of bread should not be viewed just as an imposition of a gendered, racialized, and class-based social hierarchy using food, though the induction of mountaineers into this hierarchy was certainly important. Rather, as Latour notes, we must recognize that the concerns of hygienists went beyond people; that “the action of microbes redefined not only society but also nature.”¹⁵⁶¹ Thus, we might view the politics of bread as a litmus test of both people and environment. Could the mountaineer induce the mountain to conform and sprout the victuals of civilization? If not, what good could these people and their soil offer the engine of progress?

As other scholars have noted, because of their focus on cultural preservation settlement schools were relatively less intrusive than mission schools. However, preservation efforts tended to focus on those things most palatable to an urban middle class, resulting in a sanitized version of craft culture – the dyeing and weaving of homespun, quilting, and folk music that were salable in a growing consumer market for handicrafts.¹⁵⁶² Meanwhile, activism weeded out “boisterous” get-togethers, most fermented foods, and the brewer’s and distiller’s craft.¹⁵⁶³

These were no minor omissions. Frolics, food, and drink had been the locus of “live” culture both literally, in their inclusion of the forest products and the microbial world, and socio-economically in their significance in a subsistence economy. As


¹⁵⁶² See Whisnant, All That is Native and Fine, regarding genteel gatherings.

¹⁵⁶³ Regarding the promotion of genteel gatherings, see Whisnant, All That is Native and Fine, 47-48.
Whisnant has demonstrated, cultural intervention in the mountains was not only the product of cultural assumptions— it served a function: It obscured social transformation and ultimately served the agendas of outside interests, regardless of the good intentions of liberal Protestant reformers. Moreover, intervention efforts over time worked to deskill locals of the very things that helped them survive apart from a market economy, and it did so in the name of progress and clean living.

Of course, reformers did not necessarily recognize their efforts as undermining an established knowledge or culture. In fact, they sincerely believed their efforts would aid the survival of the mountain farmer. Eva W. Bruner, a missionary who worked with children in the Kentucky mountains, reported that only “proper cultivation” was needed “to make the mountain children rivals of the children of more prosperous lands.”

There is perhaps no better example for this than the widespread reformer obsession with canning. On one hand, sanitation programs presented canning as the modern alternative to traditionally preserve food. On the other, settlement schools proudly lived off food produced and canned on their premises. Pine Mountain Settlement, for instance, in its early years survived the winter from the foodstuff its farm and students produced: “held-up cabbage” as its only green food, and “2300 two-quart jars of beans, beets, peas, carrots, tomatoes, and blackberries,” all stored in the school cellar. For Petitt and other
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1564 Whisnant, All That is Native and Fine, xxi.


school staff, this accomplishment was a sign that the school farm was a successful, even though the institution depended on donations from outsiders.

Meanwhile, the expansion of centralized industry—timber, coal and later textile mills—had entered the land in what historian Henry M. Caudill has called a “wave of economic euphoria.” As Caudill notes, the same tectonic forces that produced the Appalachian Mountains with all their diversity, riddled the range from Virginia to Alabama with coal and fostered developmental trajectories in mining through the entire southern mountain region. From the 1880s onward, expanding railroads allowed for commercial expansion looking to tap Appalachia’s natural wealth. First the timber barons stripped the land, and then the coal companies bought it up and attempted to put dispossessed populations to work in mines. In the process, the landscape, politics, and economic system of the mountains were drastically transformed. Hollows became industrial cities practically overnight. Populations shifted from an agrarian barter and subsistence economy to wage labor and money economy. Meanwhile, the kinship-based political order was replace by “a constricted political system based on economic hierarchy” dominated by distant landholders and industrialists.

The environmental impact was dramatic. In the first decades of the twentieth century timber harvesting stripped bare as much as 85% of old growth forests in states

1567 Henry M. Caudill, Watches of the Night (Ashland: Jesse Stuart Foundation, 2010), 59.
1568 Henry M. Caudill, Night Comes to the Cumberlands: A Biography of a Depressed Area (Ashland: Jesse Stuart Foundation, 2001), xii.
1569 Eller, Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers, xxi.
Clear-cutting and burning of brush dried the land while the loss of humus and water degraded the soil and encouraged flooding. The traffic and transport of logs choked waterways and displaced and compacted soil. In addition, the influx of coal mining unleashed toxic dust and chemicals into watersheds, soil and air. The rapid degradation of the environment meant the loss of ecological integrity of the forest biome—the integrated plant, animal, and microbial communities that enabled mountain farming.

Attempts to transition to petty commodity production were largely short-lived. 

Apart from environmental degradation, what little success that was had in animal husbandry, canning cooperatives, or other forms of commercial farming were undermined by nearly forty years of depressed agricultural markets beginning in the 1920s, the result of over-production. In addition, New Deal reforms seeking to address depressed markets largely benefited large-scale farmers while “short shifting” small-scale Appalachian farms, thus exacerbating the depression in the region.  

In the mountains, the combined result of industrial creep, deforestation, and agricultural depression was a notable loss of acreage. Historian Ronald D. Eller notes that by the 1930s the average farm dropped to 76 acres with a simultaneous rise in reliance on non-farm employment by farmers. Farmers were also marginalized as industry claimed the more fertile farmland in the valleys to gain access to rivers and flatter terrain for construction.  
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1570 Bolgiano, The Appalachian Forest, 80.


1572 Eller, Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers, xix-xx.
While some farmers sold their homesteads in search of better lives, many were coerced off their land. Tactics used in the process preyed on the locals’ need for hard currency, lack of literacy and knowledge of legal strategies or language, and of the market value of the resources in question. Companies also used political connections with state and county officials to claim vast tracts of untitled land and to void titles that existed without proper surveying. Notably, surveying was an atypical practice in many places where titles were often passed on orally and where property boundaries were rather fluid. Protracted litigation and outright threats were also used to dispossess farmers who refused to leave. As described by one Harlan County resident Hiram Boggs:

My daddy said they’d come up to you and ask you how much you want for this property. This man tell’d them he didn’t want to sell it and they’d say we didn’t come to ask you if you want to sell … They said, ‘the highest we pay is five cents an acre,’ and that man had to sell or they’d take him for a ride and never bring him back.

Industry dramatically transformed the land. Mining and the construction of towns began with the physical violence to the land Lefebvre linked to the production of space in the modern capitalist nation state. Quotes local Mabel Brown Ellis on the construction of Lynch in eastern Kentucky:

At the far northern end of the county the greatest corporation in the world was creating a city overnight—blasting its streets into the side of the mountains, moving a river from side to side of the valley, erecting a metropolitan hotel where

1573 Caudill, Night Comes to the Cumberlands, 65-66; 71; also see Benham Mine Manager File Collection, Box 13: “Lands” folders. Edsel T. Godbey Appalachian Research Center, Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College, Kentucky.


Indeed, the effect of industrial transformation could be jarring. In Harlan County’s Big Hollow, residents bore witness to the arrival of hundreds of coking ovens that lit up the valleys at night with “the lurid effects” of a “vast and frightening underworld conflagrations.”\footnote{Castle Rock Smith, “Benham: Pioneering City, Captive Mine,” n.s., Dec. 20, 1970. White Folder: Benham and Lynch. Edsel T. Godbey Appalachian Research Center, Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College, Kentucky.} Shanties and then bunkhouses were built to house a work crew of 1000 that proceeded with the construction of more permanent dwellings, buildings, and roadways. Workforces swelled and dropped with winter, flu epidemics, and fluctuations in the coal market.\footnote{T.E. Johnson, “History of Lynch District,” United States Steel Corporation, n.d., 3; E. Canna, “History of Benham,” n.s., n.d., 3. White Folder: Benham and Lynch. Edsel T. Godbey Appalachian Research Center, Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College, Kentucky.}

What mountain hollows experience in these early years and repeatedly over the next century epitomized the “spatial chaos” Lefebvre associated with the capitalists’ “difficulty in mastering what is at once their product and the tool of their mastery, namely, space…”\footnote{Lefebvre, \textit{Production of Space}, 63.} Reduced to the abstraction of a single commodity economy, coal camps harbored their own internal contradictions in the form of not only the environmental disruption mentioned above but also a transitory and explosive workforce. In its early years, cities like Lynch were “[d]iverse, fluid, and volatile,” displaying all of
the disorder of boom conditions, including “drunkenness, brawling, and even killings.”\footnote{1579} Locals did their best to avoid these towns because they were “mean [and] dangerous.”\footnote{1580}

The space produced for industry reduced or eliminated old linkages and in their place forged a multitude of new intersections related to the new system of production. Company towns replaced farm communities and the worker housing of coal camps supplanted the homeplace. Zones of commercial space and tight rows of individual houses reflected new linkages between private life and mining as old linkages to subsistence were eliminated with access to land and the various outbuildings that comprised the farm. The spatial practices produced a new form of cohesion in which work, living, and leisure were all provided by the company. Here the new spatial code centered life around a single enshrined resource: coal. Indeed, mining companies sought to mould and control the space it dominated to uphold the logic of single commodity production and push labor into the unenviable task of coal mining.

The most abusive company towns evinced a form of corporate slavery where immigrant families—southeastern Europeans and freedmen from the deep south - joined mountain families in coal camps where everything was owned and operated by the company. Prime examples of this can be found in the 100 plus coal mines in the vicinity of New River Gorge, Fayette County, West Virginia. Here, railroad lines, mines and towns replaced the homesteads in the river creased hills. Towns were organized by race

\footnote{1579} Kelemen, “A History of Lynch,” 162.

\footnote{1580} Bryant Caudill.
and class, with black homes situated closest to the mines, and operator housing and commissary located in elevated positions that reflected their social status. Moreover, company stores such as those designed by coal operator Justus Collins offer architectural testament to the use of space to discipline labor. Comprised of post office, commissary and clinic, Collin’s octagonal design--its location, structure, acoustics, and even its lace curtains--allowed managers and their hired guns, the Baldwin-Felts, optimum surveillance and spatial control of occupants of the store and surrounding town. The strict spatial partitioning evinced what Michel Foucault calls Panopticonism—a profoundly modern mechanism of disciplinary control through the construction of “conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power.” At the company store, workers purchased everything including the tools they needed in the mines, clothing, food, and other necessities for their families at marked-up prices with company scrip. A miner could even purchase alcohol, which was kept in the company safe alongside gold and medicine, if he had the money. Within these towns, as in industrial cities, the squandering of wages on alcohol was decried by churches and the women that attended them. With meager wages, scrip, and high prices that fostered debt, the company exercised control through dependency. And while the company store was stocked from floor to ceiling with all manner of goods for sale, this abundance was an illusion made evident by some glaring omissions. If workers wanted to grow anything in

1581 Foucault, Discipline and Punish, 201.

the spit of land around their leased homes, they could purchase flower seeds, but nothing else.\textsuperscript{1583}

The initial rush of coal companies like those in New River Gorge took advantage of local-color literature’s depiction of mountain people as backward in claiming land and resources. In an effort to off-set the harsh realities of dispossession and reputation of the industry had earned, the larger captive mines of major corporations of the golden age of coal (1910-1930) ultimately espoused social uplift through the construction of model company towns where local farmers and European peasants would be refashioned into “Americans,” and where the benefits of industrialization and welfare capitalism could be put on display. A prime example of this breed of industrial paternalism could be found in the coal towns of eastern Kentucky, the region that had become the primary focus of local-color literature by the late nineteenth century and home to the Hindman and Pine Mountain Settlement Schools years later. Here, companies like Wisconsin Steel, a subsidiary of International Harvester; US Coal and Coke, a subsidiary of US Steel, and Fordson Coal, a subsidiary of the Ford Motor Company, contributed to environmental reorganization and uplift efforts to further initiate the population into industrial life. Ironically, while their sister agricultural machinery companies, such as International Harvester’s Chicago Steel mills, targeted petty commodity farmers of the Midwest as ideal for a more expansive, mechanized agricultural model, their parent companies through their mountain subsidiaries targeted southern Appalachia for bituminous coal in

\textsuperscript{1583} From author’s visit to the Whipple Company Store and Appalachian Heritage Educational Museum, 7485 Okey L. Patteson Rd., Scarbro, West Virginia, April 2012.
making the coke necessary for steel production in general and, specifically, for the mass production of industrial farm equipment including the tractor.

Coal companies conceived of the model company town as a paragon of progress in contrast to the farm communities that they displaced. Indeed, Wisconsin Steel intentionally juxtaposed its company town, Benham, against its predecessor, the farm community of Yowell (named for the sound a wildcat makes), in full-page advertisements in the Harlan County press. “A City of Happiness, Cleanliness, and Contentment Carved from a Wilderness by the Magic Hand of Industry,” Benham had transformed a place of “bare subsistence” with one that offered “every father lucrative employment and every hungry little mouth… nourishing tasteful food.”\footnote{1584} In this piece, there is no mention of the exploitation of mineral wealth; rather, industry’s arrival is cast as an old trusty “mule” that labored to accommodate families that just kept coming. Through the company, the town, in time, offered pleasant modern homes, wholesome amusement, and schools for training in industry and home economics. A regular cornucopia, the company store featured “every type of meat or vegetable in season, ever fresh and cold.”\footnote{1585}

The fact is that social uplift provided large, vertically integrated manufacturers an alternative approach to the outright authoritarianism in labor management that defined their coal mining predecessors. The chaos of mining camps full of transient young men in

\footnote{1584} Advertisement, \textit{Harlan Daily Enterprise}, April 1, 1930, Box 3, Folder: Articles on Benham, Benham Mine Manager File Collection, Edsel T. Godbey Appalachian Research Center, Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College, Kentucky.

\footnote{1585} Advertisement, \textit{Harlan Daily Enterprise}. 
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ramshackle housing, spending their days in the dark depths of the mines for a pittance, bred discontent and labor organizing. Consequently, as of spring 1916, with the shanties of the Big Hollow near completion and nearly full, a looming strike scare, complaints of low pay and long hours, and a black minister preaching the gospel of unionization, Wisconsin Steel’s management contemplated its options: Hire the Baldwin-Felts to root-out the labor organizers or embrace welfare capitalism in its fullest form. They opted for the latter using a combination of existing uplift programs and John D. Rockefeller Jr.’s so-called “Colorado Plan.” Under the circumstance, their choice made sense. As Rockefeller’s brother-in-law, Harold McCormick, the President of International Harvester, sympathized with Rockefeller’s interest in social hygiene and his quest to find subtler means to discipline labor in the wake of the Colorado labor wars that had culminated in the infamous Ludlow Massacre of 1914, when upwards of 25 persons—striking miners, their wives and children-- were gunned down or burned to death at the hands of Colorado National Guard and the Baldwin-Felts. Back in Appalachia, the management situation in Harlan County posed unique difficulties. With several large companies in close quarters, disciplining labor and convincing workers to settle in one place was almost impossible. And, even though the mines were captive and protected
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from the worst fluctuations of the coal market, Wisconsin Steel balked at the extra expenditure for the Baldwin-Felts, especially given their association with the Ludlow Massacre and the possibility that their work might not pay-off.\textsuperscript{1588}

The essence of the Colorado Plan, as outlined by Rockefeller in the \textit{Atlantic Monthly} article, “Labor and Capital—Partners” (1916), revolved around the stance that the interests of labor and capital are the same. Together, they produced wealth but class war threatened to choke their efforts and thus, the “wellsprings of material progress.”\textsuperscript{1589}

Having studied the fundamental problems leading up to the Ludlow Massacre, Rockefeller concluded that the bloody conflict could have been averted if capitalists and employees alike recognized the burden of the other. To facilitate better relations, businesses should devise comprehensive “Industrial Constitutions” that would allow workers a vote for representatives who would voice their concerns in “work councils”. Under such constitutions, companies would post rules and wage scales and provide measures to foster cordial relations. And, to promote order and discipline, the company would be charged with creating committees on safety, sanitation, health, housing, recreation, and education. The company would also encourage the growing of gardens and provide amenities such as bathhouses.\textsuperscript{1590} Thus, capital would balance profits with the welfare of employees, but labor must also agree not to seek too much or impede capital or stockholders in their right to profit.


In this spirit, the companies in Harlan County built modern homes to replace bunk houses and shanties that initially housed their workers. In Lynch, US Coal and Coke constructed “two hundred single and four hundred double houses” --the latter built in mirror image with adjoining walls to conserve space.\textsuperscript{1591} Each was painted and trimmed according to a determined code of acceptable colors. The outsides were wooden with asphalt shingles while the interiors were plastered, and each room was equipped with a single light. Each had running water and a few had central heating and indoor toilets, though most did not. Others featured sewers and concrete sidewalks. All housing was structured around a layout that included a living room, kitchen, and individual bedrooms. In an attempt to prevent workers from wandering to other coal operations in search of better work conditions and pay, the company provided entertainment: a ball park, tennis courts, a movie theater and Amusement Building with segregated dining halls and an auditorium.\textsuperscript{1592} The companies also planned days of “jollification” such as Temperance Day (at the end of October), Fourth of July, and other holidays, to encourage clean living, company loyalty and patriotism.\textsuperscript{1593} Likewise, the construction of churches and YMCAs promoted “permanence, respectability, and restraint” while educating workers on the threat of union activism—all built and effectively run by the company.\textsuperscript{1594}

\textsuperscript{1592} Johnson, “History of Lynch District,” 3-6.
\textsuperscript{1594} Kelemen, “A History of Lynch,” 162; and Osborne, “A View of Coal Camp.”
Each company purchased huge swaths of land to lay claim to large sections of existing coal fields and to create buffer zones to discourage encroachment by neighboring companies and the migration of labor agents and employees. International Harvester purchased approximately 22,000 acres that covered much of the fifteen mile wide, forty mile long Harlan County Coal Field which held 21% of the state’s coal.\textsuperscript{1595} US Coal and Coke secured several tracts of land amounting to approximately 19,000 acres in Harlan and Letcher Counties on the Poor Fork and Clover Fork of the Cumberland River, just one half mile upstream from Benham. In the early 1920s, Ford followed, purchasing 195,000 acres of coal and timberland, most of which was located in eastern Kentucky and the rest in West Virginia.\textsuperscript{1596} With so much land, companies frequently leased land that was not in use by the mines and town back to regional farmers who also frequently worked for the mines. And, in city-limits, town and mine management encouraged mine workers and their families to garden the yards around company houses and in community gardens through gardening campaigns and garden contests. In Benham, these moves were part of the Harvester Industrial Plan. Gardening proved valuable in beautifying a landscape devastated by timber harvesting and construction. The small quantities of food produced by these efforts could also hold families over during lulls and work stoppages. And, in a space where just about everything else was determined by the company, gardening offered tenants an opportunity to individualize their homes. Personal investment in gardens fostered community while serving company interests by attaching

\textsuperscript{1595} Canna, “History of Benham,” 1.

workers to the land in some limited sense, thus discouraging employees from seeking better work elsewhere.\textsuperscript{1597} As a reward, “highly graded” employees were even granted chicken coops.\textsuperscript{1598} In Benham, such campaigns and community gardens were authorized by B.W. Batchelder, the General Superintendent of Mines, who was also charged with maintaining a sufficient workforce when labor was short. In 1917, in correlation with a labor shortage associated with World War I, Batchelder authorized the development of garden plots in association with the YMCA, the baseball park and the hotel, and for use by the newly formed canning club.\textsuperscript{1599}

It’s worth recognizing that, if a worker left town and employment or fell into sufficient debt with the company, crops and garden produce were subject to forfeiture. Indeed, the frequent problem of late or unpaid rent inspired Wisconsin Steel to consider attaching legal riders to home leases. These riders would effectively place a lien on all crops produced on company land until the rent was paid.\textsuperscript{1600} Thus, hungry or not, if someone failed to pay the rent, the company could legally seize their tomatoes. Whether this was every fully enacted or strictly enforced or not is lost to history, but the very idea reveals a ruling mentality regarding property. Usufruct has no home in a company town.


\textsuperscript{1598} Osborne, “A View of Coal Camp.”

\textsuperscript{1599} Unknown to Batchelder, May 4, 1917, Box 10: Folder: General Conditions, Benham Mine Manager File Collection, Edsel T. Godbey Appalachian Research Center, Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College, Kentucky.

\textsuperscript{1600} Correspondences, Box 14: Lands—Miscellaneous 1912 and Letter to Sampson & Sampson from Wisconsin Steel Inc, June 9, 1920, Box 14: land—Miscellaneous 1920. Benham Mine Manager File Collection, Edsel T. Godbey Appalachian Research Center, Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College, Kentucky.
Having access to land, gardens and livestock continued to make a significant difference in quality of life in the mountain even as it relinquished companies from paying a living wage. When mines were shuttered with each depression, it was remnants of farms and gardens or government assistance that fed families—not the company. Lack of land and lack of government aid (denied, at times, to striking miners) could push miners back into the mines, stymieing labor organizing, as described by G.C. Jones in *Growing Up Hard in Harlan County*.\(^{1601}\) The control of food was powerful. While the company granted rights to pasture for cows and hogs or yard space for beans, companies, with the aid of the state, took care to maintain the upper-hand as to who controlled food. Social forces facilitated the process. For instance, the work of women’s clubs in tandem with the city council ended the right to open-range livestock. At least one farmer objected (without success) to this measure, by parading through the streets of Benham while shouting that members of the women’s club “wanted to starve the children to death because they were taking the cows out of town.”\(^{1602}\) In the absence of policy, class dynamics also encouraged a mentality that linked the commissary with prosperity, for “[f]amilies who had previously raised all their own food considered it a mark of status to purchase ‘fresh’ produce shipped in by rail to the company store.”\(^{1603}\) Being a consumer
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\(^{1602}\) Pearl Walters interviewed by William Hurd, April 5, 1982. Oral History Collection, Edsel T. Godbey Appalachian Research Center, Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College, Kentucky.

was the new measure of success, even though it tied families more deeply to the company and restricted their ability to negotiate better working and living conditions.

With obsessive zeal, company management spawned a range of health, safety, Americanization, and gardening programs as part of the scientific management of their workforce. The companies worked in tandem with the Agricultural Extension Department in stimulating interest in company garden contests and they ran an Americanization School for foreigners through the YMCA. Using motion pictures and a newly constructed “shadow box” (display cabinets), they exposed workers to films and materials on healthy living. Companies also issued plant magazines of proper “philosophical and idealistic” slant so as to “increas[e] loyalty and efficiency on the part of employees” through “stories showing the place of the home in the scheme of life” and pictures of the ideal American home. Stories emphasized the importance of home economics and gardening in order to “stimulat[e]…the interest of the working man in his home.” These magazines were also designed to provide men with “the latest information regarding prices of household necessities” and importance of “health, sanitation, and hygiene” and to foster “the desire to acquire things” or the “acquisitive sense.”


In the spirit of progressive reform, company towns, schools, and government agencies alike sponsored reform measures that espoused instruction in food production, hygienic cooking and temperance. Canning lessons spanned all sources of social uplift. Mission schools were avid canners, as were the settlement schools, and federal agricultural extension programs and domestic agents funded by federal, state, and county governments according to the Smith-Lever Act of 1914—federal legislation that established land-grant college extension services for agricultural modernization. And, as previously mentioned, coal companies contributed their efforts in forming modern schools that taught young women home economics and facilitating the workings of canning clubs as well as the work of extension and domestic agents. Many reformers, in fact, moved fluidly between coal camps, schools, churches, and homesteads in proselytizing the benefits of hygiene and temperance.

One such person was Roxie C. Perkins who initially worked in extension prior to moving to Harlan County in 1920 where she replaced Harlan’s first domestic agent, Rella Skidmore. Skidmore initiated a series of small canning clubs (known as Junior Clubs at the time) in Grays Knob, Wallins, Kildav and Evarts—all of which harbored coal mining and many of which became sites of intense labor conflict with Harlan’s bloody labor battles. There are few records on Skidmore, but her replacement, Perkins stands out as a long-standing and active county resident. From arrival to her retirement in 1956, Perkins went the extra mile, quite literally, travelling through the county by foot, horseback, coal train or car, armed with her pressure cooker, into towns and hollows to hold 4-H meetings, home demonstrations and canning clubs. Perkins also served as a judge for the
Lynch and Benham annual garden contests and, with the help of specialists from the University of Kentucky, she organized homemakers clubs for the education of non-school age women in the science of keeping house. Across these various activities, her espoused objectives stressed yeast bread-making, sanitation, and food preservation through canning or drying and “in more progressive communities,” the use of “fireless cookers” and freezers. In standing abreast of local affairs, Perkins also collected articles on the county’s crusade against whiskey and need of educators to mold the “mental hygiene” of the “maladjusted mountaineer,” two efforts that informed her work.

The proliferation of “light” bread, canning and hygienic protocol is not so much surprising as it is telling. Among educated urban women, canning was part of hygiene and one of several relatively new domestic technologies taught in urban schools and colleges and proliferated through printed media including cookbooks. This does not imply that canning was altogether foreign to the mountains, but in many areas canning remained uncommon until the 1930s or later, simply because canning jars were an additional monetary expense most families could not afford. Aside from the cost of jars, sustained high temperature cooking is required to safely can food. Knowing this, schools and domestic agents expressed alarm at the sight of women boiling jars in washtubs over

---


outdoor fires and subsequently spent much time not only promoting canning, but battling unsanitary canning practices often by promoting additional expenditures on pressure cookers and indoor stoves. In this sense, canning, like other aspects of hygiene, pushed women into the kitchen, even as domestic agents, like Perkins, found a great deal of liberty in their teaching efforts. Canning pulled women and their families into the market economy as consumers, all while advocating social stability through sterilized foodstuff. For, as personifications of the state, agents not only scrutinized the workings of the home, in promoting canned food as sanitary and in couching alcohol as an inherent threat to family and home, agents effectively divided women from the art of fermentation.

Mining towns in Harlan County enforced alcohol prohibition as part of social engineering efforts for which disregard was viewed as a form of opposition to the successful development of the industrial plan. Industry, in this case, had media backing. For instance, the New York-based Outlook opined that national industrial progress required “the burial of John Barleycorn” and with him, “the passing of the Hick.” In accordance with the Harvester Industrial Plan, any alcohol consumption was potentially grounds for dismissal. From 1919 to 1920, “liquor” stood out as one of the primary categories for employee discharge, alongside theft, incompetence, insubordination, and...
union agitation. So too, US Coal and Coke and Fordson Coal vowed to discharge any employee that came to work with alcohol on his breath. Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the strain of hygienic thinking that tried to associate alcohol consumption with socialism, moonshine and union agitation were the two primary offenses warranting immediate eviction from company housing and land. People leasing land from the company could farm, cut down so many trees, even mine their own coal if they found a seam, but they could not distill moonshine. This was written into the leases prior to the passage of dry laws, making company policy a bridge toward state and federal prohibition.

Resistance and Adaptation

Of course, not everyone complied with the social engineering efforts of missionaries and company men alike. Loss of land inspired many unknown individuals to destroy company property or to disregard, move and destroy property-line markers. In an attempt to address repeated acts of encroachment and the vandalization of markers, Wisconsin Steel experimented with a variety of markers, finally turning to the use of

---


1614 Coye Gilbert.
massive “concrete monuments” along its boundaries.\textsuperscript{1615} When it came to the educational activities of reformers, gaining entry to homes was not always easy for women were not always welcoming of domestic agents.\textsuperscript{1616} Likewise, despite the enthusiasm of reformers not everyone was sold on the benefits of canned food. As late as 1931, one major Harlan County newspaper editor spoke out against the lingering prejudice against canning, pontificating that canned food was indeed modern and safe in comparison to foods “preserved through salting, smoking, pickling, drying or preserving with spices.”\textsuperscript{1617} Nor did folk medicine and winemaking vanish. Coal companies hired professional doctors, but many people continued to use midwives who charged less. Similarly, home-made medicine continued in the form of convenient remedies—moonshine, willow limb tea or rabbit tobacco for the flu.\textsuperscript{1618} Recipes lingered, often written in the margins of cookbooks where memory was preserved, though also, quite literally, marginalized.

Old practices survived also, in part, because the presence of coal towns produced demand for both “country food” and moonshine. Harlan County resident and author G.C. Jones’ makes this clear in his experience with bootlegging in Harlan County. Jones states:

\begin{flushright}


\end{flushright}
The farm-raised foods that were used to hide the liquor—shucky beans, cured hams, dried fruits, and a lot of other stuff—were beginning to crowd every storage place on the farm. For each ten gallons of moonshine they bought, an agreement was made for a few items of the produce that was used to hide it. The bootleggers didn’t like the idea at first, but soon some of them were taking double the amount of the farm foods. One bootlegger said, ‘The miners’ women are ordering more of the farm foods than their men are ordering whiskey!’ 1619

Hidden under layers of cured pork and sundries, moonshine endured with Appalachian foodways, at least for a while. In addition, demand for moonshine peaked with illness, and so did its price. A gallon that normally sold for as little as a $1 went for as much as $100 during flu epidemics. 1620

Still, cooking trends over the course of the twenty century in many ways followed national trends. Just about everything for storage, including traditional live culture foods like sausages and pickles, got canned. Published cookbooks up and down the mountains moved away from the act of fermenting as cooking became a function of consumption. For instance, sterilized vinegar marinated pickling replaced live-culture brine pickling and most fermented dairy products (except for buttermilk), gave way to pasteurized dairy such as cottage cheese; and clabber disappeared entirely. “Ingredients” came to replace farm products as most books omitted instructions in food preservation aside from the canning of fruits and vegetables, with “preserves” often reduced to jellies and jams. 1621

1619 Jones, Growing Up Hard, 94.
1620 Coye Gilbert.
1621 From a survey of the following cookbooks: Mrs. W. A. Johnson, What to Cook and How to Cook It, (Louisville, KY: Pentecostal Herald Press, 1899), Ladies Society of the First Presbyterian Church, Woman’s Wisdom: A Collection of Choice Recipes (Owensboro: O.T. Kendall, 1890), Ladies of the First Congregational Church, The Dorcas Cookbook (Ironton, OH: Ironton Book Store, 1898), Ladies Aid Society of the First Presbyterian Church, Recipes Tried and True (Marion: The Marion Mirror Printers, 1909), Miss Augusta Yates, The Keys to the Pantry: A Collection of Choice, Tried Recipes (Richmond: Hermitage Press, 1907), Social Workers M.E. Church—South, The Spartanburg Cook Book 3599
The impact of such cookbooks, while difficult to track, can be seen in the transformation of space. In many instances, canning jars came to inhabit root cellars while other outbuildings of surviving farms become derelict or junk houses. Some structures survived longer than others as compromises were negotiated. For instance, missionaries arriving in rural mountain locations soon realized that if they wanted to eat meat they needed smokehouses. Consequently, authentic mountain hams continued as a viable commodity in the market for handicraft.  

It is of particular consequence that the moonshiner’s craft was perhaps the most enduring of all. Indeed, it could be said that moonshine acquired a new social life that evoked both old and new social trends. In the cat-and-mouse game that pit bootleggers and moonshiners against local police and federal agents, locals continued to use their intimate knowledge of the landscape to produce, hide, and transport whiskey. Resident Coye Gilbert identified specific features of Harlan County’s landscape-- berry bushes, pastures, and buildings-- where moonshine was stashed or placed for pickup. Good set-ups revealed the ingenuity of the trade in the industrialized mountain setting. A friend of Gilbert set up shop in a long hollow with a nice little creek with the still located under the door of an abandoned sawmill that was then covered with wood and a pile of sawdust.


Transport through the Cumberland Gap, a main artery of trade that borders three states (Kentucky, Virginia, and Tennessee), required extra finesse. In the past, old timers had used crock jugs packed in grass or toe sacks (feed sacks) on a horse or mule, or under the boards of a wagon, but increasingly, the modern bootlegger hid mason jars of whiskey under the rumble seat of automobiles and, at times, integrated car parts such as radiators into their stills. Unfortunately, with potential chemical or lead contamination, the results could be hazardous to one’s health.

Economically, the sale of home brew supplemented incomes from the limited work that existed outside the mines as well as the limited pay of non-union mining jobs. Coal mining also had a way of generating its own demand for moonshine. The seething transformation of the regions seemed to inspire alcohol consumption, and coal miners emerging from dark dusty depths of the mines provided a large, thirsty market. In many ways it could be said that moonshine was necessary for survival and, in addition, signified the maintenance of farming traditions as part and parcel to a better way of life amidst industrial transformation. This is evident in the life of Mabel Taylor, whose family was among the original settlers in Harlan County. Taylor identified her father’s occupation as “a coal miner, a farmer, and a moonshiner”—“one of the best moonshiners in the area.” Taylor’s father did any available work but found “there was more money to be made in liquor than there was in coal mining.” Indeed, moonshine enabled her father to save enough money to buy a farm. Perhaps even more remarkable, Taylor

\[1623\] Coye Gilbert.

expressed great respect for her father’s skill and ability to provide her family a healthier and happier agrarian lifestyle even though, from age ten she stayed at a settlement school. The fact of the matter is living realities frequently trumped the abstractions of uplift.

To sustain their families, both men and women relied heavily on proceeds from the still. Jim Griffey landed in court twice for moonshine and did sixty days in the pen in West Virginia, got out, and went right back to home brewing. Since he received a light sentence, Griffey promised the judge to “never fool with the moonshine unless it gets where I can’t support my family or something or another, then I might fool with it” and this was apparently enough to ensure his release.1625 He continued by necessity, paid off the sheriff, but was raided nonetheless.

Similarly, Onie Collett, who was born on Cloverlick Creek, took up distilling five to seven gallons of moonshine at a time to help feed her six children. For Collett, reliance on moonshining was “just something she come by.” There was no recalling being taught, though she picked-up the skill and her still from her parents. Like most small producers, Collett was caught repeatedly –four times, exactly - for which she received probation twice before being sent to penitentiary twice, for a year each time. Federal agents took her car as well. Indeed, there were serious risks involved in production. Collett was “scared to death” of being caught but had few options except to return time and again to the trade.

Other women, such as Edie Mullins, went into production when their moonshining husbands landed in jail. Edie ran the still while Mr. Mullins was gone because, while there might be occasional work—“dig a ditch or make a fence or something like that for people”—the Mullins “had a bunch of kids” and, at the time, “there wasn’t any work at all.”¹⁶²⁶ The Mullins sold everything they made. A big batch from a sixty gallon barrel took four to five days to run and produced four-to-five gallons that sold for approximately $10 per gallon—a decent income, but not an extravagant sum of money.

Boom or bust, many mountain residents procured extra income from illicit liquor. Large producers, such as one “Mr. Ford,” were most successful during boom times.¹⁶²⁷ But large numbers of people were more likely to turn to the underground economy during market lulls and slumps. Walter Creech notes “people sold it [moonshine] to live on,” especially during the Depression and coming out of the Depression, while Cumberland was still a dry town. Walter began ‘shining when very young --around nine or ten years old--because there was no work. He learned how to distill from his father and brother and sold his product to people (blacks and whites) who came over the mountains. Walter worked at age fourteen in a dairy for a while, then at a sawmill, and at age eighteen he went to work in the mines for US Coal and Coke. Work and pay being insufficient, from age twenty-two to thirty, Walter bootlegged beer and liquor up the creek to a variety of businesses: a liquor store in another county; to “Mary,” who sold whiskey out of her

¹⁶²⁶ Edie Mullins.

restaurant; and Jim Sheppard, who sold it from his business, the Boar’s Nest. According to Creech, many people made whiskey (“every three houses”) when he was young, and most “people sold it to live on.”

Others confirm these general trends. “I’d of went broke if it wasn’t for the moonshine and the girls and the boys too, if you didn’t work in the coal mines,” insists Charles McKnight. During the Depression when work slowed and “WPA relief weren’t nothing,” people found in moonshine an alternative way to get by. “Up Cloverlick, up Cumberland River, down Cumberland River, Line Fork… every kid that went to school, you could almost taste the moonshine on ‘em,” Charles states. That “taste” came in the form of new overalls and dresses when dad sold a pint. As in previous decades, distilling qualified as work to be done to “make a dollar to feed us.” For many, proceeds from moonshine were more reliable than the legal market for their labor.

Like so many others, these individuals found themselves caught in a cycle of poverty and punishment that hindered their ability to transcend the monoeconomy of coal. Most produced small quantities of liquor for sale as part and parcel of living hand-to-mouth, but what they produced could not alter the broader landscape. Under the circumstances, moonshine became a fixture – a crucial underground component of above ground labor markets all of which existed in a necessary symbiosis.

1629 Walter Creech.
In the cash economy of industrial subsistence, mountain residents regularly found themselves surrounded by plenty to purchase with nothing to purchase it with. Under these circumstances, the role of moonshine in the home economy changed. Moonshine sales were often central to survival for clothing and shoes could be purchased or bartered with liquor. Creech traded whiskey for a derby hat and a watch, among other things. And, in addition to putting clothing on the backs of children, mountain dew—once blamed for the “famine” of subsistence—played an important role in putting food on the table. Nevertheless, the narrow vision of local newsprint, beholden to the company line, rendered all moonshiners as violent criminals while celebrating the “spectacular raids” of dry agents.\(^{1631}\) We might view this as the amplification of a truth. The occasional shooting associated with the contraband industry of bootlegging and drunkenness notably existed alongside the obituaries of miners sent to the sweet hereafter by kettle bottoms, fires, explosions, or cave-ins, dismissed as the tragic but accepted consequence of a hazardous job.

As in the past, many moonshiners produced for themselves and sold moonshine on the side when needed. And, to keep the peace with one’s neighbors, many continued to abide by social rules and restrictions. For instance, Jim Giffrey emphasized that he would not sell it to children and didn’t think highly of people getting drunk.\(^{1632}\) But there were also major changes in the trade. Overall, production of moonshine expanded,


became more sugar-based, and became an integral part of the new local economy. Sugar replaced corn because it was easy to come by and because it produced more alcohol than corn, per batch.\textsuperscript{1633} This particular trend linked moonshine production to other cash crops in the nexus of the market economy.

Prohibition enforcement came from a variety of directions. Coal company enforcement varied, not so much in response to violations, but according to company needs. Initially, company enforcement demonstrated corporate paternalism, serving as evidence of the sincerity of management’s concern over employee and community health. We can see this in the case of one Mr. Shelby Turner, who made the mistake of honestly admitting to his supervisor that he had “taking a drink now and then.” The mine superintendent called Turner into his office in the presence of Mr. O’Connell, “impress[ing] upon him the importance of going straight,” while assuring him that he was a valuable employee.\textsuperscript{1634}

This type of benevolent paternalism was ultimately short-lived. Coal companies, in wanting to avoid any “antagonizing effects,” shifted certain functions to the local police and the state. For this reason, Wisconsin Steel opted not to purchase riot guns for mine security; rather, they ensured that the local police, effectively owned and run by the company, were thus armed.\textsuperscript{1635} Similarly, companies turned a blind eye to alcohol

\textsuperscript{1633} Coye Gilbert.  


infractions, leaving the enforcement of prohibition to policing efforts. Motivation for this transition can be found in the early 1920s coal boom, when, in the face of a severe labor shortages, management became increasing reluctant to discharge any employees for anything short of union organizing. With their workers picking up and leaving, some to “go on the farm,” and far more filtering off to potentially better job offers, management devised a new strategy for keeping their employees in place. In the face of widespread non-compliance with prohibition, company dismissals for liquor vanished altogether.  

Rather, the police, who were hired by the company and deputized by the county sheriff, enforced liquor laws with increasingly draconian measures including higher fines, lengthier prison sentences, and sweeping raids of coal company town housing. The weekly round-up of residents for drunkenness, possession and clandestine manufacturing regularly filled the jails. The company would then spring any offending employee, pay the fine and “deduct it from his [the miner’s] pay.”  

The results were an enhanced form of indentured servitude and a nascent private-prison industry as described by the New York Times:

…the records show that 14,000 persons went to the lock-up at one time or another—a profitable guadrennium for the jailer, who is allowed 75 cents a day for feeding each prisoner. A good manager can do it for considerably less.  

---

1636 “Causes of Quits & Discharges” June 1st to 28, 1921 and “Record Turnover Form,” Box 12: Folder: Labor 1921. Benham Mine Manager File Collection, Edsel T. Godbey Appalachian Research Center, Southeast Kentucky Community & Technical College, Kentucky. According to these documents there were no dismissals for alcohol (code 43) for much of 1921.


1638 Daniell, “Behind the Conflict.”
Raids, in particular, served additional purposes such as the seizing of guns that could be used in an armed revolt and harassing individuals of “dubious” association. Initially, raids were limited to individual houses, other structures, or wooded hallows. But by late 1924, a combination of local police and federal agents was raiding whole neighborhoods and even multiple cities at a time. For instance, in October of 1924, law enforcement descended on Lynch, raiding several houses that were targeted for “their foreign element.” One month later officers swept the Tri-City area in a raid that began in Lynch, preceded through Benham, ending finally at Four Mile on the Cumberland River above Poor Fork. The cache for the day included three stills, 175 gallons of wine, and three gallons of liquor as well as five twelve-gallon kegs of moonshine. Aside from enforcing dry laws, the intrusive nature of all raids reiterated lack of privacy and personal and familial control of space in the vilification of a clandestine alternative economy. This pattern lasted into the 1930s with large raids ending in the arrest of both men and women, often solely for possession.

According to the 1930 census, with less than fifty farms, there was “no agriculture to speak of in Harlan County” and most of the county’s population entailed migrant labor


from beyond the mountains. But “Red liquor” and stereotypical depictions of hot-headed mountain men of the “feud belt” persisted as newsprint pondered the exceedingly violent confrontations between coal barons and union men. Indeed, the crusade against alcohol in the wake of national prohibition retained its potency as Harlan’s labor wars reached their zenith, and the coal towns upheld local prohibition as national prohibition came to a close. The worst company abuses waned with unionization but the continuation of prohibition in the coal towns, revenuers and the excise tax, kept the clandestine moonshine economy just that…a source of underground income for marginalized farmers, and a risky alternative in the monoeconomy of coal.

Final Thoughts

In 1912, journalist Oscar Schlief writing for Health magazine contemplated what he considered to be the greatest threat of his time. According to Schlief, at the rate things were going, all of life was at threat of being “pre-digested” and canned. There was canned music, canned housing and “canned cities, with the lid down.” Worse still, the consumption of canned victuals, food that had lost its “body and soul,” so too, Schlief felt strangely empty, “de-natured” like the Tin Man in the Wizard of Oz. How, asked Schlief, had this come to pass? He pondered a list of “inducements” made by men upon women, city dwellers upon farmers, and modern war on populations, before concluding that


1644 Daniell, “Behind the Conflict.”

canning had not only grossly altered the landscape of society, it had likewise “etched similar landscapes on our own insides.” That inner landscape was defined by a “fear that we might not get all there is” or accumulate our “market share” before being hauled off and canned in a casket. Moreover, the “canned life” in both peace and war, refashioned people into “tin soldiers” whose march left in its wake “a trail of desolated tins of all sizes and sexes.”

Schlief also found the home economics of the canned life troublesome. Despite all assurance, he was not convinced that canning saved either food or money. In fact, he felt duped—caught up in an “economic delusion” that did not make sense when one figured in the “price of jars, rubbers, time in purchasing, coal, gas and perspiration, and the expense of a heating outfit” much less, a “new stomach.” Furthermore, he could not help but notice that the impermeable jar only remained impermeable as long as it was not cracked or chipped. Indeed, the whole idea of the hermetic seal *ad infinitum* was highly suspect since rubber seals were only guaranteed for “a season.” All of this caused Schlief to surmise that true health and happiness was to be found in a menu of ferments and strenuous life spent closer to “much-abused… Nature.” Here, the wisdom of simple pickled brine, and things like “wine” and “game” might not last forever, but nonetheless, improved with age. And, as for all those “home destroyers,” the tin cans and jars, the author thought these would best serve society if reincarnated as flowerpots and wind chimes.


While it is best not to take this indictment of the can too literally, it is worth noting that this analogy for modernity touched on important developments: a sense of loss with human separation from nature and the decline of self-reliance and labor that rewards us with the most basic of pleasures, the rise of habitual consumption borne of anxiety over one’s capacity to acquire, the abuse of the environment, and the false pretense of progressive reforms—in other words, modernity itself.

For this project, we can note that tracing the production of space demystifies its alleged reality so we might recognize it as a product of a modern, capitalist system. In tracing time, we see a dialectic that actualizes itself. The “perceived” space of the southern mountains, its reconception through agricultural modernization and industrialization by middle-class journalism, and how all of this was lived, laid the foundation for regional transformation. The result was the reductionism of hygienists and writers who pressed a non-critical knowledge—a quasi-scientific ideology, into the service of power in the quest for a better reality. As Lefebvre notes,

Already in Marx’s time there were plenty of people ready to sing paeans to the progress achieved through economic, social, or political rationality as the way forward to a ‘better’ reality. To them, Marx responded by showing that what they took for progress was merely a growth in the productive forces, which, so far from solving ‘social’ and ‘political’ problems, was bound to exacerbate them.\(^{1648}\)

Indeed, if the quality of food and quantities of clandestine white lightening are a measure of social health as so many reformers claimed, than industrialization was no route to utopia.

\(^{1648}\) LeFebvre, *Production of Space*, 82.
By far the most insidious trend to be traced is the progression of dispossession—the destruction of the environmental base, assault on a subsistence skill set, the loss of land, the sanitation and homogenization of culture, forfeiture of property, and imprisonment of bodies—in the name of health, happiness, and loyalty to the industrial ideology of company and nation. In the fiction of middle-class journalism, the modern nation was afforded reality and substance as if it were natural, masking class contradictions and promoting an illusionary solidarity, resulting in the subordination of the regional economy and culture to national imperatives through violence and the control and exploitation of resources.

In this process the role of the Pasteurian Revolution is paramount. For, as Latour notes, the Pasteurians of industry and their cohorts, the hygienists, not only reduced science to the controlled conditions of the laboratory, they put it to work for industrial agendas.\(^{1649}\) The losers in the ensuing war on fermentation were the “wild” ferments and those guilty by association. The benefactors in this scenario were the “macroparasites”—empire and corporate wealth.\(^ {1650}\) Aside from the benefactors of dispossession, a wide swath of interests benefited from the relegation of fermentation to the industrial sphere. Indeed, the war on fermentation and distillation at the ground level was matched by rapidly expanding fermentation and distillation industries. In addition to a monopolistic National Distiller’s Products Company that emerged practically unchallenged in the


whiskey market at prohibition’s end, making money along the way in livestock fattened on distillery by-products, industrial needs were exempt from the war on fermentation.\textsuperscript{1651} This included the large quantities of alcohol, fuels and solvents used in industrial and chemical processes as well as a wide range of items used in processed food and professional medicine, including vaccines and distillates, standardized cultures for commercial breads and cheese, starches, sweeteners, vitamins, and enzymes. The list goes on and on.

Capitalism’s quest for hegemony, premised on the subjugation of nature including its human components, has long sought to eliminate the possibility of “spontaneous, unattended developments.”\textsuperscript{1652} Over the long haul, we witness this process through waves: the dispossession of natives, followed by subsistence farmers, followed by an assault on life down to the very level of microorganisms. To wage war on fermentation, the processes that arise “from the bottom up,” to claim land, timber, coal, and an agricultural and food system is one of the more compelling examples of the quest for total incorporation of ecosystems into a resource hungry capitalist system.

For these very reasons, I remain intrigued, still, by the image of a dozen or so young adults at a small mountain college grappling an oversized mason jar. It is a very fitting image and a testament to memory. In it we can see the thoroughness of modernization efforts so efficient that they have taken up residence in our kitchens and in

\textsuperscript{1651} Peter Caldwell, “Amalgamation or Trust: Anglo-Scottish and American Comparative Legal Institutions and How They Shaped the Nation’s Whiskey Industries, 1870-1900,” \textit{Business and Economic History} 26, no. 2 (Winter 1997), 486.

our minds. For anyone who has spent any time on farms, farming and canning are synonymous. In the last century, farm families spent the dog-days of summer bent over steaming pots of jars full of a myriad of fruit, vegetables, pickles, and meat. And in taking up canning, mountaineers managed to produce an amazing array of regional delights. But that is not all. The jar is also synonymous with liquor and its illicit proliferation at a specific moment in time. To this effect, we must remember that the jar is a container. Perhaps if we contemplate its inner landscape we will come to know the workings of our world better.

In sifting through the clutter we might once more relocate in distillation a metaphor worth pondering. For, at one time, to distill was to seek eau de vie, the water or essence of life, and today that can mean questioning the privileged status of many nineteen- and twentieth-century concepts that were cultivated in the knowledge market. It can represent the revival of popular and more democratic forms of technology, reskilling, and a reclaiming of heritage and home production to get to the heart, to capture place and all associated memories in a crystal clear liquid that evokes its name, the water of life.
Conclusion:
The Resurrection of John Barleycorn

If the country goes dry it will be either better or worse for the farmer. It cannot be without effect. Most of us have come to the conclusion that John Barleycorn, at best, is an unproductive citizen or rather alien, and at worst a veritable incendiary, while others not only like his association but feel that he enlarges the market for crops… The point we are making here is that every question which affects the market for our output or the welfare of the farmer and his family is a farm question just as truly as is one that relates only to increasing the amount or reducing the cost of production.
-- Dean Eugene Davenport, University of Illinois (1919)

Now at last, John Barleycorn emerges in his true character. He is a bearded grain. Last as first he belongs among the worthies of the farm…Banish John Barleycorn? Banish whiskered Jack and banish all the world!

If one could stand on the eve of national prohibition and look back through the preceding century, the evolving landscape would reveal the transformation of American farming from the dominant subsistence paradigm to commercial production. By 1920, subsistence farming had nearly vanished apart from small struggling pockets. Across this entire transition, temperance advocates stood on every frontier targeting alcohol as an integral part of the old, enduring subsistence economy and its frontier counterpart. Moreover, temperance, by coaxing and coercing farmers to comply with bourgeois values, helped lay the groundwork for industrial food and agriculture.

All along the way there were constant reminders of the movement’s role as a cultural arm of this transition and after a century of temperance agitation, memories of the Whiskey Rebellion and the “feudal power” of drink continued to haunt temperance crusaders. Hon. John G. Woolley of Chicago, one time Prohibition Party presidential

candidate speaking at the World’s Temperance Centennial Congress in Saratoga Springs (1908) recalled for all in attendance, their battle’s epic origins:

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the new world was setting up in business, it was ‘drink’ the old world herald, usher and sergeant at arms of feudal power that had charge. Seed time was time to drink. Harvest time waved its yellow banners over jugs in the fence corners. Barns and homes and schools were raised with the black bottle. The bar was required by law to be set up, convenient to the church. The sacrament was alcoholic. The chief drug in the pharmacopia [sic] was spirits. The drink was godfather at every christening, master of ceremonies at every wedding, first aid in every accident and assistant undertaker at the funeral. It had come with Spanish to St. Augustine in 1565. It had carried the first Virginia election for John Smith in 1507. It was the ‘Dutch courage’ of Manhattan Island in 1615. It led the prayers on Plymouth Rock in 1620. It arrived in Baltimore in 1634. It fuddled the brotherhood of Philadelphia in 1682. It was the first organized treason, in the whiskey rebellion of 1791. It has been the fata morgana of many millions of emigrants to this day. 1654

For Woolley and certain many in attendance, alcohol, the fairy mirage or fata morgana, led the colonies astray and threatened the new commercial order with rebellion. Old world immigrants, as if under the spell of the sorceress Morgana, still followed the mirage to their undoing and thus, the undoing of the nation. As long as alcohol endured, the threat of counter-revolution remained.

The final battle against this imaginary threat merged with another epic battle—the Great War. As of 1913, Anti-Saloon League strategy shifted from local and state bans to the quest for a national amendment. In addition, with the outbreak of war Anti-Saloon League tactics fed into a building anti-German sentiment. With war clouds looming, the fiery preacher Billy Sunday’s anti-booze rants harangued German immigrants, German

sympathizers, and pacifists. Using a string of military metaphors, Sunday questioned loyalties all the while casting temperance as inherently patriotic. Politicians, such as the old Populist candidate William Jennings Bryan (now Secretary of State), threw their weight behind Sunday and his appeal for “temperance recruits” in a “total abstinence army.”

Newsprint chimed in with hawkish delight. “It [Sunday’s booze sermon] is surely the greatest, hottest, deadliest machine-gun and tank drive that ever went over the top after rum,” chimed *Lyceum Magazine*. Accordingly, this “gun” could be credited with making several states go dry and throwing the liquor forces into a panic. The enemy was on the run.

Detractors could be found despite the din, and those few voices, in fact, accused the uproar of hiding other unsavory trends. The editor of Chicago’s *Day Book* pointed out that Sunday’s moral wave and the media frenzy over the war obscured “financial stunts while the people are too busy being reformed.” Newspapers were filled with raids on “anything that is illegal and raidable” minus the unscrupulous activities of railway magnates and “franchise grabbers” who were at work on city councils. According to Cochran, the war against John Barleycorn had become a “distractionary sport” while the public purse was being raided.

~~~


Evoking the wartime needs of the state became a way of silencing and marginalizing criticism even among farmers. The tenor of the time was captured by Grange State Master L.J. Taber, who, at the 1918 Ohio State Fair “made it plain that the Grange as an organization is not in politics.” By this Taber meant that the Grange encouraged acquiescence when it came to US involvement in the war and the politics wedded to its outcome. Speaking directly to farmers, Taber’s message was clear—the farmer’s duty was “to raise more wheat…for the winning of the war.” Any agriculturalist that failed to do so was “a German sympathizer.” In all, Taber instructed farmers to produce as much wheat as possible “regardless of the price,” pay their taxes, buy Liberty Bonds, and support the dry cause.\(^{1659}\) That these “duties” qualified as overtly political activities did not seem to cross his mind. Nor did the article’s author question the wisdom of expanding production for a short-lived wartime economy.

Taber’s injunction was not unique. Indeed, his announcement echoed a wide range of similar mandates. The \textit{Prairie Farmer} published its own rendition of the “Farmer’s War-Time Duty” as a list of must-dos that included furnishing sons for the battlefield, investing in Liberty bonds, donating money and time to the Red Cross, YMCA, and similar organizations, all in addition to saving and producing food.\(^{1660}\) In an attempt to engender farm patriotism Illinois Governor Frank Lowden rhetorically placed farmers on the front. “The real battle,” charged Lowden, “was in the wheat, corn and


potato fields.” Hence farmers had a duty to maximize crop production. In Indiana the press reminded farmers, exempt from conscription, that they had a duty to produce wheat before other crops. The farm wife had duties too; namely to can her fruits and vegetables to save tin canned goods for soldiers. Thus canning demonstrations were planned across the country. President Wilson also chimed in, via the agricultural press, with a message that praised farmers for their undying commitment to this battle for “the whole future of civilization.” In doing, Wilson drew comparisons between the unyielding patriotism of modern tillers of the soil and their historical counterparts in the Revolutionary War. It was a dubious call given historical reality, but in this instance Wilson wasn’t speaking as a historian; he was speaking for the state.

Each of these edicts suggested that when the state calls, farmers must mobilize unquestioningly. And arguably, the wartime rally did much to solidify the temperance front. Even when wartime propagandists did not overtly argue for prohibition, most encouraged the support of organizations closely associated with the dry cause. In addition, farmers were expected to drop crops identified with alcohol manufacture, such as corn and barley, in lieu of wheat. In exchange some farmers hoped that war might act as an agent of change, providing farmers much deserved recognition as a vital leg in the


great national “triumvirate” alongside labor and capital.\textsuperscript{1665} Wallace’s Farmer suggested that since the war came down to the “producing power” of German and American fields, organizing the agricultural sector for a victory might actually inspire a new era of “intelligent support” for farmers from the federal government.\textsuperscript{1666}

Prohibition measures came in quick succession with the League taking advantage of a primed political atmosphere and ASL influence over individual politicians in Congress. On April 11, 1917, Congress adopted national wartime prohibition in the name of conserving grain in the face of rising demand. Additionally the Food and Fuel Control Act (aka the Lever Act) of August 1917 banned distillation. A little over a year later, the Wartime Prohibition Act of 1918 outlawed the manufacture and sale of any beverage exceeding 2.75 percent alcohol. Herbert Hoover, a wealthy mining consultant, was appointed to the newly created US Food Administration under the Lever Act. In this post, Hoover devised price control mechanisms to limit speculation and hence the inflation of prices on wheat and other foodstuff. Meanwhile, the Department of Agriculture established wartime quotas for wheat production that were imposed county by county across the grain belt of the nation. Each of these developments reinforced previous calls for voluntarism with a framework of rewards and punishments.

The consequences of wartime measures were generally upheld as having a positive impact on American agriculture. Not only did farmers appreciate an elevated

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1665} “Farmer’s Statement,” Prairie Farmer, Oct. 25, 1919, 43. Illinois Digital Newspaper Collections (IDNC). University of Illinois.
\end{itemize}
status, as reward for their dedication they were now “getting a pretty fair price for their wheat” thanks to government intervention in the market. Fair is the operative word in this instance. With demand so high that the prices would have been through the ceiling were it not for the command economy, there was no getting rich off the wartime wheat boom. But, on whole, farmers did well. Notes the Prairie Farmer, though wheat prices should have been higher, farmers weren’t complaining because wheat was consistently selling at well over $2 a bushel. Ergo, even at the low end there was good money in wheat.

Meanwhile, in making the world “safe for democracy” against the rampages of the voracious Hun, the temperance crusade had found its millennial battle. The Great War and prohibition went together, noted one major temperance journal, in this “most important event… the greatest and most successful of human wars.” The ASL was quick to reinforce the association. In the League’s 1918 Year Book, author Ernest Cherrington stirred the pot of indignation with claims that “Hun Brewers and the German-American Alliance (an American ethnic German Association) worked together for the Kaiser” seeking to undo “the great dry gains.” Meanwhile, wartime stories told

---


of Germans who conquered the Russians by luring them into towns emptied of all but wine and liquor. Once thoroughly sauced, the wasted Russians proved no match for the Hun. With the Russians routed all seemed lost, at least until America’s dry regiments arrived, accompanied by YMCA workers.\textsuperscript{1671} It was dry America that saved the Allies. And once the war was over, dry America would lead the world in banishing alcohol from the face of the earth.

Domestically, the combination of war and prohibition received accolades for its power to transform German immigrant farmers into loyal Americans engaged in “proper” forms of production and consumption. The most striking example of this can be found in the lengthy story of Scott County, Iowa, published in \textit{Wallace’s Farmer}, in October of 1919. Author, G.R. Bliss, envisioned the war as a source of progress and assimilation in a lengthy contest over this county which dated to the early nineteenth century. According to Bliss, fine old stock Americans originally settled the land. Then an influx of poor and uneducated Germans arrived from Schleswig-Holstein, a province of Northern Germany. The foreigners worked as laborers and tenants initially, but bit-by-bit they took control of the farmland as Anglos sold out in their quest for bigger and better farms farther west. With the loss of its Anglos, the county changed. German replaced English, barley flourished in the fields, and the county so diverged from its neighbors it came to be known as “the state of Scott.”\textsuperscript{1672} Saloons and roadhouses sprung from this “wet” soil—


so many that they outnumbered grocers. (Why viable farms would need many grocers, the author does not query.) Local barley went directly into local breweries and the Scott County farmers came to out-rank all other barley growers in the region. But markets in the early twentieth century fluctuated. Yields diminished. Old timers continued to grow barley out of “instinct,” but the younger generation began to show interest in “progress.” They were moved by a slow simmering temperance movement led by the few remaining Anglos. The markets also rewarded other efforts. As temperance grew and the value of barley diminished, farmers fed their barley to dairy cows and hogs instead of the breweries. Then there was war, and the Scott farmer began to grow wheat “because the government told him so.”1673 Thus the farmers learned not to “fear prohibition.” The saloons disappeared, yet the farmers went “on making money, building fine homes, putting in all modern conveniences, buying fine automobiles, and improving their land.” Throughout the county the

…stars and stripes floated… and all the farmers bought their quota of Victory bonds in one day’s time. They contributed well toward the Red Cross and the Army Y.M.C.A., and sent their boys to fight for humanity in France.1674

Thus Scott County made its circuitous journey back into its proper place as “a very valuable, prosperous and loyal part of the United States of America.” The themes are strikingly mythic: a prodigal population and its landscape returns to the national fold; the “new” and “improved” replaces the “old” and “instinctual;” and producers become consumers by the guiding hands of temperance, the market, and the state.


1673 “Barley Beer and Barley Feed,” 2065, 2075.

1674 “Barley Beer and Barley Feed,” 2065, 2075.
There were signs, however, that not everyone marched along so cheerfully; and for the recalcitrant, there was the discipline of the state. As of spring, 1918, the Food Administration (FA) empowered state administrators to seize grain from so-called “German sympathizers.” According to the press, between 100,000 to 180,000 bushels had already been seized and more requisitions were expected in the Northwest grain belt, home to a large population of Germans. Two brothers “of German extraction” living in New Mexico, were among the first farmers subjected to requisition.\(^{1675}\) Whether these brothers were moved by politics or pecuniary interest is unclear. We can say, however, that farmers in various locations had refused to sell their wheat to state food administrators primarily because grain could fetch a better price outside of government price controls. Some also stubbornly held onto their harvests out of protest of grain commission prices that they felt were too low. Millers defied the system too by selling into the illicit market that served a domestic shortfall of 45 million bushels of wheat annually—a shortage that limited Americans to two pounds of wheat flour per week. For their “rebellious attitudes,” the FA withdrew licenses from mills operating in several locations ranging from South Hutchinson, Kansas to Belding, Michigan.\(^{1676}\) Beyond that, the FA could be excessively rigid in its demands that farmers get their wheat out by set dates. If the farmers failed, the FA threatened to hire workers and trucks to requisition the grain at the expense of the farmer. These demands were particularly aggravating for farmers in the northern latitudes where weather did not necessarily coincide with

\(^{1675}\) “Wheat to be Seized,” *The Grain Dealers Journal XL*, no. 7 (Apr. 10, 1918), 561.

\(^{1676}\) “War Affecting the Grain Trade,” 568.
bureaucratic deadlines. Notably, regardless of the circumstance, the government seized crops “on the ground that holding was aiding the enemy.”¹⁶⁷⁷ War, as is often the case, had made dispossessio acceptable.

Still, many argued that farmers generally benefited from the command economy of war. Wallace’s Farmer decried the fact that the armament industries profited most, nevertheless, the paper concluded that corn, oat, and wheat farmers were profiting and using their surplus income to invest in bonds.¹⁶⁷⁸ In addition, Prairie Farmer argued that a stabilized price and not having to deal with the warehouse men of the “old gambling system” was good news in and of itself.¹⁶⁷⁹ Of course, the benefit of a stabilized price benefited the government far more than the farmers.

Temporary wartime prohibition was rapidly replaced with constitutional prohibition absent of a direct national referendum. In August 1917, just four months after the passage of the wartime measure, members of Congress took up the League’s proposal for an amendment in return for the League’s political endorsement in the upcoming election. Having passed in both the Senate and House, the amendment was sent to the state legislatures for ratification. Thirteen months later, prohibition was official. The industry was granted one year to liquidate its holdings before enforcement began on January 16, 1920. What exactly this meant was not clear until the passage of the Volstead Act on October 27, 1919. As with wartime prohibition, this militant enforcement act

¹⁶⁷⁷ “War Affecting the Grain Trade,” 568.


came into being under the guise that the US was still in a state of war because many American troops remained abroad after the November 11, 1918 armistice. Wilson vetoed the measure on grounds that use of the war to implement the designs of a few was distasteful, but Congress quickly overturned his veto.\footnote{Kyvig, \textit{Repealing National Prohibition}, 13.}

For the public at large the Volstead Act—the brainchild of the League’s general counsel, Wayne Wheeler-- was a shock. In outlining enforcement protocol, the act defined illegal intoxicating beverages as any drink containing more than half a percent of alcohol. “The .5 percent provision,” observes historian David Kyvig, “surprised considerable numbers of persons who assumed that, as had been the case with many state laws, only distilled spirits would be banned.”\footnote{Kyvig, \textit{Repealing National Prohibition}, 13.} Indeed, of the twenty-six state prohibitionary laws, half contained allowances for beer and wine. In other words, only approximately one quarter of states had legislation resembling national prohibition under the Volstead Act prior to its passage. So extreme was the act that under its provisions (had they been fully enforced) even sauerkraut and German chocolate cake, which contain a very small amount of alcohol, would have been illegal.\footnote{Prohibition.}

Prior to the final ratification of the amendment, some looked to the potential of voter referendums in nullifying state ratification. But the Supreme Court squashed this hope when it nullified an Ohio referendum and upheld ratification by legislature alone.
With what appeared to be the final nail in the coffin, Wayne Wheeler of the ASL asserted that “the beverage liquor traffic was dead as slavery.”

The agricultural press treated these developments with a form of resignation. With prohibition looming, newspapers encouraged farmers to consider how they might benefit from the demise of the doomed alcohol beverage industries. Through the nineteen-teens, the agricultural press had emphasized that sales of alcohol to American consumers put money into the pockets of the monopolist—money that should go to rural producers of more salubrious foodstuff. With alcohol production cast as a drain on society, many imagined prohibition as a way to capture wealth from Sir John Barleycorn who, by this point, personified a foreign aristocratic element as much as the small subsistence farmer. Orchardists in Ohio, for instance, were encouraged to imagine their fruit as a refreshing and potentially profitable substitute for drink, that is, if the overpowering allure of alcohol was eliminated. One correspondent with the Ohio Farmer even suggested that “The regular apple eater [would] never contract the liquor habit.” Indeed, this writer claimed that “There is a mutual aversion between the apple and John Barleycorn”—a rather curious statement given the lengthy history apple cider and applejack production in the US. Regardless, with a bit of wishful thinking, apples could be constructed as an aid to temperance and temperance, an aid to the apple farmer, as states such as Ohio vied for the title of the “land of apples.”

Similarly, dairy farmers who had suffered loss of

\[1683\] “John Barleycorn’s One Remaining Hope,” 19.

control over the price of milk in the expanding dairy market were encouraged to see opportunity in prohibition. The rural weekly, *Farmers Wife*, reveled in the possibilities: “What would be better for our national beverage than milk, now that the nation has tried and convicted John Barleycorn?” In working with dairy cattle, women could make money and plenty of this “perfect food” in an “upward climb” towards health and mutual well-being.\(^\text{1685}\)

Even beekeepers could expect the windfall effects of wealth redistribution with John Barleycorn’s exile. Francis Jager, Professor at the University of Minnesota and president of the National Bee Association, confirmed this sentiment, saying, “Beekeepers think driving John Barleycorn out of the United States is going to increase the demand for honey.” The reasoning was simple. According to Jager’s observation of consumer trends in dry states and counties, “When men give up alcohol or tobacco or both, they turn into sweet-eaters.” In gaming the prohibition market the farmer or his wife might consider large-scale honey production so as to capture anticipated windfall prices of 40 to 50 cents per pound for honey.\(^\text{1686}\)

But prohibition did not play out as envisioned. The real rush came to the landlord, not the farmer. As one periodical noted, when John Barleycorn “gave up his ghost,” businesses dashed in to bid over Barleycorn’s “corpse” –vacated hotels, breweries, and saloons, all of which were picked up in a mad urban real estate rush that meant handsome


profits for a select few in cities across the country. In the attempt to liquate assets, owners sold buildings at a loss, and with long-term leases broken, shops with low rents became some of the “most expensive spaces in the world.” New chain stores, motion picture “palaces,” and soda joints turned “Prohibition’s casualties into profits”; all of which supposedly revealed the accruing benefits of the dry law.\textsuperscript{1687}

Meanwhile, agricultural markets took a sharp decline. As price controls were lifted and European production revived, farmer’s watched with horror as prices plummeted in a world awash in commodities. Economic losses for farmers by consequence of prohibition were apparent by the early 1920s. In 1921, a delegate from Minnesota speaking before the Senate and House Joint Committee claimed that the lost market for barley was costing Minnesota farmers $30,000,000 annually. The delegation, led by Charles D. Kenney of the Minnesota Farmers’ Elevator Association who happened to live in the same district as Andrew J. Volstead, chairman of the House Committee of the Judiciary and whose name emblazoned the enforcement act, requested a modification to the law to allow for sale of 2.75\% beer. Kenney noted that some areas of the state could only grow barley profitably. Likewise, his associate, R.H. Jones of the Minnesota grain dealers claimed that Minnesota farmers were in consensus in their opposition to prohibition as were farmers across the grain-growing states. Petitions were circulated in Minnesota, the Dakotas, Iowa, and Wisconsin, with farmers calling for allowances for low alcohol beer. According to Jones, 80,000,000 bushels of barley had annually gone to

\textsuperscript{1687} “Prohibition and Realty Values: Volsteadism a Blessing in Disguise to Landlords” \textit{Current Opinion}, Apr. 1, 1924, 462. This article reiterates a similar piece by Felix Isman in the \textit{Saturday Evening Post}. 
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beer production. Jones also argued that with the restoration of this outlet suppressed grain prices would rebound to the tune of $300,000,000 of income to farmers in the Northwest. But this was not all. “[T]he salvation, not only of the barley crop, but of the whole cereal industry,” was at stake, argued Jones.\footnote{1688} American farmers had run to wheat to meet the demands of the Great War. But in years since, grain markets had crashed. When prohibition went into effect, high-grade barley lost its status and was lumped in with cattle feed. In response, some farmers turned to wheat production, thus contributing to the over-production of wheat. By 1927, California farmers also complained of losses in land values to the tune of $23 billion due to losses in barley, rice and other cereals used in the manufacture of beer. Hop producers suffered too. Between 1910 and 1913, according to Department of Agriculture statistics, the US produced 43,900,000 pounds of hops annually as compared to 4,000,000 lbs in 1924. Exports of hops did grow, but overall, “the condition of American hop growers ha[d] grown more precarious because they [were] almost entirely dependent upon foreign demand.”\footnote{1689} Clearly the pain felt by the loss of one branch of producers had rippled through the agricultural sector disrupting the lives of many who were not necessarily directly connected with the production of spirits.

But economists argued otherwise. For them, losses concentrated among farmers who had successfully specialized but failed to garner the political attention necessary for legislative reform. Prof. Herman Feldman of Dartmouth College argued against 2.75%
beer on the grounds that doing so served only a minority. “From a national standpoint modification of the liquor laws,” Feldman asserted, “would not be of general aid to the farming industry as a whole.” Besides, in a twist of irony, dry farmers in New England had reported unprecedented sales for apples—not as table fruit but as “dropped fruit.” A sudden rush of buyers had materialized seeking large quantities of damaged fallen fruit that farmers previously allowed to rot. Sold at $3 per barrel, this fruit found its way into dusted-off cider presses throughout the region. The Ohio Farmer also reported numerous requests for information on regulations for producing cider with recommendations that farmers inquire with the federal prohibition director or read the Farmers’ Bulletin No. 1264. Furthermore, wine grape production had increased by leaps and bounds in California since prohibition’s onset. The conditions of wartime prohibition proved a harbinger of things to come. Even as early as 1919, growers reported “ravenous demand” in all major grape-growing districts. In California, the 60,000 acres of wine grape in production in 1919 had swelled to 140,000 by 1926. This spike in consumption went into home-winemaking which was not subject to law enforcement. In light of these developments, Feldman’s logic essentially fell within existing


assumptions that farmers simply needed to adjust to existing market demands with prohibition as the newest factor to negotiate.

Complaints were not limited to wheat, barley and hop farmers. By the summer of 1923, the markets for corn and potatoes were, according to the *New York Clipper*, “so low farmers were poverty stricken.” The paper stressed that “Prohibition and the Volstead Act [were] blamed for conditions.” Formerly, cheap, tremendous quantities of corn and potatoes went into the manufacture of alcohol. Without this outlet, surpluses glutted the market. Indeed, prices had dropped to such depths that farmers in North Dakota were abandoning fertile farms, or renting them out, house, equipment and all, for as little as $25 a year. Sentiment, the author quipped, had also turned violently against the “church morons,” who continued to oppose modifications to the amendment and the Volstead Act. As in the past, the appeal of temperance ideology faded fast among agriculturalists in the absence of economic stability.

In the South and West, a farm bloc formed whose legislatures pushed for relief. The Grain Futures Act (1921), Capper-Volstead Act (1922) and Agricultural Credits Act (1923), granted the Secretary of Agriculture a modicum of control over the grain exchange, exempted co-ops from anti-trust laws, and extended credit to farmers, respectively. But the cumulative benefits of all three did painfully little to aid farmers in any serious fashion because none of these measures addressed the core problem of surplus. The reigning logic that innovation and “improvement” geared for mass

---

production could insulate farmers from the constant threat of falling prices was, in the end, a perfect recipe for overproduction and collapsing markets. Farmers had little choice. They were caught in a race to the bottom. In light of this, some farmers looked to the security of the wartime command economy and called for price supports. Representatives Charles McNary of Oregon and Gilbert Haugen of Iowa composed legislation for this purpose. In short, the plan called for Washington to purchase farm surpluses to be dumped abroad or stored at a loss born by taxpayers. With all honesty, this form of government support amounted to just another band aid for systemic problems. Still, the McNary-Haugen Bill repeatedly came up for vote from 1924 to 1928, and repeatedly failed due to fierce opposition from the Harding and Coolidge Administrations for whom relief programs and price supports for farmers ran counter to market logic. Of course, the same administrations eagerly subsidized industry. Loyalty to classical economics had always been selective. The central point is this: Once more, farmers found themselves caught in a market contradiction. Worse still, political leadership in the ruling party, as notes historian William E. Leuchtenburg, “spoke for the urban industrialist and had nothing to say to the beleaguered farmer.” Allied to business, the Republicans, notes Leuchtenburg, had rediscovered “their patron saint” in Alexander Hamilton.

As of 1926, the Department of Agriculture’s yearbook ascribed the ongoing agricultural depression to prohibition, at least in part. The Committee on Agriculture

---
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floated potential farm relief bills, none of which met a warm welcome in the House, and only a lukewarm reception by “all Representatives confronted by farm constituencies [who felt] obliged to take seriously.” Nor was the party willing to touch the Volstead Act. Representative Loring Black, a Democrat of New York’s fifth district, argued for beer’s capacity to do three times of the work of relief. But as avowed champions of prohibition, the GOP refused to challenge prohibition as it stood; after all, the economy was booming, and the League continued to work against any “wet” candidate.\footnote{1698}{\textit{"Rustic John Barleycorn," }\textit{New York Times}, May 8, 1926, 16. ProQuest Historical Newspapers. Kyvic, Repealing National Prohibition, 63.} Indeed, League influence made any challenge taboo—veritable “poison ivy” as expressed in one political cartoon in the \textit{Current Opinion}.\footnote{1699}{\textit{“John Barleycorn’s One Remaining Hope,” }\textit{Current Opinion} 69, no. 1 (Jul 1920), 20.}

Meanwhile, Free Alcohol, already severely crippled by other factors, fell to the wayside. Wartime demand for wheat directed farmer interest away from alcohol production. Simply put, it no longer made sense to convert pricey grain into alcohol. In addition, national prohibition, once and for all, squashed the dream of independent farm stills. The potential for diversion into bootlegging was too great a liability. Sentiment had also turned against similar European practices. Charles A. Crampton, the Chief Chemist of the Internal Revenue Bureau and his superior John G. Capers, US Commissioner of Internal Revenue, denounced the “whole denatured alcohol business in Germany as paternalistic”-- a function of imperial politics in Germany’s quest for energy
independence from American oil. In essence, Free Alcohol as a challenge to big oil had become unpatriotic.

What little industrial alcohol that was produced through a handful of independent distilleries largely went to wartime needs. Thus John Barleycorn was conscripted for the manufacture of gunpowder and mustard gas. The landscape of cooperative distilleries next to fields and feedlots never materialized. Simultaneously, prohibition wiped out what remained of small breweries that utilized local crops. Big breweries, however, survived by shifting to the production of malt extract for candy making or yeast, just as large distillers specialized in medicinal or industrial alcohol for in the interim of prohibition.

By 1928, a deep cynicism had settled over the grain belt. As one paper noted, the Republicans, as the party of industry, would do nothing that threatened to take a bite from the “pie” of “industrial communities.” The author scoffed at the maxim that representative government was somehow better than a direct vote. Indeed, the author notes that the “broadest problems” were “overlooked at the time of election” and prohibition fell into that category of neglected issues. No change could be expected, he
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mused, until trends “drift[ed] into a natural solution in the open sea of time or until they break the dam of discontent.”

The dam of discontent broke during the 1928 election. On June 13th, an army of farmers stormed the Republican National Convention in Kansas City. Over 2,000 arrived from states across the South and West demanding “immediate and adequate aid” for the three million farmers they represented. These protestors were spurred by the realization that the convention favored the nomination of Herbert Hoover, the old Secretary of Commerce who had capped grain prices during the war and now stood adamantly opposed to farm relief. Hoover took the cavalier attitude that if farmers were in trouble they should seek a solution in crop specialization and co-ops. Posed with yet another administration unfriendly to their concerns, the tillers advanced on the convention hall where doormen denied them admission. Twenty large and brawny fellows, however, pushed their way through before being nabbed by “blue coats” and tossed out on the sidewalk, “indignant and disheveled.” Rejected by the party of the Homestead Act, the farmer army, thus mobilized as a sea of denim and broadcloth with rakes, hoes, and shovels in hand, circled the hall thrice with forty bandsmen playing Chopin’s Funeral March. “Don’t make us vote a Democratic ticket” read their banner. As the New York Times asserted, this was their “last demonstration.”


Two weeks later the protesters found a warm greeting at the Democratic National Convention in Houston, Texas. The Democrats became the farmer’s party of choice in light of GOP inaction. Consequently, the 1928 election became a referendum on farm relief and prohibition.\textsuperscript{1705} The Democrats, however, did not emerge victorious. In fact, they were “licked” by Republicans running on law-and-order platforms and the equation of the extraordinary economic achievements of the decade with prohibition.\textsuperscript{1706} Regardless, the shift put in motion a new chapter in prohibition politics.

With over a decade of agricultural depression, farmers overwhelming supported the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. In February of 1930, Pierce Blewett, farmer and mayor of Jamestown, North Dakota, went before the House Judiciary Committee composed, largely of representatives from dry rural districts. “Farming in this country has been ruined, I think, by prohibition,” stated Blewett. “It has taken away our barley, rye and corn markets and given us a wheat surplus. It has turned many farms into distilleries.” Over-production of wheat had degraded the soil as other crops diminished. What’s more, John Barleycorn was not dead. Rather, he had survived in a shadowy form. As mayor of Jamestown, Blewett tried to enforce prohibition but his agents were quickly corrupted. In addition, booze had poured over the border from Canada, siphoning money from his state.\textsuperscript{1707}
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Blewett explained that farmers had been mistaken in their support for prohibition. Prohibition was a nostrum that had proved ineffective for rural difficulties. That is no surprise. But what of John Barleycorn? Certainly, there is more to be said about his various incarnations and resurrection.

Blewett was not alone. Others correctly surmised that the funerals held for John Barleycorn across the US were only “mock” burials with notations that this trend had historic precedent in failure of previous prohibition laws dating back to eighteenth-century Britain. In addition, author Benjamin De Casseres suspected that John Barleycorn was only “playing opossum” since New Yorkers “simply refused to take prohibition seriously.” Indeed, there were numerous reported “sightings” of Barleycorn. He lived openly in Wisconsin, the so-called “traitor state,” where prohibition went largely unenforced. Elsewhere, he was spotted aiding farmers as the landscape of illicit ferments grew. In the Midwest, Barleycorn’s spirit seemed to animate bootleggers as they took up moonshine production using corn sugar and depressed farm stock.

Barleycorn came to haunt the most forsaken spaces. For instance, smuggling converted the Hi-Line, backcountry of Montana and one of the last holdouts of subsistence farming, into an artery of the black market. Tucked into mountain ravines,
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bubbling stills performed their magic. Locals brewed beer and pressed wine in an extensive cottage industry. Deliveries were arranged by landmarks—glacial rock outcroppings and lightning struck trees. Notes Beverly Badhorse, in this often dangerous terrain, “many outlaws were caring and thoughtful,” for they delivered clothing, spare parts and even apple seedlings, with some unasked for items appearing mysteriously on the doorsteps of needy homesteaders. 1712 A new breed of highwaymen had surfaced with John Barleycorn as their confidant.

In Appalachia where reformers once hoped to bury John Barleycorn to eliminate the “hick,” John became a champion of what was now viewed as an endangered species. The tourist press, in an oddly sentimental fashion pointed out that Barleycorn still endured in the “primeval grandeur” of Appalachia, the old “Paradise of the moonshiner,” where the southern highlander might give “up his couch to the visiting preacher, only to utilize the restless night in tending his still.” 1713 The peril of industrial development and the rush of federal agents suddenly seemed greater than the peril of the still, especially when one’s focus turned to the “last of the eastern wildness.” For this author at least, industrial and state forces represented the true agents of devastation and ruin. Was this the “last stand” of the chestnut, the oak, and the mountaineer? 1714 Or could these endure on some level like Barleycorn’s restless ghost?
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Not everyone celebrated John’s survival. His refusal to be buried—his “boot-leg
kicks out of the grave,” shrieked the *Christian Advocate*, exhibited, once more, the “black
teeth” of a demon that first reared its head in the “Whisky [sic] Rebellion.” Such
papers constructed any defiance of temperance as the latest in treason. Hence the
*Advocate* insisted that all residents in the nation had an absolute moral obligation to obey
the law as a show of fidelity to the state. By nature, the liquor traffic defied law and
order. Its defiance in the face of prohibition served as proof that it “could act in no other
way.” This mentality called for new draconian measures of enforcement: increased
federal and state spending, fines, and sentencing.

But the shadowy Barleycorn had numerous champions. In his new subterranean
existence, John Barleycorn continued to represent rooted cultural attachments to drinking
and popular sentiment that moved in opposition to the police state. Beginning in 1922,
voters began to chip away at laws funding state enforcement. This strategy proved
particularly important where a dry minority dominated state politics as was the case in
Montana, where, in 1926, voters repealed state enforcement via the initiative.

Likewise, at a time when formal politics accepted prohibition as a permanent
legal fixture, the pervasive use of jury nullification—the refusal of juries to indict or
convict despite evidence of guilt—reflected widespread disdain for the Eighteenth
Amendment and its effects. As legal historian Jeffrey B. Abramson notes, jury


nullification is a form of civil disobedience against what is viewed as an unjust law. Notes Abramson, “for anyone to take seriously the jury as a bridge between community values and the laws, jury nullification is a strong plank” the purpose of which “empowers jurors to appeal to fundamental principles of justice over and above the law.” Its roots are noteworthy. Arising with trial by jury under the Magna Carta, jury nullification is an institution of medieval origins. Known as “pious perjury,” nullification served as a counterweight to the notorious “Bloody Codes” of England which prescribed death sentences on beggary, witchcraft, petty theft, and other numerous minor offenses. The tendency of juries to acquit in the face of excessively cruel laws migrated to America during the colonial era. Thus lodged in legal heritage, the practice resurred repeatedly when, as historian Clay S. Conrad points out, “legislative ambition again [overtook] its legitimate bounds.” The “jury revolt” against prohibition stands at the greatest example of recent unorganized juror resistance resulting in up to a 60% acquittal rate in some regions. Inherently populist, nullification on this scale materialized without the aid of promotional literature, arising instead from “deeply ingrained” social custom.

Already in use in the 1870s by rural southern farmers in opposition to revenuers, nullification spread with prohibition legislation. In West Virginia prior to national
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prohibition, juries rebelled against harsh state laws described by the *Unitarian Register* as “the most drastic ever written upon the statute books.” Public officials in charge of enforcement confirmed that “[v]ery few convictions were secured” though “[m]oonshine stills and blind tigers flourished everywhere.”\textsuperscript{1722}

During prohibition, what began as a regional rural rebellion became the hope of notable legal minds such as that of Clarence Darrow when the possibility of generating the necessary supermajority needed to repeal the amendment seemed unlikely.\textsuperscript{1723} With time even middle-class publications suggested that a little legal anarchy in the face of bad legislation could be a positive thing. In 1925, legal scholar Arthur R. Hadley, fearing the loss of democracy to legal tyranny, came out in favor of nullification in an article published in *Harper’s Magazine*.\textsuperscript{1724} In 1927, the liberal Catholic theologian Father John A. Ryan followed with support for civil disobedience out of his understanding of prohibition as socially harmful and an affront to civil liberties.\textsuperscript{1725}

The implications of nullification are debated. James H. Landman argues that the practice reflects the willingness of people to rule on conscience not law—a practice that often opposed by authorities as an appropriation of power dating back to its origins. Likewise Landman notes that, historically, opposition to nullification reflects an attempt to negate the commoner’s capacity for rational judgment, especially of “rustics”
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otherwise contrived as unqualified to assess the validity of law.\textsuperscript{1726} Others, such as Hiroshi Fukurai and Richard Krooth argue that nullification primarily functions as a gauge of public sentiment regarding the morality of legal priorities.\textsuperscript{1727} More specifically, Conrad argues that widespread nullification in 1920s America exposed the law as exceeding “the limits of social consciousness”; namely, the widely held tenet that the individual had the “right to be left alone,” so long as one does not harm others.\textsuperscript{1728}

The fact that so many Americans in the 1920s came to view nullification as the people’s remedy to legal tyranny is testament to the survival of the social practices and principles of the commons. At the heart of the commons is vernacular law—those informal forms of governance born of social negotiation that become deeply ingrained with time and the moral legitimacy of community. Decentralized and committed to the larger collective, nullification reflects an older paradigm that still held value over official forms of government.

That said we must also recognize that farmer protests and jury nullification contributed to the Eighteenth Amendment’s repeal by threatening to create the very conditions middle-class reformers feared most. We could even say that the antiprohibition movement was piqued in response to the populist rejection of the law. Over forty antiprohibition societies—most of which were small and short-lived—formed
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during the 1920s. Of these, four major organizations emerged to successfully coordinate campaigns for repeal. These included the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment (AAPA), the Women’s Organization for National Prohibition Reform (WONPR), the Voluntary Committee of Lawyers, and the Crusaders. All four were composed of urbanites, professionals, and members who favored repeal on the same grounds that previous reformers favored prohibition. Antiprohibitionists were aroused, on one hand, but the rapid expansion of federal government power at the cost of free enterprise and other liberal institutions, and on the other hand, by the threat of widespread noncompliance, criminality, and “moral decay.” Many opposed the expense of enforcement as burdensome taxes borne by legitimate business. Others argued that prohibition unleashed a poisonous tide of alcohol greater than what existed before the Eighteenth. To them, prohibition meant growing political corruption, disrespect for government and social instability that harbored Bolshevism. But most of all, this new wave of activists shared the concern that widespread noncompliance fostered an erosion of law that imperiled the very future of the government.\textsuperscript{1729} Indeed, on these grounds the AAPA vehemently opposed nullification.\textsuperscript{1730} Notably, to address these threats, the AAPA and its counterparts employed the same strategies utilized by their prohibitionist counterparts. Their publicity campaigns unleashed a deluge of propaganda into the public sphere, they forged alliances with prominent politicians and business leadership, their
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coffers relied heavily on deep pockets, and their lawyers worked behind the scenes promoting legal resolutions to facilitate their cause.\textsuperscript{1731}

In the end, sufficient pressure for repeal came only with economic depression, the loss of general prosperity, the rise of the Democrats with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the endorsement of major industrialists including the du Pont brothers (Pierre, Irénée, and Lammont II), businessman John J. Raskob of General Motors, and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., among others.\textsuperscript{1732} It was depression and the near death of the capitalist system that discredited the temperance ideology behind prohibition. It was the depression that invalidated the Republican platform, the party’s cozy relationship with business and its support for prohibition as morally and economically sound. It was the depression that revealed the permanent prosperity of the “New Era” as a sham—the illusion of easy money, wealth without work, and growth without limits. There were warnings—growing macrocontradictions within the system including an ongoing agricultural depression, the gravitation of capital toward the few at the expense of the many, and a world swimming in debt—all of which were already in place at the end of the First World War.

The unraveling economy raised the specter of revolution. In the last few months of the Hoover administration, conditions steadily deteriorated. Indeed, as historian Michael Hiltzik has noted, in the two weeks prior to Roosevelt’s inauguration,
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“[conditions] had taken a sickening plunge, as if pitched over the rim of a waterfall.”

In the southern plains the beginnings of a decade long drought added to the pain of rural depression. Having plowed up millions of acres of prairie to grow wheat, the loose and desiccated soil over the next few years would literally blow away in the Dust Bowl, one of the greatest manmade ecological disasters in history. Elsewhere in rural America, commodity prices flat-lined well below production costs, aggravating the already desperate conditions of rural communities. In response a dormant, but not dead, rural radicalism stirred to life. Members of the newly formed Farm Holiday Association called for national farmers’ strikes with farmers pledging to withhold their products from the market. As the movement expanded, their tactics grew in militancy. They refused to pay taxes, to leave foreclosed homes, and to buy or sell anything. In Iowa, whole communities of farmers blocked the auctioning of foreclosed farms. Others destroyed crops and shut down roadways with blockades. A few homesteaders even “locked up Sheriffs in brooder [chicken] houses” or drove authorities off their land at gunpoint. Pushed to the breaking point, farmers in small town meetings rediscovered old phrases such as “Justice above the law.”

With crowds threatening to lynch any banker who appeared at foreclosure sales, state courts and legislatures scrambled to respond. Meanwhile, in the nation’s capitol, the National Farm Union president, John Andrew Simpson, “informed the Senate Committee on Agriculture, ‘The biggest crop of

---

revolutions you ever saw is sprouting all over this country right now.”
Paralysis, however gripped Washington. Unemployment soared and the banking system teetered on the verge of collapse. The economy was shutting down and the pitchforks were coming.

It is established knowledge that the goal of the Roosevelt administration was to rescue capitalism by humanizing it with piecemeal legislation. The 1932 Democratic Convention called for prohibition’s repeal and Roosevelt’s platform promised a multi-pronged approach to farm relief. After the election as the new administration mapped its plans for sweeping new legislation, the new Democratic Congress prior to FDR’s inauguration tested the waters with legislation for the Twenty-First amendment. The easy passage of the Twenty-First over the dry Republican minority officially signaled the end of an era. It also opened the floor to a deluge of New Deal legislation.

The passage of the Twenty-first Amendment as one of the first major actions of new administration served many purposes. Accomplishing what appeared to be an impossible feat—repealing an amendment to the Constitution, emboldened the new Congress. The amendment signaled dedication to popular demands, especially the demands of farmers. It offered a way to arrest legal anarchy and thus salvage law itself, the basis of centralized government, the largest concern of the antiprohibitionists. It revived what had been a very large and vibrant industry, which meant jobs and economic


activity when the country needed it most. Finally, repeal meant revenue: millions of dollars in taxes to help fund New Deal programs.

Prohibition was declared dead and officially buried with the ratification of the Twenty-first Amendment on December 5, 1933. In celebration, major supporters of the AAPA and other antiprohibition groups joined with many honored guests including figures from government, business, and the arts and sciences in the grand ballroom of New York City’s Hotel Astor. Roosevelt’s secretary was there, along with Mayor-elect Fiorello La Guardia. After dinner, with a menu that included no wine (a faux pas quickly remedied by guests and hotel management), “the stage was set,” claims the New York Times, for a “traditional frolic.” “Old Man Gloom and his Prohibitionist Pall-bearers” delivered the lifeless body of “John Bacchus Barleycorn,” bier and all, to the dramatis personae of the new Democratic order: FDR’s Brain Trust dressed in “academic garb,” a surgeon labeled “New Deal,” and his assistant nurse, the “NRA.” With an injection from a hypodermic needle labeled “repeal,” Barleycorn, the “garlanded Bacchus,” sprang to life.1738

In some ways, the referencing was appropriate. The National Recovery Administration, while it lasted, did challenge unbridled competitiveness. Furthermore, under the New Deal the federal government would strive, for the first time, to address the problem of agricultural overproduction, though modernity and farming continued to be an uneasy marriage. Moreover, the general sentiment of society had shifted. A new “mood

and tempo,” claimed the New York Times, had settled over the country. Notes author Robert L. Duffus, a student of Thorstein Veblen, “It is no coincidence that the collapse of prohibition followed the collapse of the stock market.” The twenties, explains Duffus, was the “neurotic decade” as defined by three phenomena of excess: prohibition, bootlegging, and unbridled speculation. The nation in its new “realistic mood” rejected the lot as symptomatic of unrealistic dreams and imprudent materialistic ambition. In place of the old, a new “mature and mellow civilization” was emerging. Pondering the future, Duffus surmised that the country would share with France, Spain, and Italy an attitude that was “more thankful for small favors from the Fates” and “more leisurely” in its work and drinking habits. It all came down to understanding limits. As if responding to Jack London’s brooding novel, Duffus concludes, “We discovered as a nation that we cannot have the moon, no matter how much we may cry for it.”

Of course the benefit of hindsight proves otherwise. The “frolic” at the Astor was, after all, just a show, and one that had little to do with the frolics of the old subsistence paradigm. Nor did it accurately reflect politics. After all, the Twenty-first Amendment preceded other New Deal legislation. Arguably, John Barleycorn gave life to the New Deal.

Though a displaced folk figure in a modern world, John Barleycorn in the broadest sense of meaning, never really died. For that matter, at no point was Barleycorn just alcohol, nor was the assault on alcohol merely the rejection of a consumer good, for

it is doubtful that alcohol as a commodity alone would ever have been perceived as a threat worth banishing. As a vehicle of commoning, Barleycorn’s associations endured in populist revivals. He returned repeatedly as a reminder of the indissoluble links between people, and the companionship of humans and their environment. Ever the trickster, his humor is wry and ironic, laughing as it were with a sort of cosmic wisdom at life’s absurdities, and especially at human folly. Certainly such a figure would laugh at any attempt to formally bury or resurrect him.

In closing, the politics of space remain telling. The celebration at the Astor ceremonialized the return of a legal beverage industry among other industries dominated for the most part by powerful interests. The mountains tell another tale. Stills would continue to bubble in their hollows, agents would continue to ferret them out in the name of enforcing the excise, and a new era of prohibition known as the drug war would be launched by the end of the decade.
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