

God's Gift or Demon Drink? Churches and Alcohol in South Australia Between the Two World Wars

Judith Raftery

All churches in South Australia expressed concern about the effects of alcohol in the community in the inter-war period. This was nothing new. Alcohol, its effects, its abuse, its cost to the community and the conditions of its sale had been widely recognised in South Australia as a social issue of major importance since the 1880s. Even before that time, some South Australian Christians had been involved in temperance activity. The Primitive Methodists and Bible Christians were especially active, their churches having adopted teetotal policies soon after their establishment in England in 1807 and 1815 respectively. In South Australia they supported a Total Abstinence League which was founded in 1840 and boasted 10,000 members by 1869.⁴² But it was not until the 1880s, when a wave of popular revivalism cemented a strong connection between total abstinence and Christian discipleship,⁴³ when teetotalism became common amongst the largest group of Methodists, the Wesleyans, and when Wesleyan Methodist conferences called on members 'to promote such legislative measures as aim at the restraint or extinction of the liquor traffic'⁴⁴ that 'drink' emerged as an issue of major proportions, capable of uniting Christians who were divided on many other issues. The formation of two ecumenical temperance organisations, the South Australian Alliance in 1884 and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) in 1886, was important evidence of the growing commitment among Christians to the cause of temperance.

In fighting alcohol, South Australian churches were following the example of British churches, which had been involved in temperance activities of various kinds since about 1830. The temperance movement in Great Britain seems to have emerged in respect to a particular set of social and economic circumstances.⁴⁵ In South Australia, where different social and economic conditions applied, temperance concerns seem to have been part of the traditional baggage which the churches brought with them when they arrived, or which they subsequently imported. The movement developed in ways that were very similar to the ways it developed in Great Britain, even though it was not goaded into action by the dramatic changes in life patterns and accessibility of alcohol that account for its beginnings in Great Britain.

From the beginning of white settlement, alcohol was a part of South Australian life.⁴⁶ Whether South Australians consumed as much as or more alcohol than people in Great Britain did, or whether they and other Australians deserved the reputation of being hard drinkers is difficult to determine. A.E. Dingle, in an historical survey of Australian drinking habits, questions whether Australians have had a 'truly magnificent thirst', but demonstrates significant fluctuations in levels of alcohol consumption corresponding to changing economic conditions.⁴⁷ It may have been that the high level of consumption in the 1870s and 1880s encouraged the flurry of temperance activity at that time, and that the slump in consumption during the 1930s went some way towards explaining the concern of the liquor interests to extend trading hours at that time. What is clear is that, between the two world wars, as at other times, there were many opportunities for South Australians to consume alcohol. Temperance workers, who regularly gathered and reported statistics about numbers of liquor licences, per capita expenditure on alcoholic beverages, alcohol-related accidents and crimes, and results of local opinion polls, were well aware of these opportunities.⁴⁸ They knew, for example, that there were 639 hotels in South Australia in 1920,⁴⁹ and that in Adelaide and its suburbs, these were very unevenly spread. There were heavy concentrations in the poorer working class areas such as Port Adelaide and the Bowden/Brompton/Hindmarsh area, and in the city of Adelaide itself.⁵⁰ These were areas of high unemployment, contained pockets of squalid housing,⁵¹ and, not coincidentally, were the areas in which several of the churches, including those most concerned about temperance questions, had their mission work.⁵² In Adelaide, the number of hotels varied between 90 and 95 during the 1920s and 1930s, a considerable drop from the peak of 128 at the turn of the century.⁵³ Wine shops were beginning to appear, to cater for people whose drinking habits did not conform to the hours or style of the hotels, and the WCTU, at their annual convention in 1923, complained that in Hanson Street there were 'three wine shops and four hotels within 880 yards'.⁵⁴ In Port Adelaide, although a number of hotels had been delicensed as a result of local option polls in 1909, there were still 18 licensed premises during the 1920s and 1930s, and in the Bowden /Brompton/Hindmarsh area there were 13. By contrast, in Burnside there were no licensed premises, in Goodwood

there was one, and in Unley/Parkside, five.⁵⁵ In 1930, South Australians spent an average of £4/11/4 per capita on alcohol, and in 1934 the state's 'drink bill' was £1,895,236, 'more than four times what the Government pays for sustenance'.⁵⁶ In this setting, Christians exercised their temperance views, partly inherited and imported, and partly a response to South Australian conditions.

People of all churches, and not just those commonly derided as 'wowsers' condemned drunkenness and dependence on alcohol. They recognised that alcohol could lead to personal degradation, and was often associated with problems such as poverty, unemployment, lack of personal achievement, domestic dislocation and neglect of children. The work of church missions in the poorer areas continually highlighted this association. Church people differed, however, in their analysis of the connection between alcohol and these associated problems, and in their ideas about strategies that were appropriate in the battle against it. In order to understand the varying responses of Christians and of churches to this issue, we need to understand their varying views on the nature of alcohol, on the means that it was acceptable to use in bringing about change, on the way change occurs, on the relationship between private and public morality and on what Christian discipleship actually involved. Views on these questions varied quite considerably among the different churches, but there were also, in some instances, a range of views within a particular church.⁵⁷

Some Christians did not see alcohol as a problem in itself. They conceded that there were grave problems associated with its use, but these were attributed not to alcohol itself, which they saw as one of God's good gifts, but to the weakness, intemperance or sin of those who used it. In relation to alcohol, as in every other area of life, people had to exercise control, had to resist temptation and so develop the moral strength that would make them into responsible human beings. These Christians, who believed that alcohol was not itself a problem, felt comfortable about drinking it in moderation, as long as this produced no apparent ill-effects on themselves or anyone else. Christians who thought about alcohol in these terms were to be found in all churches, but much more frequently in the Anglican, Catholic, Lutheran and Presbyterian, than in the Nonconformist churches.

In the latter were many Christians who believed alcohol was a grave problem

in itself. No one could guarantee immunity to its effects and therefore total abstinence was the only sensible response. These people believed alcohol was a poison, an addictive drug which was injurious to health and which had the effect of undermining the moral strength and the power of the will of those who used it. It was ridiculous and futile, therefore, to expect people to be able to use it with moderation: the essential nature of the drug pushed people away from moderation to over-indulgence and dependence. If this dangerous drug was combined, as it often was, with inherent individual weakness, or with circumstances that made people feel that they really needed the sense of relaxation and well-being that alcohol provided, then the results were disastrous, for individuals and for society. It is clear that those who saw alcohol in this light were bound to promote abstinence for others as well as for themselves, especially as they recognized that not all people were equally strong. Some total abstainers believed that even if they could be sure that they could handle alcohol successfully and not be lured beyond moderation, they were still called to be total abstainers, so that their example would not offend their 'weaker brother'. Such a stance, though motivated by concern for the wellbeing of others, was understandably seen by some as offensively intolerant and 'holier than thou'.

These views about the nature of alcohol and appropriate personal responses to it were associated with a variety of views about its place in society and about the extent to which society should control its use. Firstly, those who saw people rather than drink itself as the problem, and who were themselves moderate imbibers, naturally wanted drink to remain as part of South Australia's way of life. Its effects were circumscribed by the principle of local option and by restricted hours, and so long as these were honoured and enforced, and altered only by democratic means, the situation was satisfactorily in hand. However, many of those who abstained from alcohol because they saw it as a problem in itself wanted it banished from the land as well as from their own lives. This second group saw prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages as a logical corollary of total abstinence, and the only way to guarantee that society would be safe from alcohol's snare. For them, legislating for moral ends was not a problem; it was, on the contrary, a Christian responsibility. They did not see this, as some of their critics did, as an undemocratic imposition of minority views; they saw it rather as producing a community environment that would support rather than undermine people's efforts to be responsible human beings and good citizens. At the same time, these people were prepared to use the available means of moral

suasion as well as legislation to promote their cause. In between these two extremes was a third group of Christians who, although they were themselves total abstainers, believed that it was not the churches' job to compel, and who favoured moral suasion alone as the means to temperance ends. Closely allied to them was a fourth group, some of whom were total abstainers and some of whom were not, who believed that the church should not be involved in political issues or action of any kind. Their response to the temperance activities of the period stemmed not so much from their view of alcohol and its effects as from their doctrinal position about the role and purpose of the church. In so far as temperance questions were treated as political questions, they could not support the involvement of the church in them.

It is apparent from all this that church people who were concerned about alcohol had to deal with many differences among themselves when trying to formulate policy or plan action, as well as trying to counter those forces in the community at large which were opposed to their efforts. It is also apparent that in the campaign for prohibition, and the intense political activity involved in fighting for and maintaining early closing, which engaged temperance workers in the 1920s and 1930s, it was only those people in the second of the groups described above who were really actively and wholeheartedly involved. They were not, of course, members of a coherent group, but they were highly likely to be members of the evangelical, Nonconformist churches, in which total abstinence was virtually the rule, albeit an unwritten one.

At the beginning of the inter-war period, the sale of alcohol in South Australia was regulated by a range of licensing laws. South Australians had had the opportunity to control the granting of liquor licenses through the principle of local option since 1877.⁵⁸ Local option polls were frequently sought by temperance advocates who saw local option as an important means of 'entrusting to the people effective and complete control of the Liquor Traffic', and also regarded it as 'an instalment on prohibition'.⁵⁹ In the meantime, temperance workers had also sought to restrict hotel trading hours. Sunday closing became law in 1896, and further minor restrictions on hours, and also an end to the employment of barmaids came in 1908.⁶⁰ The minimum drinking age, which was 12 up until 1876, was raised to 15 in 1876, 18 in 1908 and 21 in 1915.⁶¹ The greatest and most recent of temperance victories, still fresh in the memories of its supporters at the beginning of the interwar period, was the 1916 law which established 'six o'clock closing' of hotel bars. This change from closing at

11.00 p.m. had come about largely as a result of prolonged agitation by temperance interests, which had culminated in the granting of a referendum on the question in 1915. Of the 176,537 who voted, 100,418 voted for six o'clock.⁶² No doubt some of those who voted for the change did so out of war-induced patriotism, and probably believed that early closing would end when the war ended.⁶³ They greatly underestimated the strength of the temperance movement and of commitment to the maintenance of six o'clock closing. In fact, late closing was not re-established until 1967.⁶⁴

In the early years of its operation six o'clock closing was regarded by many as a great victory for decency and dignity. The South Australian Alliance declared in its 1916-17 Year Book that the positive results of six o'clock closing were remarkable. They included a decrease in drunkenness, a marked improvement in the conduct of soldiers, both in camp and in the streets,⁶⁵ an increase in evening tram traffic and the 'total abolition of what used to be known as the "drunks" cars and trains'. The Alliance also noted a big increase in business in Gouger Street and other shopping areas, the conversion of two city hotels into a draper's shop and a cafe, respectively, and the erection of shops on the street frontages of many other hotels. As final telling evidence of the good effects of early closing on the whole community it noted that 'in spite of heavy drains on people, saving through the war, the Savings Bank deposits have been more than maintained'.⁶⁶

These past achievements set the scene for the beginning of the inter-war period. For those Christians who were prepared to embrace legislative means to achieve temperance ends, and for those Churches which corporately supported such means, the gains of the past, and especially six o'clock closing, were not laurels to be rested on, but a spur towards the final goal of prohibition. If early closing could be achieved, against great odds, why not total abolition of the liquor trade? America was doing it: why not Australia?⁶⁷ The connections between human society and alcohol or other intoxicating or relaxing drugs extend back into antiquity, and, in the 1920s, as at other times, alcohol was firmly entrenched as an important part of the Australian way of life. But the consumption of alcohol was not part of the cultural pattern of temperance campaigners, many of whom believed that prohibition could be achieved in South Australia, would be effective and would be permanently maintained. If Maine could stay 'dry' since 1851, Kansas and North Dakota since 1880, and if all the other American states were to be dry by 1920, then it could be done here, and by 1925, according to the most hopeful.⁶⁸ While many Christians never

sought prohibition, and thought it more appropriate simply to continue with their personal witness of moderation or abstinence and their public support of responsible licensing laws, it was the hope of prohibition that activated the most ardent temperance supporters during the early years of the inter-war period. This hope also shaped the temperance campaigns.

The immediate aim was to get the government to agree to a referendum. To this end a 'monster petition' was prepared, and was presented to parliament in 1920. It contained 58,000 signatures, many of which were gathered by the 'heroic service' of the women of the WCTU.⁶⁹ An earlier petition with 35,000 signatures had been ignored in 1917, but this had not daunted prohibition workers, who, between March and July of 1919 had organised 236 meetings, designed to elicit support and prepare the ground for the 1920 petition. Parliament was not moved, which caused the Rev. C.E. Schafer, a Methodist prohibitionist of considerable reputation, to conclude: 'Any government, irrespective of their political creed, so blind to the signs of the times that they could not see the force of public opinion behind the signatures of 58,000 electors, courted political extinction, and deserved only the withering condemnation of all fair-minded people.'⁷⁰ Presumably the 58,000 petitioners shared Schafer's disgust, but there were many Christians and several churches who held different views. They did not support this, or other attempts to gain prohibition. For example, the Anglican church did not support prohibition, nor was total abstinence the rule amongst its adherents even though Bishop Thomas (Adelaide diocese) and Bishop White (Willochra diocese) were both in favour of prohibition and Bishop Thomas was a total abstainer.⁷¹

There were attempts at the Anglican synods at the beginning of the period to pass resolutions in support of prohibition. Although the anti-prohibitionists prevailed on each occasion at the Adelaide synod, in the smaller Willochra synod where the influence of individuals was magnified, a motion in support of holding a referendum on the question was passed in 1920, due in large part to the eloquence of J.S. Moyes, the rector of Port Pirie,⁷² and the personal influence of Bishop White. In the Adelaide diocese, an inauspicious beginning to the campaign for prohibition was made in 1919. The Church of England Temperance Society, under the leadership of Canon T.H. Frewin, tried to bring the matter before synod, but 'in the press of business the motion was crowded out'.⁷³ During 1920 Bishop Thomas made his views very clear. Early in the year he preached a prohibition sermon at St Peter's

Cathedral. Taking as his text 1Corinthians 8:9, in which Paul exhorted Christians to ‘take heed lest by any means this freedom of yours becomes a stumbling block to them that are weak’, he encouraged his listeners to consider the moral reasons for prohibition. These were commonly forgotten and eugenic and economic reasons were stressed. He argued on all three grounds and called Christians to ‘consider whether strong drink is not one of those stumbling blocks — like slavery or opium — for the removal of which the time has now come.’⁷⁴ To further press his point he appointed 18 April as ‘Temperance Sunday’ and encouraged clergy to preach, on that day, sermons in support of prohibition.⁷⁵ But on this matter, Adelaide Anglicans were not in accord with their bishop. At the 1920 synod, opponents of prohibition suggested that it was ‘anti-Christian’ as ‘compulsion was not Christ’s method’. The suggestion that ‘it was God’s design that man should be tempted’, and that Christians ‘were bound to self-denial and should take up their cross and follow Christ’ brought synod’s applause. It also brought a reaction from the South Australian Alliance, whose paper, the *Patriot*, featured a front page cartoon deriding the synod’s attitude.⁷⁶ Furthermore, prohibition was ‘an American crank idea’, and all that was really needed in South Australia was for the current legislation regarding the consumption of alcohol to be more strictly enforced.⁷⁷ When a motion to that effect was put, there was only one dissenting voice.⁷⁸ This may well have been that of A.A. Arnold, a lay synodsman who moved prohibition motions in subsequent years and who steadfastly championed a minority view on many social issues until his death in 1935.⁷⁹ The report of this debate, published in the *Advertiser* on 8 September 1920, led to a good deal of correspondence for and against prohibition.⁸⁰

In the following year, Bishop Thomas prepared the ground for the prohibition debate by some forthright comments in his ‘state of the diocese’ report:

Intemperance, besides wrecking the character and will of the individual, wrecks many of the homes of our country. It is the ally of the immorality we deplore. It ... discourages thrift and economy, it encourages the cry for higher wages. ... It is responsible directly and indirectly for much of the unemployment which is rife in our midst today.⁸¹

He did not, on that occasion, actually advocate prohibition, but a year later advocated ‘rooting out the chief cause of the trouble here as America had done’. One result, he claimed, would be that much less hospital accommodation would be required.⁸² The Alliance acknowledged his views in its 1923 Year Book, rejoicing

that the bishop had 'advocated Prohibition instead of enlarging the Children's Hospital, expressing the opinion that half of the cases therein were due directly or indirectly to drink'.⁸³ In the Willochra diocese, Bishop White maintained his pro-prohibition stand, recommending it at the 1922 synod as the 'only practical remedy for drunkenness'. He echoed the argument of Paul and also his brother bishop by saying that he 'had never thought that drinking alcohol was a sin but because there were so many who could not use it in moderation, those who professed themselves to be Christians ought to deny themselves for their sake'.⁸⁴

But bishops do not rule synods, and can not impose their views about social issues on an unwilling church. The lukewarmness of Anglicans on temperance questions, despite their bishops' forthrightness, was hinted at by the polite but plaintive report of the Church of England Temperance Society in 1923:

It is to be hoped that the clergy and Church-people generally will exhibit a greater degree of sympathy with, and interest in, the work of this Society. The establishment of a branch of the CETS in every parish should be regarded as a necessary adjunct to parish organisations.⁸⁵

Meanwhile, prohibition motions at synod continued to be lost. Even A.A. Arnold's 1924 motion, expressing sympathy with the efforts of the South Australian Alliance to get the government to hold a referendum on the liquor question, was rejected.⁸⁶ By then, the heat had gone out of the prohibition debate, and Anglican temperance enthusiasts turned their attention to lesser goals.

The official Anglican position on prohibition, though not the views of the bishops, was echoed by South Australia's Lutheran churches. The *Lutheran Herald*, the paper of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia (UELCA), noted in September 1921 that prohibition had been rejected by the Anglican synod. It supported this stance since 'it is the duty of the Church to persuade, not to compel'.⁸⁷ A similar view was spelt out fully in a statement made at the 1920 General synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Australia (ELSA), and reported in the ELSA paper, the *Australian Lutheran*, in October 1920. This statement explained that the prohibition movement, since it aimed to change laws, 'ought to be treated as a political, social and economic, and not a religious issue'. Furthermore, it claimed that, 'as Lutherans we regret ... the doctrine that the use of liquor as a beverage is in itself a sin'. However, 'the Lutheran church recognises the gravity of the evils connected with the liquor traffic', but 'its duty in the matter ends when it teaches the

sinfulness of the misuse of liquor, and through the sanctifying power of the Gospel, strengthens its members against the temptations that lurk in the use of alcoholic drink'.⁸⁸ Continued Lutheran adherence to this position was indicated in 1926, when a statement appeared in the *Patriot*, wondering when the Lutheran churches would join the battle against alcohol.⁸⁹ The reply published in the *Australian Lutheran* not only illustrated Lutheran views on prohibition, but also provided a clear statement of the fundamental Lutheran stance on all social and political issues:

as long as prohibitionists insist on making the reform they advocate a religious question, we shall make no common cause with them. But if they make it a purely political issue, many Lutherans will vote for prohibition, just as they would vote for the abolition of slavery or for legislation to suppress open immorality, or for a policy of better roads.⁹⁰

This distinction between what was a religious question and what was a political question, albeit a political question on which Christians might be especially likely to act, was not one which seemed important to many non-Lutheran Christians. However, for Lutherans this was of great importance, as it sprang directly from Luther's doctrine of the two kingdoms, which had authority as a Lutheran confessional statement.⁹¹ This doctrine was one to which South Australian Lutherans made frequent reference, and its implications were obvious in the life and activities of the Lutheran churches throughout the inter-war period. Not just in relation to prohibition, but in relation to other social issues as well, they maintained a clear distinction between what they were called to as Christians and as citizens. Hence, despite the invitation of the South Australian Alliance, and later of the Council of Churches in South Australia, to join them, the Lutheran churches, as churches, refrained from taking up social issues. It is not known how many individual Lutherans, acting as Christian citizens, acted on social issues. There was no doctrinal impediment to such action, but it may have been the case, as some commentators have suggested, that Lutherans, in South Australia as elsewhere, adopted a more passive social role than Luther's 'two kingdoms' teaching indicated.⁹²

The fact that the *Southern Cross*, alone among the church papers in the 1920s and 1930s, carried advertisements for alcoholic beverages is an indication of Catholic attitudes to 'demon drink'. To most Catholics, drink was not a demon, and to those few Catholics who knew the technicalities of their faith well, to see alcohol as evil in itself was to subscribe to the Manichean heresy.⁹³ Viewing alcohol in this way 'transfers responsibility from the agent to the instrument, and so destroys morality'. Thus,

prohibition, which so many other Christians were seeking, was ‘an Insult, an Outrage and an Indignity ... a remedy fatal to morals ... fatal to temperance’.⁹⁴ Moreover, a not insignificant number of Catholics were engaged in the hotel trade, and Catholic spokesmen showed more interest than did people of other churches in protecting the interests of those who were thus employed. The Australian archbishops, in a 1918 pronouncement, had declared that prohibition would be ‘unjust to those engaged in the drink traffic’, and this was twice quoted during the period when prohibitionists were most active, and was enthusiastically endorsed by the State Council of the Australian Catholic Federation.⁹⁵

Though opposed to prohibition, Catholics acknowledged the evils that stemmed from abuse of alcohol and promoted moderation in its use. The editor of the *Southern Cross* responded very angrily when the Methodist paper, the *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, referred to it as ‘that fiercely intemperate sheet’.⁹⁶ So angry was he that he departed ‘from our rule of treating the mendacious Methodist sheet with the silent contempt which it merits’, and defended the Catholic position and the *Southern Cross*’s position vigorously. He claimed that his readers would know

that it is a deliberate and malicious falsehood, characteristic of the organ in question, to represent the ‘Cross’, or Catholics in general, as opposed to temperance. As a matter of fact, we have always followed the Church in advocating temperance in all things.⁹⁷

Though the word ‘intemperate’ was what really angered the editor of the *Southern Cross*, he also objected to ‘fiercely’, because, as he said, ‘we have never been able to emulate the fierceness of the intemperate cranks who now howl for prohibition’.⁹⁸ This protest indicates something of the bitter sectarian spirit of the time, as well as Catholic attitudes towards drinking. We can be sure that the irony of its placement in the *Southern Cross* was not lost on the Methodists whom it maligned. It was placed next to an advertisement for ‘West End’ beer!⁹⁹

During 1919 and 1920, when many other Christians were putting considerable effort into trying to convince the government to take the prohibition question seriously, the *Southern Cross* frequently and emphatically decried prohibition. It supported the argument of the Australian archbishops who not only believed that it would be ‘an unwarrantable infringement on the reasonable liberty of the mass of the people’, but also that it ‘would most probably be inefficacious for the purpose in view ... and ... in the end might produce more evil than it would remove’. In the same

statement, the archbishops ‘frankly admit[ted] that drink has done, and is doing much evil in Australia’, but argued that ‘what the people needed was not force and compulsion from outside, but a building up and strengthening of character from within, and then decent surroundings and comfortable homes, in which they would have a chance of living honest, clean, sober lives’.¹⁰⁰ The implication of this last statement, that better living conditions would help people to live more responsible lives and be less vulnerable to the lure of drink was not one that found much favour with prohibitionists. They argued that drink was the determining factor of the squalor and poverty of the lives of many of the intemperate, and often promised that prosperity would be one of the results of a life of abstinence. Father Lockington, a Melbourne Jesuit who addressed an Adelaide meeting in 1920, on his return from the United States of America where he had been investigating prohibition in practice, supported the archbishops' analysis of the relationship between poverty and intemperance. He believed the prohibitionists were wrong because

they could not make a man strong by propping him up with crutches. He should be built up morally and physically, and the removal of poverty would go a long way towards endowing him with that self-respect, love for all that was good and true, and moral courage that would enable him to resist intemperance.¹⁰¹

In the previous year, a similar line had been preached at St Francis' Church in Melbourne, and reported in the *Southern Cross*: ‘While they herded people in the miasmatic atmosphere of slumland, the drink evil would be with them The real remedy was to provide happiness and comfort for all.’¹⁰² Catholics, on the whole, had not left the ‘miasmatic atmosphere of slumland’ so far behind them as Anglicans and Protestants had done, which helps to explain their greater tolerance of drink and the drinker, and also their different analysis of the relationship between drink and poverty.

While waiting for the abolition of poverty, the *Southern Cross* had other more specific and immediately practical suggestions about combatting intemperance. In an editorial in 1919, it suggested a ‘Catholic temperance program’, whose main features were restricted hours of opening of hotel bars, plentiful supplies of beer at a fairly high price, greater ease in procuring spirits for medicinal purposes, an end to ‘shouting’ and to the extension of credit in bars, and a ban on ‘drinking among women’ on licensed premises. ‘This is the kind of reform’, it claimed, ‘which recommends itself to honest and reasonable folk.’¹⁰³

A quite different approach, and one which was much more akin to dominant Nonconformist strategies, was taken by the Guild of St John the Baptist. This organisation, which was founded in 1883 at Thebarton, was committed to the care of underprivileged boys and men. During the inter-war period it was still being run by its founder, Monsignor Healy. In 1922 he established the Guild of St John the Baptist Total Abstinence Society, although total abstinence and the signing of a pledge as an aid to commitment were already associated with the work of the Guild.

At the Guild's 37th anniversary celebrations in 1920, the guest speaker, Father Doyle, a Dominican priest, warned his listeners that, if they drank at all, they could not be assured of remaining moderate, 'social' drinkers, and urged them 'for the sake of charity, good example and the moral support of the weak who had not their strength of character ... for the love of God and their fellow men to take the pledge'.¹⁰⁴ Seventeen of them did so at the end of that meeting. If they were still being faithful to that pledge in March 1926, they might have agreed with the Rev. R.P. Denny who spoke at a Guild picnic at Thebarton Oval. In a style that would have qualified him to grace a South Australian Alliance rostrum he claimed:

total abstinence is good for body, mind and soul; good for a man's business, for his banking account, for his home, for his wife and family. It brings health, happiness and prosperity, and keeps a man fit for his daily work and for the hour of special emergency. It is also good for one's neighbour, as good example is often useful for the weaker brethren.¹⁰⁵

But the total abstainers of the Guild of St John the Baptist remained very much a minority among Catholics, and they were not to the fore in the temperance battles of the 1920s or the 1930s. They disappeared even from the *Southern Cross*. The last reference to a Guild picnic was in 1930, when the claim was made that 'the only power on earth that can conquer evil habits and transform the drunkard, and control the use of liquor, is the moral force of Christ's saving grace'.¹⁰⁶ Certainly Catholics showed little evidence of putting faith in other methods of controlling the use of liquor, and as early as 1922 the *Southern Cross* was condemning the Methodists for continuing their campaign for prohibition. It claimed that. it was 'certainly not a political issue ... at present, though the Methodists and other fanatics have tried their hardest to make it one'. Thus the Methodists were 'meddling' in 'controversial politics' which the churches should keep out of.¹⁰⁷ On other

issues, particularly to do with education, the Catholic church seemed willing enough to be involved in politics. Perhaps, then, its condemnation of the Methodists had more to do with their different views about alcohol, than about the relationship between the church and politics. Furthermore, in condemning alcohol, Methodists and other temperance advocates were often seen by Catholics to be attacking a set of cultural patterns, including a characteristic use of leisure time, which was strongly associated with Catholicism. Alcohol, at least when it was consumed in public, was a powerful symbol of working class life, in which drinking went hand in hand with gambling, racing, contact sports, and with lack of discipline and general 'respectability'. The lives of Catholics conformed to this pattern to a greater extent than did those of other denominations, nations, who often had little sympathy for Catholicism's tolerance of such a life pattern. If, as Hunt concludes, 'drink had a lot to do with antipathy to Catholicism among Protestants',¹⁰⁸ then we can assume also that Protestant condemnation of drink and, by implication, of a whole life style, had a lot to do with Catholic antipathy to Protestants.¹⁰⁹

The five other churches, Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregationalist and Churches of Christ, were all officially committed to the cause of prohibition and other temperance goals through their affiliation with the South Australian Alliance. The Catholic and Lutheran churches had no connection with the Alliance, and the Anglican church was connected only through the CETS.¹¹⁰ The affiliated bodies contributed to the work of the Alliance in proportion to their numbers and their enthusiasm for the cause. In the case of the smaller churches this meant that their temperance activities and to some extent their own peculiar responses to temperance questions were at least partly hidden in the collective witness of the Alliance. It was really only the Methodists who were big enough to maintain an independent, highly visible temperance campaign of their own while contributing significantly to the work of the Alliance as well.

The Presbyterian approach to prohibition was low-key and piecemeal, and lacked the passion that was expressed in those churches in which total abstinence was, if not the rule, then the unquestioned standard. There were no clear doctrinal guidelines for Presbyterians to follow on this matter, and there was probably a

significant lack of correlation between the public, official stance of the denomination and the private practice of many Presbyterians. Although not 'given to drink', and not part of the working class culture in which drinking in hotel bars or on public occasions was the norm, everyone knew' that 'they liked their whisky'. Moderate consumption of alcohol in the home, as part of a 'civilised' pattern of eating and offering hospitality, was not uncommon among Presbyterians. In this, they were very similar to Anglicans.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, official Presbyterian support for prohibition was fairly consistent. In 1919, State Assembly resolved to support the movement,¹¹² and from time to time the *Presbyterian Banner* published material in favour of prohibition,¹¹³ or noted the work of the South Australian Alliance.¹¹⁴ Sometimes, a voice was raised in protest against the view that people can be made Christians by acts of parliament. The Rev. Hugh Morris, Moderator of the Assembly in 1921, was one such voice. He believed that reformed laws and improved social conditions were ineffective in inducing 'poor men' to spend their money 'in providing home comforts' rather than remain living in slum conditions. That would only happen 'when the gospel was embraced'.¹¹⁵ Sin, not laws or social conditions, was the problem. In June of 1923, the Rev. A.C. Weber, in an editorial, expressed a different view when he declared: 'It is quite time the Christian folk of the Churches rose up in indignation, and through the ballot box cleared our land of this curse.'¹¹⁶ The Presbyterian Life and Work Committee, which tried to keep itself alert to threats to public and private morality, and to protest about them whenever it could, decided in March of 1924 to send a circular to all Presbyterians, urging them to vote at the coming elections for candidates who would pledge their support for the South Australian Alliance.¹¹⁷ Since the Alliance was still actively supporting and hopeful of achieving prohibition, this amounted to a strong, official Presbyterian endorsement of prohibition.

The Congregational church was not to the fore in the campaign for prohibition, though there was certainly much sympathy for the cause amongst Congregationalists, and, in their circles, prohibition was not publicly and emphatically opposed, as it was by many Anglicans, Catholics and Lutherans. The Social Questions Committee reported to the Union meetings in 1922 that 39 churches had opened their pulpits to Alliance speakers.¹¹⁸ In 1926, the Executive Committee reported that it had 'had under its notice during the year the questions of gambling, drink and sex instruction, and took such action as appeared to be

necessary at the time'.¹¹⁹ But there were no large-scale attempts to unite Congregationalists behind the banner of prohibition. Principal Kiek, who was outspoken on social issues and greatly respected by Congregationalists, addressed the Union Meetings in 1922 on 'Our Social Responsibility', and expressed the view 'that the Church confines its social activities too much to the questions of drink, gambling and immorality', and suggested a wider platform. This was reported in derisive tones in the Methodist paper, which claimed that Kiek had nothing new to offer, and that 'all his suggestions were passed by our Conference a dozen years ago'.¹²⁰ Despite this, Kiek's standing as a credible spokesperson on social issues was confirmed by the invitation extended to him by the Methodists to speak on prohibition at the Social Service Demonstration of their 1924 Conference.¹²¹

The Congregational reaction to temperance activities was to some extent a reflection of their distinctive denominational style. Judging from their sedate newspaper, and the restrained way in which they reported their activities, we can surmise that Congregationalists were not the kind of people to feel comfortable with the noisy, flamboyant, emotional and often simplistic approach of the prohibition movement. This conclusion is supported by evidence on other occasions of a Congregational response that set them apart from other churches. On their own admission, Congregationalism's 'chief appeal has been made to the middle and wealthier classes',¹²² and perhaps this too helps to explain its cool and reasoned rather than impassioned and campaigning approach.¹²³

The Baptists were similarly circumspect in their support for prohibition, perhaps because, like the Presbyterians, they were concerned about their financial difficulties and their declining strength, and their mood was far from confident. Any lack of vigor sprang from that, rather than from lack of conviction. Prohibition was not something that was debated amongst Baptists: it was accepted almost as an article of faith. The *Baptist Record* declared with confidence in 1924: 'As Baptists we know where we stand in relation to the liquor traffic: we are against it, root and branch.'¹²⁴ Baptists regularly passed resolutions at their annual meetings supporting the work of the South Australian Alliance in general and the cause of prohibition in particular.¹²⁵ In 1927, when many others had turned their attention to more partial goals in relation to alcohol, the President of the Baptist Union, in his presidential address on 'Some Troubles and their Solutions' recommended prohibition as the solution to intemperance.¹²⁶

It was the Methodists and the members of Churches of Christ who were the most energetic and uncompromising supporters of prohibition. Their support sprang in no small measure from the fact that total abstinence was all but universal amongst them. Prohibition seemed the logical public corollary of this private attitude. The impact of the Methodist church on the prohibition movement was greater than that of the Churches of Christ because of its very much greater size and its consequently greater ability to contribute people and other resources to the cause. In intensity and enthusiasm, however, Churches of Christ members were equal to the Methodists. Both took up the cause earlier than any others, and pursued it harder and longer, and often in more colourful language. Intemperance was a 'malignant growth',¹²⁷ and the liquor trade 'unscrupulous'¹²⁸ and 'iniquitous',¹²⁹ and therefore 'the professing Christians of Australia' ought to 'pray for the abolition of the liquor traffic, and vote as they pray'.¹³⁰ 'Beer and whiskey', declared the *Australian Christian Commonwealth*,

have had their day, and it is time that they ceased to be. They do not cure diseases; they cause them. They do not benefit the community; they curse it. They do not add to human happiness; they are the prolific parents of misery and pain.¹³¹

The South Australian Methodist Conference of 1919 decided to set apart the Rev. Frank Lade, for one year of propaganda work in connection with the prohibition of the liquor traffic, and to that end called on Methodists to contribute £500.¹³² Lade was to work with and through the South Australian Alliance, which regarded him as 'the most valuable contribution to the movement that the Alliance has yet received'.¹³³ So highly did it regard him that when the 1920 Methodist Conference again set him aside for a year of temperance work, the Alliance agreed to meet the costs.¹³⁴

Frank Lade was well-educated, an extremely able speaker, and a man whose integrity and Christian qualities were unquestioned. His standing within the Methodist community is indicated by the fact that he was chosen as President of the Conference in 1916, and as principal of Brighton College from 1922 to 1927 and of Wesley College from 1927 to 1939.¹³⁵ In 1919, when he began his work for the South Australian Alliance, he was a seasoned temperance campaigner. In 1915, he had been the main speaker at a 'monster demonstration' in support of early closing.¹³⁶ In 1917, when he was vice-president of the Alliance, he had challenged, in public debate, H.L. Penfold-

Hyland, a prominent South Australian vigneron and staunch opponent of prohibition. The debate, entitled 'Is Prohibition Desirable?' took place in the Brougham Place Congregational Church, and although 700 people crowded the building, 'hundreds' more were turned away.¹³⁷ On that occasion Lade argued against alcohol primarily on health grounds. He maintained that alcohol was a drug and should be treated like other drugs. He dismissed the view that the means to the abolition of intemperance was 'to improve the man' first of all. 'All you need first of all', he maintained, 'is to put the drugged drink out of his reach ... then you give him an opportunity to become a better man.'¹³⁸ Penfold-Hyland had no answer to the logic of Lade's argument, and made no serious attempt to rebut it. Instead, he relied on humour and concern about the South Australian economy to make his case persuasive. He stressed the importance of the wine industry to the state, and pushed the view, surely scarcely credible in 1917, that wine was 'not alcohol'.¹³⁹ He encouraged his audience to 'follow the king', and take a little wine. Many South Australians had previously followed the King's example and had agreed to abstain from alcohol during the war, as a patriotic gesture. Penfold-Hyland was delighted to inform them that the King was drinking again, on medical advice, and, raising his wine glass, he invited them to do the same!¹⁴⁰ It is not clear who, in the opinion of the audience, won the debate, but the South Australian Alliance felt sure enough of the persuasive power of Lade's case to publish the speeches in full and distribute them in pamphlet form.

Lade, who spoke from many platforms, argued the temperance cause in specifically religious terms if he saw fit, but when he was preaching to non-church audiences, he consistently presented alcohol as a health problem. He did not rely on the 'weaker brother' argument, and claimed that 'the banning of alcoholic liquors is in the interest of normal human nature and not simply out of consideration for the abnormal. Man is so constituted physiologically that alcoholic liquors can be safely indulged in by no one.'¹⁴¹ Hence, he concluded, 'the prohibition of the liquor traffic is immediately in the interests of hygiene and only secondarily or by consequence in the interests of morality'.¹⁴² He edited the *Patriot* during 1920, and gave considerable space in it to health-related arguments against alcohol. He insisted that 'the man who is drunk is drugged', and is therefore a 'problem for the

health authorities rather than for the clergy'.¹⁴³ He believed that once it was understood that 'we prohibitionists are out in the interests of public health and are not trying to make men moral by Act of Parliament ... the prohibition movement will prove irresistible and sweep through this country like wild fire.'¹⁴⁴ Not all Methodists, or other pro-prohibition Christians, gave such prominence to this view that prohibition was primarily a health question. Within the churches, the arguments that were used were often expressed in religious terms, and probably many would have felt more in tune with Bishop Thomas's biblical approach, or with that of the editor of the *Australian Christian* who claimed that 'our chief objection to "the trade" is founded on moral and religious reasons.'¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, since the battle for prohibition had to be fought in the community at large and ultimately in the parliament, Frank Lade's style was a great advantage. The *Patriot* was sure that 'the ripening of public sentiment in favour of Prohibition has undoubtedly been, to a large measure, due to his logical and vigorous addresses and literary articles.'¹⁴⁶

Methodism's work for prohibition did not end with the gift of Frank Lade to the movement. The church had a 'social service platform' which included many issues such as care for immigrants, Sunday observance, 'care for the poor and reform of the criminal classes', the prevention of venereal diseases, the promotion of total abstinence and prohibition, and opposition to all forms of gambling,¹⁴⁷ but prohibition was, in the early 1920s, clearly the primary concern. Almost all Social Service Department entries in the *Australian Christian Commonwealth* were about prohibition, which was often promoted as plain commonsense and a way to avoid race suicide. At the Social Service Demonstration of the 1921 Methodist conference prohibition was the chief focus and Frank Lade tried to stress the complementarity of various approaches to it by contending that 'no sound argument could be drawn from Scripture, science or common sense to show that prohibition was wrong or the licensing of the sale of alcohol was right'.¹⁴⁸ Of course, Lade was preaching to the converted, as prohibition advocates often were when addressing Christians, especially in the Nonconformist churches. Neither speakers nor the

audience regarded this as a waste of time. The *Australian Christian* reported on one occasion that 'members of the Churches of Christ do not need converting to the temperance cause, but many delight to attend meetings where the prohibition plea is made in order to demonstrate their attitude to the drink traffic'.¹⁴⁹ Those already converted realised the need to do more than to attend meetings and maintain their personal witness through total abstinence. They needed also to produce another generation of temperance workers, and this was the motivation behind the support, in many of the churches, for the juvenile temperance organisation, the Band of Hope.¹⁵⁰ Through the Band of Hope, through Sunday School lessons and Christian Endeavour Society programmes, temperance workers tried to foster in children what the Methodists called 'relentless hostility' to alcohol.¹⁵¹ Such strategies relied on moral suasion for their success, and also on monumental faith and patience on the part of their advocates, since the goals were, of necessity, distant.

In the meantime, the South Australian Alliance continued to maintain its many-sided attack on alcohol and its urgent campaign for prohibition. Through its numerous meetings and Field Days, and through the pages of the *Patriot*,¹⁵² the Alliance spread an immense amount of information, comment, debate, letters, statistics, photos, cartoons and inspirational material, all designed to prove that alcohol was disastrous for individuals and for the state, and that prohibition 'gets results ... pays ... has made good'.¹⁵³ Much supporting evidence from the United States of America, 'the Great Land of Constitutional Prohibition', was presented in the form of articles, photos and statistics.¹⁵⁴ The *Patriot* also paid a good deal of attention to the imagined effects of prohibition on the South Australian economy. This was an apt strategy since the South Australian wine industry was expanding at that time and the government was underwriting it by settling returned soldiers on irrigation blocks on the River Murray and encouraging them to grow vines. Even for these people, according to the Alliance, prohibition was good news. If Australia was already the 'vineyard of the Empire,' it would be so to an even greater extent under prohibition, since growing grapes for production of dried fruit, non-intoxicating drinks and vinegar was far more profitable than making wine.¹⁵⁵ The *Patriot*, often using cartoons and catchy slogans to underline its message, regularly portrayed the liquor interests as malevolent, irresponsible, prejudiced and

destructive,¹⁵⁶ whereas the aim of the temperance interests was ‘to help, not to hinder; to construct, not to destroy; to do the greatest good to the largest number and to promote the well-being of all’.¹⁵⁷

Although its 1920 petition to parliament was unsuccessful, the Alliance continued its lobbying. Before the elections of 1921 and 1924 it campaigned to get candidates to pledge themselves to support a referendum on prohibition if they were elected, and to persuade voters to vote for candidates who were prepared to make this pledge. Twice in 1924, in January and in July, an Alliance deputation waited on the premier.¹⁵⁸ All of this was part of an effort, agreed to at the Annual Conference of the South Australian Alliance in 1921, ‘to concentrate all its forces and resources upon an effort to secure Prohibition in South Australia by 1925’. On that occasion, in what must have been a stirring ceremony, ‘every delegate stood, and with the right hand raised, made the resolve:— “We will see it through!”’¹⁵⁹

Although it appeared optimistic throughout 1922 and 1923, by 1924 the Alliance knew that it would not ‘see it through’ by 1925, and like the churches it represented, it ceased agitating for prohibition in the near future, and opted instead to work for the maintenance or improvement of the current. licensing situation, which was frequently under attack. This did not mean that prohibitionists changed their minds or ceased to see prohibition as their ultimate goal. The Alliance claimed that it was ‘the Church in Action against the Liquor Trade’,¹⁶⁰ and that ‘the attitude of the Christian Church to the Liquor Traffic should be one of absolute and uncompromising hostility’.¹⁶¹ That claim was supported by resolutions and statements of the churches long after 1924. But in case anyone should infer from their change of immediate strategy, a sacrifice of their long term goals, both the Alliance and one of its affiliated churches made name changes. Late in 1925 the South Australian Alliance became the South Australian Prohibition League, and in 1926, the Churches of Christ Temperance and Social Problems Committee became the Prohibition and Social Problems Committee.¹⁶² They were clearly signalling that to change tactics was not to retreat from the field.

From 1924, early closing of hotel bars on Saturdays became the legislative focus of the temperance lobby. The conferences or annual meetings of several churches passed resolutions supporting early closing, and church social service departments and temperance committees began ‘working zealously’ for this end.¹⁶³ Even the Adelaide Anglican synod, hitherto resistant to the efforts of Arnold to get it to pronounce

strongly against alcohol, was prepared in 1925 to pass a resolution in support of one o'clock closing on Saturdays.¹⁶⁴ It was claimed during the debate that 85 per cent of hotels had a bookmaker on the premises, and so perhaps early closing was seen as a practical way of controlling gambling as well as drinking. In any case, in a rare moment of triumph for Arnold, the motion was 'adopted with a considerable show of enthusiasm'.¹⁶⁵

Apart from some expression of concern about the connection between Saturday afternoon drinking and gambling, the arguments advanced in support of one o'clock closing differed little from those that were used to promote prohibition. There was hardly any analysis of particular problems associated with Saturday afternoon drinking, but a good deal of the by-then familiar, generalised condemnation of alcohol as a blight on society. Early closing advocates simply assumed that the restricting of the hours during which alcohol was available for sale would lessen its impact and diminish its harmful effects. Saturday afternoon was the obvious target, given the general tendency towards a shorter working week and a half-holiday on Saturdays. If the bars continued to be open at a time when most people were at leisure, then the chances for indulgence in alcohol were great, and at the same time, those workers who were employed in the hotel trade were denied the benefits of a shorter working week.

All those forces which had previously agitated for prohibition threw themselves behind the campaign for one o'clock closing, though they were, in some cases, more realistic than they had been earlier about the difficulties they faced. As the *Australian Christian Commonwealth* pointed out:

there is no political party today daring enough to oppose the liquor trade ... It was possibly too much to expect even a Labour Government to consider the happiness and well being of their supporters to be more worthy of consideration than political security.¹⁶⁶

The Methodist Social Service Department had already realised this and declared:

we do not propose any longer to stand, cap in hand, on the door mat of the politician, begging for his 'powerful influence' and in grudging favours. The offensive must be with us in future.¹⁶⁷

It was difficult, however, to translate this aggressive attitude into effective policy. What options were available? Several churches, and the Council of Churches in South Australia,¹⁶⁸ 'wisely delegated' the question 'to the South Australian

Alliance'.¹⁶⁹ The WCTU continued to teach 'scientific temperance' in schools, and to regret that the subject was not examinable.¹⁷⁰ The WCTU women also continued their 'public house work'. Reports of this work displayed a political and economic naivety which underlines the futility of this earnest and gentle approach. For example, at the WCTU's 1927 Triennial Convention it was reported that

hotels have been visited and it was pointed out to one publican that a case of distress was caused mainly through the drunken habits of a father who obtained liquor from this hotel. The publican said he was sorry but continued to supply the man with drink and said he would send around a pint of milk daily for the children.¹⁷¹

Meanwhile, in Wallaroo's five hotels, 'good work is done by personal solicitation, and men who have been spoken to upon the evils of drink have been known to pass by the liquor bars instead of spending their money there'.¹⁷² It is clear that this 'good Work' moved them no nearer the goal of early closing, and they openly confessed that their 'legislative work' was 'quite at a standstill'.¹⁷³ The Prohibition League's legislative work was at a standstill too, after its 'strong deputation' to the Premier in October 1926 achieved nothing.¹⁷⁴ It continued to put its faith and much of its energy into the printed and the spoken word. From late 1926 it published the *Patriot* monthly rather than fortnightly. The journal was expanded in size, was printed on better quality paper and carried advertisements for Adelaide business firms, indicating that, despite the apparent lack of advancement towards its goals, the temperance movement was in good heart, and financially secure. In April 1929, the *Patriot* began advertising a 'Prohibition Open Forum', to be held monthly in the Rechabite Hall in Grote Street.¹⁷⁵ At these meetings, which attracted 'all classes'.¹⁷⁶ Veteran campaigners from several denominations pleaded the cause of temperance.¹⁷⁷ The Prohibition League, in organising these meetings, was acting on the belief that 'truth ripens in the open air of public discussion',¹⁷⁸ and by May had concluded that 'upon no measure of temperance reform, since the movement for six o'clock closing has there been such unanimity as upon this question'.¹⁷⁹

All of this patient campaigning and heightened awareness was to no avail, however, unless it could somehow impinge on the lawmakers. The chance came in August 1929, though to what extent this was due to

the work of the temperance movement during the previous five years it is impossible to tell. Shirley (later Sir Shirley) Jeffries, a Methodist and a Liberal member of the House of Assembly, introduced a private member's bill proposing a referendum on the question of early Saturday closing.¹⁸⁰ In his second reading speech, Jeffries claimed that 'in every part. of the State, there is strong agitation for this reform ... among all classes of the community, including those who have never been associated in the past. with temperance reform there are many hundreds, if not thousands, who think this reform is long overdue.'¹⁸¹ The temperance movement was delighted. The Prohibition League threw all its efforts into supporting Jeffries, giving one o'clock closing much coverage in the *Patriot* and organising a mass meeting at the Adelaide Town Hall on 3 November.¹⁸² The new superintendent of the Methodist Social Service Department, the Rev. A.D. McCutcheon, gave the cause prominence by interviewing a well-known and sympathetic citizen each week from 6 September to 18 October, and having the interviews published in the *Australian Christian Commonwealth*. The interviewees, who represented four denominations and a wide range of interests and influence, were the Rev. E.S. Kiek, R.S. Richards, M.P., Shirley Jeffries, M.P., Archdeacon J.S. Moyes, Frank Nieass, Secretary of the Australian Government Workers' Union, R.D. Nicholls, M.P., the Rev. Dr G.H. Wright of Stow Memorial Congregational Church, and Dr C. Duiguid.¹⁸³ Canon Frewin successfully appealed to the Anglican synod to express its support for Jeffries' bill,¹⁸⁴ and many church people and organisations forwarded to their local member of parliament evidence of their support for one o'clock closing.¹⁸⁵

In parliament, the debate turned not just on the temperance question, but on the rightness or otherwise of deciding such a question by means of a referendum. Jeffries himself claimed not to be 'a believer in the referendum as an instrument of government', but to be a 'believer in ascertaining whether there is a sufficient body of public opinion behind questions of this kind to make a reform effective if it is introduced'.¹⁸⁶ He suggested that the real reason some people, including members of the Licensed Victuallers' Association and their friends in parliament, argued against the

holding of a referendum, was that they knew and feared the level of support for early closing in the community.¹⁸⁷ The bill was before parliament for three months, and, as Jeffries acknowledged, was debated fully.¹⁸⁸ It was defeated on 28 November 1929, by 27 votes to 14, in a conscience vote.¹⁸⁹ The advocates of one o'clock closing, refusing to accept this as final defeat, immediately mounted a campaign to ensure that in the next parliament there would be a majority of members committed to early closing.¹⁹⁰ The results of the election held on 5 April 1930 indicated their lack of success, and, to their dismay, Shirley Jeffries was not reelected.¹⁹¹ In a mood that was despondent yet realistic, the *Patriot* concluded that the election result was 'a distinct negative. The ballot box has been padlocked, and liquor's seal affixed to it for at least three years.'¹⁹² It was a bitter blow, the more so since it followed the great defeat over prohibition. But the temperance movement did not lick its wounds for long.

Concern for early Saturday closing was soon set aside in favour of preparations for the battle that was looming over the question of six o'clock closing on weekdays. The defence of six o'clock closing occupied temperance interests for the rest of the decade. There was considerable support for an extension of liquor trading hours, both within parliament and within the community at large. But there was also a large body of opinion, not all of it wowsers or prohibitionists, which believed six o'clock closing had been a positive reform, and, representing as it did the 'will of the people', should not be tampered with. According to the South Australian Alliance, extended hours were 'not wanted by any section of the people' except for the 'the liquor interests'.¹⁹³ The 'will of the people' had been expressed by the referendum of 1915, and should not be flouted, since it was 'more sacred than the profits of brewers and publicans'.¹⁹⁴ It is possible that the views expressed by 'the people' in 1915 might have changed by 1935, but this was not something which temperance advocates chose to investigate, or even, it seems, think about seriously. Their 'unswerving hostility' to the drink trade remained unchanged, and this was the real basis of their stand against changes to the licensing laws. To avoid complicating the issue with too close a scrutiny of the 'will of the people' may have been a wise strategy, because there is some evidence that they had to work very hard, in the early 1930s at least, to maintain support for the

temperance cause. There were other urgent issues clamouring for the attention of the churches, especially the growth of legalised gambling. The South Australian Alliance hinted at another factor too. When, in October 1933, it complained that

there are not a few Christian people who are inclined to pooh-pooh any agitation against the liquor traffic in the present day. They are very ready to declare that the problem is solving itself, and in the words of a prominent church member, "It is only wasting money to keep up the agitation."¹⁹⁵

There was not much money to be wasted in 1933, and the declining fortunes of the South Australian Alliance were reflected in the depression-style *Patriot* which was reduced to four poor-quality pages which carried no advertising. Despite these difficulties, every move to extend liquor trading hours was countered with strong protests from the Alliance and from some of the churches.

The first skirmish was in 1934, over a bill to provide the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League Club (RSSILC) with a special licence for selling liquor after six o'clock.¹⁹⁶ The RSSILC Licensing Bill was a private bill, and not part of a campaign to alter the general licensing situation, but was opposed by some people on the grounds that it set a dangerous precedent, and could easily lead to further undermining of six o'clock closing. Some also argued that it was undemocratic to give special drinking rights to a few, but such was the sympathy for the RSSILC that the bill was passed, on 15 November 1934.¹⁹⁷ From that time on, the battle for six o'clock was on in earnest.

Within a year, a Labor member, S.R. Whitford, had introduced into the Legislative Council a bill to amend the licensing act by the reinstatement of late closing and the extension of the permit system and the drinking opportunities for bona fide travellers and hotel lodgers.¹⁹⁸ Most of the public attention focused on the attempt to end six o'clock closing. Whitford was supported by the Licensed Victuallers' Association, but he claimed that the bill was not 'a publican's Bill', and was 'as much in the interests of the public as it is of the publican'.¹⁹⁹ He claimed that those who opposed the bill were prohibitionists or wowsers, whom he described as 'snipe-nosed people who wear spectacles on the tips of their noses, and can see no good in anyone'.²⁰⁰ 151 Unafraid of such a description, the Rev. E.H. Woollacott, Superintendent of the Methodist Social Service Department, urged his fellow Methodists to the battle lines:

Let us uncover every gun we possess and repulse this impudent project with

such vigour and decision that the first-line of our legislative strength be not broken ... Methodists, rally to the fray! ... Hold meetings ... Write to your Members of Parliament.²⁰¹

According to Woollacott, the licensed victuallers were defying public opinion,²⁰² and in a radio broadcast during October, the Rev. W.G. Clarke presented the issue as 'The Publican Versus the Public'.²⁰³ The opposition of the public to the bill was expressed at a 'Citizens' Indignation Meeting' in the Adelaide Town Hall in September. The meeting was addressed by E.S. Kiek, who described it as 'a striking demonstration of the strength of temperance sentiment in Adelaide'.²⁰⁴ The bill faced much opposition within parliament as well, and although it was passed in December 1935, it was in an amended form which allowed six o'clock closing to remain, while liberalising the permit system.²⁰⁵ 'The Voice of the People Prevails' claimed the Methodist Social Service Department.²⁰⁶ 'Long Live Six O'Clock Closing!', said the *Patriot*.²⁰⁷ But a warning note was sounded by the writer of the South Australian newsletter in the *Australian Christian*. He deplored the extension of the permit system, and observed that 'moral deterioration' had set in, as witnessed by the increasing incidence of drunkenness, which boded ill for the future.²⁰⁸

The final round in the battle for six o'clock was fought in 1938, when Whitford made his second attempt to have the licensing act amended. The indignation of the temperance lobby was greater than ever, and the churches made their views felt in whatever ways fitted their own denominational styles and resources. 'As Christian citizens', argued the *Baptist Record*,

it is our duty to bring pressure to bear upon Parliament to reject this measure, and, failing that to submit the question to the people. To pray and work for the retention of this reform is a Christian demand.²⁰⁹

The *South Australian Congregationalist*, which had been previously engrossed in its own affairs, ran a strong editorial statement against interfering with six o'clock closing, which, it claimed, could not be justly altered without a referendum.²¹⁰ The 1938 Anglican synod passed a strong resolution against the bill, and Bishop Thomas frequently condemned the permit system and spoke in favour of early closing.²¹¹

When Richard Thomas, the Bishop of Willochra, declared himself to be in favour of late closing, since the hotel bar was 'the poor man's club', the Bishop of Adelaide was quick to dissociate himself from this point of view.²¹² G.T. Fitzgerald, the chairman of the Churches of Christ Social Service Department, issued an invitation, through the Methodist paper, to a Churches of Christ conference demonstration at which six

o'clock closing would be the subject. 'Hands off the Six O'Clock Closing Act!', he urged, and continued in pulpit-thumping style:

It represents the expressed will of the people, and the will of the people must remain more sacred than the profits of the brewers and publicans. Christians! Democrats! Patriots! Friends of the Young! Arise! Demand that Parliament shall put the wishes of the people first.²¹³

The Council of Churches in South Australia, which up to this point had been happy to leave most action on the drink issue to the South Australian Alliance, protested 'in the most emphatic manner against the flagrant and undemocratic attempt being made in the interests of the Drink traffic to alter the hours of consumption of liquor, in direct violation of the expressed will of the electors,' and launched an appeal for a 10,000 shilling Fighting Fund 'to retain the benefits of six o'clock closing'.²¹⁴

The climax of the churches' public campaign was the Youth Protest Rally of 28 September 1938, when at least 3,000²¹⁵ young people marched from the City Baths behind Parliament House, up King William Street to the Adelaide Town Hall. The crowd at the meeting overflowed into Pirie Street Methodist, Flinders Street Baptist and Stow Memorial Congregational churches. On that occasion, 6,000 people, claiming to represent 48,000 members of 15 organisations, passed a resolution denying the claim that young people wanted the bill amended, affirming the benefits of early closing and opposing alteration to the legislation except by referendum.²¹⁶ Probably more effective than all of these statements, resolutions and rallies in influencing the final outcome of Whitford's 'booze bill', was the consistent lobbying of parliamentarians that was going on at the same time. E.H. Woollacott was the chief lobbyist for the churches. He put enormous energy into this activity before the 1938 election, in order to secure a result that would 'prove a definite triumph for moral righteousness in our land'.²¹⁷ The Premier, Sir Richard Butler, complained of the 'intrusion of the Churches ... into politics'²¹⁸ but that did not stop Woollacott. He organised lobbying again when Whitford's second bill was before parliament. Given that the 1938 parliament had an extraordinarily high number of independents, susceptible to non-party arguments, this was an astute move on Woollacott's part. The bill was defeated, in December 1938, by one vote, and Woollacott claimed this as his personal victory since he had persuaded one person to change his mind.²¹⁹ The *Patriot* saw it as a 'triumph of Public Opinion' and believed that it was 'beyond question' that 'the Churches' united activities counted for a good measure of success in the contest

just ended'.²²⁰

It had been a protracted battle and it was a great victory. It was also the last major battle and the last great victory of the temperance movement. What was achieved by 1938 remained intact until 1967 without the need for major defensive campaigns. By 1967, however, South Australian society and the life and priorities of the churches were so changed that what the temperance movement had achieved at such cost between the wars was very easily swept aside.

⁴² Arnold Hunt, *This Side of Heaven* (Adelaide, 1985), p. 189.

⁴³ For details of evangelical revival crusades, and their promotion of teetotalism, see David Hilliard, *Popular Revivalism in South Australia from the 1870s to the 1920s* (Adelaide, 1982).

⁴⁴ Hunt, *op.cit.*, p. 189.

⁴⁵ Brian Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England, 1815-1872* (London, 1971), especially pp. 37-58.

⁴⁶ The first South Australian hotel, the 'Edinburgh Castle', on the corner of Currie and Gray Streets, Adelaide, was licensed on 31 May 1837. J.L. Hoad, *Hotels and Publicans in South Australia, 1836-1984* (Adelaide, 1986), p. 2.

⁴⁷ A.E. Dingle, ' "The Truly Magnificent Thirst": An Historical Survey of Australian Drinking Habits,' *Historical Studies*, Vol. 19, Apr. 1980-Oct. 1981.

⁴⁸ See e.g. Woman's Christian Temperance Union of South Australia Inc. Minutes of Annual Conventions; the *Patriot*, the organ of the South Australian Alliance. Both made a feature of such statistics.

⁴⁹ South Australian Directory for 1920 (Adelaide, 1920), pp. 1769-1772.

⁵⁰ Hoad, *op.cit.*, Part 2, pp. 1-64. Hoad lists, by locality, all the licensed premises which have existed in

South Australia, 1836-1984.

⁵¹ Ray Broomhill, *Unemployed Workers: A Social History of the Great Depression in Adelaide* (St Lucia, 1978), p. 148.

⁵² The Methodist church had large central mission operations in the city of Adelaide and at Port Adelaide, and other missions in Bowden and Brompton. The Congregationalists had a large mission at Hindmarsh. The Baptist church had two missions in Adelaide. Anglicans conducted substantial mission activities from St Luke's church in Whitmore Square, Adelaide.

⁵³ Hoad, *op.cit.*, p. 2; *S.A. Directory for 1920*, pp. 1769-1772; WCTU, *Minutes of Annual Conventions, 1920-1930*.

⁵⁴ WCTU, *Minutes of Annual Convention, 1923*, p. 58.

⁵⁵ Hoad, *op.cit.*, Part 2, pp. 1-64.

⁵⁶ WCTU, *Minutes of Annual Convention, 1930*, p. 52; 1934, p. 51.

⁵⁷ The range of attitudes of Christians and churches to alcohol is discussed in a number of places. See e.g. Harrison, *op.cit.*, t., pp. 27-31, 163-166; Richard Broome, *Treasure in Earthen Vessels: Protestant Christianity in New South Wales Society, 1900-1914* (St Lucia, 1980), pp. 141-145; Hunt, *op.cit.*, pp. 189-190, 271-272; Walter Phillips, *Defending 'A Christian Country': Churchmen and Society in New South Wales in the 1880s and After* (St Lucia, 1981), pp. 144-148; Patrick O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church and Community: An Australian History* (Kensington, NSW, 1985), pp. 282-283.

⁵⁸ For a brief account of the establishment of local option laws in S.A., see Hunt, *op.cit.*, p. 193.

⁵⁹ South Australian Temperance Alliance, *Facts for Reformers* (Adelaide, 1910). Statement on Alliance aims, between pp. 16 and 17.

⁶⁰ See e.g. *ibid.*, pp. 5-6; Hunt, *op.cit.*, p. 194.

⁶¹ Hoad, *op.cit.*, p. 5.

⁶² South Australian Alliance, *Facts for Reformers and Alliance Year Book, 1916-1917*, p. 3. 11.00pm was the next most favoured option, and smaller numbers voted for 7.00, 8.00, 9.00 and 10.00pm.

⁶³ For an assessment of the relative importance of the patriotic vote and the long-term temperance commitment in securing six o'clock closing, see Phillips, *op.cit.*, p. 270 and also his article '“Six O'Clock Swill”: The Introduction of Early Closing of Hotel Bars in Australia', *Historical Studies*, Vol. 19, Apr. 1980-Oct. 1981.

⁶⁴ It cannot reasonably be claimed that this was due entirely to the strength of the temperance lobby. Also important was a long period of non-labour government in South Australia (1933-65) and the strong personal influence of Thomas Playford, the teetotalling and long-serving premier (1938-65). By the time six o'clock closing gave way to 10 o'clock closing in 1967, it was derided by many as puritanical, uncivilised and productive of that unattractive phenomenon, popularly termed 'the six o'clock swill'.

⁶⁵ There was for several years a particular concern in the community about the abuse of alcohol by returned soldiers. People saw 'liquor doing what Huns failed to do' to the soldiers, and some even believed that 'a sinister trade influence has been at work, endeavouring to fasten the wine industry onto the returned soldier'. *Patriot*, 3 Jan. 1919, 7 Mar. 1919.

⁶⁶ South Australian Alliance, *Facts for Reformers and Alliance Year Book 1916-17*, p. 3.

⁶⁷ National prohibition came into force in the USA on 16 January 1920, but most states had enacted their own prohibition laws before that date. *Australian Prohibition Year Book, 1921*, p. 47.

⁶⁸ The South Australian Alliance committed itself to securing prohibition in South Australia by 1925 at its Annual Meeting in 1921. *Patriot*, 4 Nov. 1921.

⁶⁹ WCTU, *Minutes of the Eleventh Triennial Convention, 1921*, p. 119.

⁷⁰ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 11 March 1921. This statement was made in the report of the S.A. Methodist Social Service Department to the S.A. Methodist Conference.

⁷¹ David Hilliard, *Godliness and Good Order* (Adelaide, 1986), p. 86.

⁷² *Adelaide Church Guardian*, Oct. 1920.

⁷³ *Yearbook of the Church of England Dioceses of Adelaide and Willochra, 1919-1920*. Report of the Church of England Temperance Society (GETS), p. 186.

⁷⁴ *Patriot*, 5 Mar. 1920.

⁷⁵ *Church of England Yearbook, 1920-1921*. GETS Report, p. 140.

⁷⁶ *Patriot*, 1 July 1921.

⁷⁷ *Advertiser*, 8 Sept. 1920.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* The dissenter is not named, but several synodsmen, including A.A. Arnold, argued strongly for prohibition.

-
- ⁷⁹ *Adelaide Church Guardian*, 1 Oct. 1935. This article expressed regret at Arnold's absence from synod. It described him as 'honoured veteran ... keen Labour man and trades unionist', which indicated something of his peculiar contributions to synod discussions and awareness.
- ⁸⁰ See, e.g., *Advertiser*, 9, 11 and 14 Sept. 1920.
- ⁸¹ Church of England Yearbook, 1921-1922. Report to the laity on the state of the diocese, p. 101.
- ⁸² *Advertiser*, 7 Nov. 1922.
- ⁸³ *Australian Prohibition Yearbook*, 1923, p. 42.
- ⁸⁴ *Advertiser*, 30 Sept. 1922.
- ⁸⁵ Church of England Yearbook, 1922-1923. GETS Report, p. 142.
- ⁸⁶ Church of England Yearbook, 1924-1925, p. 111.
- ⁸⁷ *Lutheran Herald*, 26 Sept. 1921.
- ⁸⁸ Statement made at General Synod of ELSA, Oct. 1920, and reported in *Australian Lutheran*, 27 Oct. 1920.
- ⁸⁹ *Patriot*, 17 June 1926.
- ⁹⁰ *Australian Lutheran*, 7 July 1926.
- ⁹¹ Elvin W. Janetzki, *Before God and the World* (Adelaide, 1980), pp. 82-84.
- ⁹² See e.g. Conrad Bergendoff, *The Church of the Lutheran Reformation* (St Louis, 1967), pp. 298-299, and also Oliver Barclay, 'The Theology of Social Ethics: A Survey of Current Position', in *Interchange* 36 (Sydney, 1985), pp. 11-13.
- ⁹³ *Southern Cross*, 16 Sept. 1921.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 16 May 1919. This view was stated in a pastoral letter of Francis Redwood, Archbishop of Wellington, New Zealand. It was read in all the churches of his archdiocese on 6 April 1919 and printed in full in the *Southern Cross*, 16 May 1919.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 18 Apr. 1919, 15 Oct. 1920, 11 Apr. 1919.
- ⁹⁶ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 23 May 1919. This accusation was made because the *Southern Cross*, in its review of W.J. Denny's book, *The Diggers*, said nothing of Denny's approval of prohibition.
- ⁹⁷ *Southern Cross*, 30 May 1919.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 18 April 1919, 15 Oct. 1920.
- ¹⁰¹ Supplement to the *Southern Cross*, 22 Oct. 1920.
- ¹⁰² *Southern Cross*, 28 Mar. 1919.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 25 Apr. 1919.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 10 Dec. 1920.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 12 Mar. 1926.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 7 Mar. 1930.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 13 Jan. 1922.
- ¹⁰⁸ Hunt, *op.cit.*, p. 195.
- ¹⁰⁹ O'Farrell argues that Catholic and Protestant cultural patterns were distinct, and that the 'Catholic proletariat' was under pressure to conform to patterns that were bourgeois and puritan in origin. See e.g. O'Farrell, *op.cit.*, pp. 253, 282-284, 375-376.
- ¹¹⁰ The *Australian Prohibition Yearbook* for 1921 lists the affiliates of the Alliance. As well as the churches mentioned above the affiliates were the Salvation Army, Seventh Day Adventist Conference, Society of Friends, WCTU, Christian Endeavour Union, 10 lodges of the Good Templars, 10 lodges of the Rechabites and the Sons of Temperance.
- ¹¹¹ This, of course, is impossible to document conclusively. It is based on oral evidence from Presbyterians and members of other denominations recalling the 1920s and 1930s, and also on evidence from later decades. Thinking and practice on the question of alcohol and other questions, especially gambling, remained substantially unchanged until the 1960s, and I have discovered a very high level of agreement amongst church people about the general stance and 'character' of their own and other denominations. My assessment of Presbyterian and Anglican attitudes to alcohol is based on this subjective, non-quantifiable but nevertheless credible evidence.
- ¹¹² *Presbyterian Banner*, June 1919. Report of the Presbyterian State Assembly, 1919.
- ¹¹³ *Ibid.* See e.g. June-Oct. 1923, section headed 'Temperance Jottings' or 'Temperance Shots', and especially Sept. 1923.
- ¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Aug. 1920, p. 8.
- ¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, May 1921, p. 3.
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, June 1923, p. 5.

-
- ¹¹⁷ Presbyterian Life and Work Committee Minutes, 14 Mar. 1924.
- ¹¹⁸ Congregational Year Book, 1922, p. 392.
- ¹¹⁹ *South Australian Congregationalist*, Oct. 1926.
- ¹²⁰ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 27 Oct. 1922.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 14 Mar. 1924.
- ¹²² *South Australian Congregationalist*, May 1926.
- ¹²³ These judgements reinforce views expressed orally by Congregationalists and others, and also elaborated in Phillips, *op.cit.*, pp. 11, 84 and Broome, *op.cit.*, pp. 44, 145.
- ¹²⁴ *Baptist Record*, Feb. 1924.
- ¹²⁵ See, e.g. Baptist Handbook 1922, p. 23; 1924, p. 18.
- ¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 1928, p. 10.
- ¹²⁷ Churches of Christ Conference Report, 1921. Temperance and Social Questions Committee Report, p. 36.
- ¹²⁸ *Australian Christian*, 13 Feb. 1919.
- ¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 20 Nov. 1919.
- ¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 29 July 1920.
- ¹³¹ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 17 Jan. 1919.
- ¹³² *Ibid.*, 7 Mar. 1919.
- ¹³³ *Patriot*, 4 Apr. 1919.
- ¹³⁴ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 27 Feb. 1920.
- ¹³⁵ For an assessment of Lade, see Arnold Hunt (ed.), Number 20: A Pictorial History of Theological Education at No. 20, King William Rd. (Adelaide, 1980).
- ¹³⁶ Hunt, *This Side of Heaven*, p. 282.
- ¹³⁷ Details of the meeting, and verbatim reports of the speeches are included in the pamphlet, *Is Prohibition Desirable?* (Adelaide, 1917).
- ¹³⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹³⁹ This argument was really an argument against the use of spirits and in favour of 'lighter', supposedly less damaging beverages. It reflected a belief that had been common in England in the first half of the nineteenth century. It rested on a lack of understanding that alcohol was present in all intoxicating beverages. This had been attacked by Livesey's famous 'Malt Lecture' from 1833. See Harrison, *op.cit.*, pp. 120-125. The belief was still sufficiently alive in the 1880s for the WCTU to state that its opposition to 'all intoxicating drinks' included opposition to 'wine, beer and cider'. See e.g. Anthea Hyslop, 'Christian Temperance and Social Reform: The Women's Christian Temperance Union of Victoria, 1887-1912', in Sabine Willis, *Women, Faith and Fetes* (Melbourne, 1977), p. 145.
- ¹⁴⁰ *Is Prohibition Desirable?* (Adelaide, 1917).
- ¹⁴¹ Frank Lade, *Prohibition in Principle and Practice: A Plea for Sanitary Legislation* (no date).
- ¹⁴² *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴³ *Patriot*, 30 Jan. 1920.
- ¹⁴⁴ Frank Lade, *op.cit.*
- ¹⁴⁵ *Australian Christian*, 20 Nov. 1919.
- ¹⁴⁶ *Patriot*, 20 Feb. 1920.
- ¹⁴⁷ South Australian Methodist Conference Minutes, 1919, p. 130; 1920, p. 132.
- ¹⁴⁸ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 11 Mar. 1921.
- ¹⁴⁹ *Australian Christian*, 24 Apr. 1919.
- ¹⁵⁰ 'The Band of Hope' was a temperance organisation for children and young people, designed to encourage members to commit themselves to life-long and total abstinence from alcoholic beverages. It was founded in Leeds, G.B., in 1847 and in the 1920s and 1930s was affiliated with the South Australian Alliance and was part of the life of all the churches except the Catholic and Lutheran. Harrison, *op.cit.*, p. 166.
- ¹⁵¹ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 2 July 1926.
- ¹⁵² It is difficult to know how many people the Alliance reached but some idea is given from figures in annual reports. In 1923, it reported 1000 services and meetings. In 1925 it conducted 561 Field Day Services and concluded, 'There are only a few churches in the State which have not had an Alliance Field Day Service.' In 1925, 124 Bands of Hope were functioning, and 117,814 copies of the *Patriot* were distributed. *Australian Prohibition Year Book*, 1923, p. 38; 1925, p. 30.
- ¹⁵³ *Patriot*, 1 Apr. 1920.
- ¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.* See e.g. 11 Feb. 1921, 8 Apr. 1921.
- ¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.* See e.g. 23 Apr. 1920, 30 Sept. 1921.

-
- ¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.* See e.g. the front page cartoons on 28 Aug. 1921, 23 Sept. 1921, 11 Nov. 1921, 17 Dec. 1925.
- ¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 30 Sept. 1921.
- ¹⁵⁸ For the Alliance's judgement about the outcome of these efforts, see *Patriot*, 2 Apr. 1921, 15 Jan. 1925.
- ¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 4 Nov. 1921.
- ¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 7 Feb. 1924.
- ¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 4 Dec. 1924.
- ¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 3 Dec. 1925; Churches of Christ Conference Report, 1926, p. 33. The South Australian Prohibition League reverted to its original name in 1932. See *Patriot*, 25 Aug. 1932. In the same year the Churches of Christ Prohibition and Social Service Committee was restyled a 'Department'. The last use of that name was in the 1936 Conference Report. In the 1937 report, it was referred to as the Social Service Department. See Conference Report, 1937, p. 41.
- ¹⁶³ See, e.g. *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 4 Jan. 1924; *Australian Christian*, 24 Sept. 1925.
- ¹⁶⁴ Church of England Yearbook, 1925-26, p. 115.
- ¹⁶⁵ *Advertiser*, 3 Sept. 1925.
- ¹⁶⁶ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 7 Aug. 1925.
- ¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 16 Jan. 1925.
- ¹⁶⁸ The Council of Churches in South Australia was established in the late nineteenth century and was reconstituted in 1925 after a period of inactivity. From 1925, it consisted of representatives of the Baptist Union, the Churches of Christ Conference, the Congregational Union, the Methodist Conference, the Presbyterian Assembly, the Salvation Army and the Society of Friends. Amongst its office-bearers and members were people who were activists and spokespersons on social issues within their own denominations.
- ¹⁶⁹ Council of Churches in South Australia, Minutes, 5 May 1925, p. 8.
- ¹⁷⁰ WCTU, Minutes of Triennial Convention, 1924, p. 131.
- ¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 1927, p. 58.
- ¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 59.
- ¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 69.
- ¹⁷⁴ *Patriot*, 23 Oct. 1926.
- ¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 25 Apr. 1929.
- ¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 25 July 1929.
- ¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 25 Apr. 1929.
- ¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 25 Apr. 1929.
- ¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 23 May 1929.
- ¹⁸⁰ South Australian Parliamentary Debates, 1929, Vol. 1, p. 853.
- ¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 1929, Vol. 1, p. 1021.
- ¹⁸² *Patriot*, 28 Nov. 1929.
- ¹⁸³ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 6 Sept., 13 Sept., 20 Sept., 27 Sept., 4 Oct., 11 Oct., 18 Oct. 1929.
- ¹⁸⁴ Church of England Yearbook, 1929-30, p. 128.
- ¹⁸⁵ Hunt, op.cit., p. 329.
- ¹⁸⁶ South Australian Parliamentary Debates, 1929, Vol. II, p. 2338.
- ¹⁸⁷ South Australian Parliamentary Debates, 1929, Vol. 1, p. 1022.
- ¹⁸⁸ South Australian Parliamentary Debates, 1929, Vol. II, p. 2338.
- ¹⁸⁹ The House of Assembly had 46 seats in 1929. These were distributed as follows: Liberal and Country: 28; Labor: 16; Independent Protestant Labor: 1; Independent 1. The vote on the early closing referendum bill cut across party loyalties. Of the 14 who voted for the bill, 11 were Liberal and Country, and three were Labor (including Independent Protestant Labor). Of the 27 who voted against the bill, 16 were Liberal and Country, ten were Labor and one was Independent.
- ¹⁹⁰ See e.g. *Patriot*, 1 Feb. 1930; WCTU Triennial Convention Minutes 1930, p. 61; *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 21 Mar. 1930, 38 Mar. 1930.
- ¹⁹¹ Jeffries was re-elected at the 1933 election, and retired in 1953, having held ministerial rank between 1933 and 1944. He was knighted in 1953.
- ¹⁹² *Patriot*, 1 May 1930.
- ¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 1 Jan. 1936.
- ¹⁹⁴ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 9 Sept. 1938.
- ¹⁹⁵ *Patriot*, 26 Oct. 1933.
- ¹⁹⁶ South Australian Parliamentary Debates, 1934, Vol. 1, p. 1215.

-
- ¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1934, Vol. 2, p. 2141.
- ¹⁹⁸ South Australian Parliamentary Debates, 1935, Vol. 1, p. 403. The permit system, whereby organisations and individuals could apply for occasional permits allowing them to serve liquor after hours and away from licensed premises, had gradually expanded since 1916, through amendments to the licensing act. So, too, had provision for the drinking requirements of bona fide lodgers and travellers.
- ¹⁹⁹ South Australian Parliamentary Debates, 1935, Vol. 1, p. 495.
- ²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 496.
- ²⁰¹ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 23 Aug. 1935.
- ²⁰² *Ibid.*, 6 Sept. 1935.
- ²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 11 Oct. 1935.
- ²⁰⁴ *Patriot*, 1 Oct. 1935.
- ²⁰⁵ South Australian Parliamentary Debates, 1935, Vol. 11, pp. 2039, 2052-3.
- ²⁰⁶ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 27 Dec. 1935.
- ²⁰⁷ *Patriot*, 1 Jan. 1936.
- ²⁰⁸ *Australian Christian*, 23 Jan. 1936, 20 Feb. 1936.
- ²⁰⁹ *Baptist Record*, Aug. 1938.
- ²¹⁰ *South Australian Congregationalist*, Sept. 1938.
- ²¹¹ Church of England Yearbook,, 1938-39, pp. 127-128; *Adelaide Church Guardian*, 1 Oct. 1937, 1 Jan. 1938, 1 Mar. 1938.
- ²¹² *Australian Christian*, 29 Sept. 1938.
- ²¹³ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 9 Sept. 1938.
- ²¹⁴ South Australian Council of Churches, Minutes, 5 Sept. 1938, p. 279.
- ²¹⁵ The South Australian Alliance claimed the number was closer to 5,000. *Patriot*, 1 Oct. 1938.
- ²¹⁶ *Baptist Record*, Oct. 1938. See also Hunt, *op.cit.*, p. 330.
- ²¹⁷ *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 4 Mar. 1938.
- ²¹⁸ *Patriot*, 1 Apr. 1938; *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, 23 Mar. 1938.
- ²¹⁹ Ronald T. Hayward, 'The Methodist Church and Social Problems in South Australia 1900-1952' (B.A. Hons. thesis, University of Adelaide, 1952), pp. 15, 67.
- ²²⁰ *Patriot*, 1 Jan. 1939.