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During the First World War, Texas enjoyed a special relationship with the military. It hosted more training camps and military bases than all other states and nearly thirty communities eventually contained some form of military installation by war's end. These facilities ranged in size from the military training camps, in which thousands were stationed, down to schools to train aviators and nurses which contained less than a hundred people. The federal government established four of the sixteen military training camps, or cantonments, in the Lone Star State, scattering the others throughout the country. By the time of the Armistice, more than 200,000 men and women had been trained in Texas, ranging from the large and populous Camp Travis in San Antonio to the smaller nursing school in Houston, pouring millions of dollars into the state's economy. Texas drys argued that their state had a special obligation to the rest of the nation, and to the mothers and fathers of the military personnel, to provide a virtuous and healthy setting for the training. Alcohol, the prohibitionists avowed, would wreck the clean environment of the camps and undermine fighting strength, and had to be eliminated as a military obligation.

W.R. Sinclair, editor of the Houston Post, outlined the interrelationship between military camps, economic motives, and the drive for prohibition. An avowed wet, Sinclair noted, "I have found every prohibitionist of my acquaintance to be a damned hypocrite. Have seen them drank [sic] and have drank with them, including candidates for governor, senate, and so on. That is my main reason for being an anti [-prohibitionist]." Despite his scathing view of drys, on May 5, 1917, Sinclair predicted, "Two more years and Texas will be dry... However, national prohibition as military necessity may be here first." He reported, "Win the war is the keynote of the whole layout in Texas and prohibition is dead as an issue, with a cinch that the state is hell bent for Sahara dryness in broken doses... [A]rmy camp[s] may force all to close if the bootlegging continues." Sinclair also understood the economic consequences if communities failed to eliminate alcohol from the vicinity of military installations. He predicted, "If Houston lost the [army] camp this town would be as dull as Mexia in midsummer. The camp saved this burg." Texas drys heightened concerns about the dire economic consequences if military cantonments stayed awash in alcohol, appealing both to Texans' patriotism and economic sense to enact prohibition.

Initially, drys concentrated on local option elections, as outlined in the Texas Constitution, to eradicate alcohol near military facilities. A hostile, pro-wet governor, James Ferguson, threatened to veto any state prohibition law, while a divided state legislature seemed incapable of generating enough
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support to override his veto. Instead, the drys utilized their strong grass-roots movement to influence voters at the county level with their wartime arguments. While continuing to agitate for a federal constitutional amendment, Texas drys worked to achieve short-term goals at the county level, with each victory providing fresh ammunition in subsequent county option campaigns. Consequently, several Texas counties held referenda on prohibition in the nine months following American entry into the First World War. Ultimately, the drys encountered strong resistance in hard-core, wet counties, which forced them to modify their tactics to press for a state-wide white zone law.

McLennan County provided the initial testing grounds for the new military focus for prohibition. On July 5, 1917, Waco secured a cantonment, Camp MacArthur, that would instruct men conscripted from Illinois. Within weeks of the announcement, prohibitionists in McLennan County began to agitate for a local option election to eliminate alcohol from their community as a military necessity. Pat M. Neff, later governor of Texas in the 1920s, headed the executive board of the local option committee and coordinated the campaign. In August 1917 Neff went before McLennan County commissioners to petition for a local option election. Revealing keen political acumen, he proposed dropping Axtell and West precincts from the referendum because they traditionally voted wet. Neff contended, “Fighting the whiskey traffic is a practical rather than theoretical proposition, and the [local option] committee... decided to begin the campaign in a way that would be absolutely sure of winning this election.” Because Neff knew the drys’ chances of enacting county-wide prohibition would improve dramatically without these districts, he opted for expediency over principle and worked to remove them from the boundaries of the referendum.

O.L. Stribling, a notable wet, submitted a petition containing over 4,000 signatures of “pros and antis alike,” protesting the “gerrymandering” of the county to exclude West and Axtell. Stribling charged that the drys “...are not willing to let Waco decide this matter for herself, but are taking the votes of a lot of dry precincts to vote Waco dry.” Neff denied this allegation, claiming the drys “...are combining wet Mart, wet Riesel, wet Hallisburg, wet Harrison to wet Waco in order to vote all of those spots dry.” By a vote of three to one, the county commissioners denied Neff’s recommendation to omit the wet precincts. He then withdrew the petition, but promised “[b]y the time the last bale of cotton is picked this season...,” the drys would again petition for a referendum.

Privately, Pat Neff confided to R.H. Kirby, a fellow dry, different reasons for withdrawing the petition to hold a local option election at the August meeting. Demonstrating the interconnectedness of the Texas prohibition movement, Neff justified the delay because “...the Dallas election would not be held before the last of September.” Like most prohibitionists, he concluded Dallas finally would vote itself dry, which would provide powerful ammunition in local option elections across the state. Echoing his public pronouncements, he also argued, “...those two weeks would be the very busiest weeks with the farmers of this county in gathering their short cotton
crop....," and holding an election then would present them with an undue hardship. Finally, Neff revealed, "...we could use that time in perfecting our organization." By delaying the petition, the McLennan County drys catered to the schedule of farmers who nominally voted dry, used the precedent of the Dallas County election for their propaganda efforts, and gained valuable time to prepare their association for the campaign. On September 23, 1917, the executive board of the McLennan County local option committee again called for a local option election, this time including all precincts. The county commissioners acceded to their request and, after much debate, set Saturday, October 20, 1917, as the day for the election. H.A. Ivy, a long-standing champion of prohibition in Texas, told Neff, "All Texas will have their eyes on you for the next twenty days, and most of us are expecting you to win."

To avoid an allegation by wets that outside agitators worked for prohibition, Neff maintained "this campaign will be by, of and for the people of McLennan County, without the entangling alliances of outside organizations." Later, he asserted, "...the executive committee decided not to use any outside help. We are having our home people do the speaking." He further explained, "We are doing our best to make this [election] strictly a home affair." McLennan County drys hoped to defuse pointed and damaging wet assertions that national prohibition organizations such as the Anti-Saloon League forced local option elections on Texas counties against their will. Dr. Arthur J. Barton, president of the Texas chapter of the Anti-Saloon League, rebuked Neff for refusing their assistance. Barton declared, "I know that owing to the constant[,] vicious[,] false attacks made on the Anti-Saloon League by the liquor forces[,] some of our good friends in different sections think they have to shy away from the League. At this point they make a mistake which results in weakness and harm to all our work." Ignoring Barton's protest, Neff and the executive committee adhered to their decision to rely solely on local people as speakers and organizers.

In their mass meetings, public demonstrations, and massive newspaper campaign to attack demon rum, Pat Neff and his dry followers started with traditional arguments. They published newspaper advertisements in which they denounced saloons as being guilty of such social evils as raising the divorce rate, causing bankruptcy and poverty, leading to immorality and impiety, and destroying legitimate businesses. Prohibitionists included eyewitness accounts, tearful, first-person testimonials, and statements by leading community figures to buttress each contention about the immorality of alcohol. Chronicling the effects of alcohol on school children, drys quoted Superintendent Cobb of the Waco Public Schools. Cobb argued, "If we had prohibition our teachers would have less to do with deformed children, and the county would not have to keep a free book supply if whiskey was voted out." Like prohibitionists around the nation, McLennan County drys insisted that alcohol led to handicapped children, twisted morals, reduced wages, and overall social distress for ordinary people.

As the campaign progressed, McLennan County prohibitionists increasingly focused on wartime concerns as their definitive reason to eliminate
brewed, fermented, and distilled beverages. In a column which he placed in the Waco Times-Herald to run daily during the two weeks before the election, Pat Neff reinforced the belief that voters had to enact prohibition as a military necessity. Neff maintained, “Put the saloons out of business and make it ‘safety first’ for our soldier boys.” Highlighting the sums spent on alcohol in McLennan County, he argued, “The saloon bill of this county for ten months would purchase all the Liberty Bonds requested by the government to be sold in the county.” Drawing on civic pride, he asked, “Who brought the army cantonment to Waco? The president of the Chamber of Commerce, an unyielding prohibitionist.” Neff averred, “Many, many people who have heretofore voted the anti[prohibition] ticket, are now voting against the saloon as a patriotic duty.” He echoed such positions privately, claiming “Many new recruits are coming from well-known anti ranks of Waco” in this election. Neff and McLennan County drys maintained that prohibition would render military personnel fit to fight and allow people to invest in the war effort. Their efforts yielded good results among voters.

Pat Neff reiterated wartime themes in an important speech he gave before an assembly of dry supporters. In it, Neff painted a stark and dismal picture of future conditions in Waco if alcohol continue to be sold near the military cantonment. Denouncing the bootlegging that accompanied the camp, Neff proclaimed,

“Our government honored Waco with an encampment. The whiskey traffic, having no regard for the wishes of this government, possessing no patriotism but profits, and worshipping [sic] no God but gold, seemingly flung wide their back doors, until every darkened alley was filled with soldiers and beer bottles. So open and so flagrant was it that the secretary of war sent his personal representative here to denounce it. [He] ... publicly announced that if conditions were not improved the camp would be moved [even] if it cost fifty million dollars.”

Neff concluded, “…the little foaming scooner [sic] that passes over the bar is more injurious to our men than all the submarines that sweep the ocean with their guns.” Banning alcohol would allow Waco, simultaneously, to keep the military encampment in its midst and eradicate a menace to American fighting strength.

McLennan County prohibitionists even questioned the loyalty and patriotism of the wets who fought to keep alcohol legal. Nolan Taylor, of the Bruceville State Bank, informed Dr. I.L. McGlasson, head of the anti-prohibition organization, that the liquor industry contained enemy aliens and weakened the nation. In an impassioned polemic, Taylor charged,

“...many years ago there were big men, red blooded men and responsible, men of true american [sic] berth [sic] that [sic] dispensed liquor ... but today there is a change, the liquor business has passed from the hand of liberty loving american [sic] men... and today the liquor is owned controlled, soul (if it has such) and body by foreigners, and an element that is Un-American[,] undemocratic, and knows no master except the dictates of its own lust, for money and ruin.”

Taylor chastised McGlasson for siding with “…the thraldom of liquor rule…”
and exhorted him to "...avail yourself of the opportunity, of aligning yourself with the forces of good Government ...."41 Neff, who received a copy of the letter, explained, "Had it not been our policy to keep individuals personalities out of the campaign, your letter would have made splendid reading matter for the prohibition cause. Some of the ideas expressed in your communication were used in different ways ...."44 The McLennan County drys considered their opponents as supporters of the enemy in the struggle to improve society and win the war against the enemy nation, Germany.

Wets responded to the drys' challenge by organizing the McLennan County Anti-Local Option Committee, with Dr. I.L. McGlasson, a local physician, as chairman.45 McGlasson understood the allure of the drys' rhetoric that wartime conditions mandated prohibition. In an interview given the week before the election, McGlasson pointed out what he considered the flaws in their reasoning. After revealing "I have been an anti-prohibitionist all my life...."46 McGlasson explained, "...it's my belief that you can't legislate morals into anybody."47 He claimed, "You can take whiskey away from a man and if he has the seed of weakness and corruption in him it's going to keep on growing."48 Regarding the war, he announced, "It's against all our democratic ideas to say that a man cannot take a drink if it gives him pleasure. The world is at war today for liberty. That's not giving people liberty, to prohibit everything that might be harmful."49 Finally, McGlasson denigrated prohibition because "...prohibition does not prohibit," because people would consume alcohol regardless of the law.50 McGlasson and other anti-prohibitionists reiterated such themes in their print campaign against the local option election.

The McLennan County wets' political advertisements fervently attacked the "quack nostrum" of prohibition.51 They began by utilizing standard arguments against it, such as reprinting Jefferson Davis' letter from the Texas prohibition referendum in 1887.51 Turning many dry positions around, they insisted prohibition actually would hinder business expansion, lead to higher unemployment, and raise local taxes if enacted.52 They asserted that it yielded higher crime rates in dry cities, counties, and states, reprinting statistics from Iowa, Maine, and Virginia to support their contention.53 Using Texas examples as well, wets compared the high crime rate for Grayson County, which had banned alcohol, with the lower figures for McLennan County, where alcohol was legal.54 Anti-prohibitionists produced grand jury reports from Navarro and Bell counties documenting the expansion of boot-legging and the sale of alcohol to minors under the local option.55 Citing events in nearby Temple, wets attacked the belief that vice, especially prostitution, would be eliminated through prohibition. Dr. I.L. McGlasson declared, "Generals Parker and Haan of the United States army found it necessary to go to Temple to confer with the peace officers there about certain houses of ill fame. We are shocked indeed, to think that in such a good prohibition town as Temple, our army officers should find trouble, especially since [dry] Temple is thirty miles from [wet] Waco."56

Also recognizing the importance of wartime issues, McLennan County wets wielded them to defend their cause. First, anti-prohibitionists in
McLennan County exploited the situation in Dallas County, which had voted dry the previous summer. They contended, "There are four army cantonments in Texas. Dallas has a bad case of 'sour grapes,' because her competitors, Waco, Fort Worth, Houston and San Antonio, were fortunate in securing governmental recognition. Shall we keep step in a class with these cities or will we make the mistake of 'following Dallas for Dallas' sake'? Wets emphasized the ability of the federal government to ban alcohol if it deemed it a military necessity, trying to undercut the drys' basic arguments for the local option. McLennan County anti-prohibitionists pointed out that the military had placed a cantonment in Waco knowing that it allowed alcohol to be sold. They charged,

"...the prohibition committee has seen fit to make many statements concerning the adoption of prohibition in Waco for the protection of the army camp. They have done this regardless of the fact that the army camp was located in McLennan County, as at Fort Worth, Houston, San Antonio and other wet points, with full knowledge of the fact that Waco was wet, and regardless of the fact that it is within the power of President Wilson to close every saloon in Waco if he deems it for the best interests of the army."

If the military had been concerned about the sale of beer, wine, and distilled spirits in McLennan County, the wets reasoned, the Department of War would have chosen a different site.

Returning again to the federal power to close the saloons, Dr. McGlasson elaborated:

"President Wilson has it within his power to confiscate every drop of intoxicating liquors in the United States and close every saloon in the United States, if he deems it to be necessary for the best interests of the United States in time of war. We are willing to leave the liquor question to President Wilson for the period of the war and devote all of our energies to assisting the Liberty loan campaigns and giving assistance to the Red Cross. Will our prohibitionist friends join us?"

The wets argued the local option election needlessly diverted manpower and funds from the war effort and meddled in a problem best left to the federal government to resolve.

McLennan County drys dismissed the wets' conclusions. Reflecting newspaper rebuttals, Albert G. McGee wrote, "Their latest and most shallow pretense at argument is that we should stand by the President and the Nation. Do you suppose they forget that the same President ... has made ... a law making it a prison offense to sell liquor to our soldiers? Can the man or men who is prohibited under penalty of imprisonment from selling booze to our soldiers be such a great community asset?" McGee concluded, "In putting ourselves under the ban of booze we are only doing for ourselves as civilians what our commander-in-chief, the President, has done for our army and navy." If the Department of War decreed prohibition essential to ensuring peak performance for military personnel, the drys theorized, then civilians should enact it to achieve similar beneficial results.

Anti-prohibitionists also observed the absurdity of fighting a war for
democracy while attempting to curtail liberties on the home front. Wets asserted that prohibition "...involves an attack upon the 'personal liberty' of the individual, which, if successful, will be followed by another and another [law], until we have...individual actions[s]... [being] curtailed to suit the whims of the majority." As evidence for their view, they cited a report by Dr. A.J. Barton of the Texas Anti-Saloon League, which called for the abolition of fishing, baseball, hunting, outings, public fairs, and places of amusement on Sundays. Prohibition, they reasoned, represented the leading edge of a wide-scale effort to legislate morality and criminalize behavior deemed inappropriate by certain special interest groups.

The local option campaign extended even to the German-language community in McLennan County. To address German Americans at a rally, the drys brought a German-speaking prohibition speaker from Cuero, Rudolf Kleberg, who was considered "a well-thought of man and anti." Beyond that, the drys essentially ignored German Americans, apparently conceding their support to the wets. The wets displayed far more activity in the community, bringing the issue directly to the German voters. To appeal to them, the anti-prohibitionists placed both English and German advertisements in the Waco Post. Drawing on the anti-German rhetoric of many drys, the wets asked, "Why is the loyalty of the Germans being insulted? Have they not been quite loyal, have they not participated with honor in all wars in this country? Have they not served their time...in Uncle Sam's army?" Wets claimed the drys besmirched the patriotism of German-Americans in the World War with their allegations and urged the German-speakers to vote against prohibition. In an effort to make voting easier, they even printed in the newspaper a sample ballot for the referendum, in English, with instructions on how to mark it.

McLennan County wets ultimately fought a losing battle against prohibition in the election. Arthur J. Barton recounted an incident that indicated the wets' sense of futility. Barton recalled, "Yesterday morning coming up on the interurban from Waxahachie to Dallas I met our good friend Dr. D.L. McGlasson [sic]. As we were talking together I said, 'Well McLennan County is going to vote dry, is it not?' He replied, 'It looks that way, but we will do all we can to keep it from it.' At that time I didn't know and had no thought that Dr. McGlasson was Chairman of the liquor committee." As the election neared, the intention of voters to ban beer, wine, and hard liquor became move evident. In a straw poll taken on the eve of the election, the Waco Morning News reported the drys carried a clear majority in the county, even in predominately wet districts. For instance, the town of Mart, listed as "wet," favored prohibition by a 5:1 margin. In the actual referendum, voters in McLennan County, for the first time, chose prohibition by more than 1200 votes. The measure became effective December 1, 1917, closing at least ninety-three wholesale and retail liquor houses.

Prohibitionists from across the Lone Star State believed the victory in McLennan County benefited the struggle to eradicate brewed, fermented, and distilled spirits across the nation. Morris Sheppard claimed he "Was profoundly gratified over recent great prohibition victory in McLennan County[.] It will
be of vast help to prohibition movement not only in Texas but in the Nation.”

Thomas Ball, who had run for governor against James Ferguson, hoped, “That dry zone[s] [will] be extended by national authority so as to provide real protection to our patriotic soldiers wherever camped under our flag from the demoralization of the booze traffic....” National dry leaders took heart in every prohibition victory, viewing them as small steps towards their ultimate goal of eradicating alcohol from the entire United States.

In particular, Texas prohibitionists understood that the achievement in Waco would hold important considerations for drying out their state. Pat Neff counseled Milton Morris, who mobilized Travis County drys in their effort to enact a local option law, about the tactics he had utilized in Waco. Summing up the points of the anti-prohibitionists, Neff wrote, “...the campaign literature of the antis as published in the papers consisted of some statistics showing that there were more violations of the law in dry territory, than in wet territory, also [that]...there were many cases of bootlegging, and...they sought to prove that when a town went dry, that property valuations were greatly decreased.” He maintained, “...the best way to handle the anti literature, is not to pay very much attention to it, to pick out a few of the most erroneous statements made by them and answer merely by showing that it is not correct, and that no confidence can be put in the statements made by the defenders of the saloons.” Austin prohibitionists adopted many of the tactics and positions of Waco drys in their successful bid to oust demon rum from the state capital.

McLennan County provided an important testing ground for the new prohibition tactics. Displaying their political abilities, local drys worked to ensure the most favorable conditions for the election by attempting to exclude wet precincts. Failing that, they diligently worked to underscore the need for wartime prohibition. Although McLennan County drys employed traditional rhetoric to persuade voters to accept prohibition, recounting poignant examples of the ill-effects of alcohol on society, they emphasized wartime issues in their propaganda. Drys claimed prohibition should be imposed to render American Sammies fit to fight and to protect them from evil influence. Couching prohibition as a patriotic duty, they exhorted voters to place national security above petty local interests and outlaw beer, wine, and distilled spirits.

The McLennan County wets began the fight using standard rejoinders against prohibition that dated back many years, such as concerns about personal liberty and unwarranted government intervention. Copying the drys’ lead, the wets attempted to manipulate wartime circumstances to their own advantage. They publicized vice activity in nominally dry regions, contended the election distracted people from vital war work, and maintained President Woodrow Wilson already had the power to impose prohibition as a war measure if he deemed it necessary. They reached out to the German-American voters, who were denigrated by the drys, and tried to ensure as much support as possible. Despite their efforts, the voters sided with the drys and approved prohibition for McLennan County.

The arguments and tactics that both the wets and drys used in McLennan County were replicated by other prohibitionists in local option elections...
throughout the state. The rhetoric worked best in McLennan County, which already possessed a cantonment, since prominent members of the administration such as Secretary of War Newton Baker, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, and Commissioner of Training Camp Activities Raymond Fosdick favored prohibition to keep troops fit to fight and at peak efficiency. Despite the new wartime rhetoric, voters in other counties proved harder to convince to pass local prohibition laws. Texas drys faced a difficult time in more resistant, wet-dominated counties.
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