

The Son of Temperance.

VOL. II.

TORONTO, MARCH, 1881.

No. 11.

The Good of the Order.

Self-Forgetting.

BY FRANCES RIDLEY HAVERGAL.

Let me try to lift the curtain
Hiding other hearts from view ;
You complain ; but are you certain
That the fault is not with you ?

In the summer sunny hours,
Sitting in your quiet room,
Can you wonder if the flowers
Breathe for you no sweet perfume ?

You must go to them, and stooping,
Cull the blossoms where they live ;
On your bosom gently drooping,
All their treasure they will give.

Fairly sought, some point of contact
There must be with every mind,
And perhaps the closest compact
Where we least expect to find.

Closed the heart door of thy brother,
All its treasures long concealed ;
One key fails, then try another—
Soon the rusty lock must yield.

Seldom can the heart be lonely,
If it seeks a lonelier still,
Self-forgetting, seeking only
Emptier cups of love to fill.

Wendell Phillips in Reply to Rev. Dr.
Howard Crosby.

The Temperance Argument Restated.

A TREMONT TEMPLE GATHERING.

PROFESSOR CROSBY, of New York, was in Boston, and, in the course of his address, endeavoured to belittle all those who differ from him as to the best way of ridding the world of the liquor curse. Mr. Wendell Phillips, at a subsequent meeting, replied to his remarks as follows:—

Dr. Crosby's lecture was noticeable for lack of novelty or weight of argument and of correctness in his statements. I dissent from Dr. Crosby's remark that we "cannot conscientiously object to the means employed by others unless they contain an immorality," and say that Dr. Crosby should have studied the history of the temperance movement. I may sum up Dr. Crosby's lecture as follows:—

1. Dr. Crosby objects to the total abstinence theory and movement, as it insults the example

of Jesus ; that its advocates undermine and despise the Bible, while they strain and wrench it to serve their purpose ; and he asserts that the Bible, correctly interpreted, repudiates total abstinence and such a temperance crusade as has existed here for the last fifty years.

2. Dr. Crosby objects to this movement as immoral and unchristian ; the total abstinence system is "contrary to revealed religion," and "doing unmeasured harm to the community ;" he considered it as the special and direct cause of the "growth of drunkenness in our land, and of a general demoralization among religious communities ;" asserts that it is exactly the kind of movement that rumsellers enjoy, and that it ought not to succeed, never will and never can.

3. The pledge is unmanly and kills character and self-respect.

4. The assertion that moderate drinking leads to drunkenness is untrue.

5. The total abstainers bully and intimidate the community, and disgust all good, sensible men.

6. That what is needed to unite sensible men, in a movement sure to succeed, is a license system recognizing the distinction between moderation and excess, between harmless wines and beer and strong drink. Such a system, "free from taint of prejudice and instinct with practical wisdom, will establish order and peace and save us from a moral slough."

The looseness of these statements is noticeable. Total abstinence is abstaining from intoxicating drinks ourselves and agreeing with others to do so. No one pretends that he can cite a Biblical text which forbids total abstinence. Dr. Crosby's argument is that Jesus drank intoxicating wine and allowed it to others. There is no proof that he ever did drink intoxicating wine ; but let

that pass, and suppose, for the sake of the argument, that he did. What then ? To do what Jesus never did, or to refuse to do what he did, are such acts necessarily "contrary to revealed religion ?" Let us see. Jesus rode upon an ass' colt ; we ride upon railways. Are they contrary to revealed religion ? Jesus never married. Is marriage contrary to revealed religion ?

Now, there is a class of biblical scholars and interpreters who do assert that wherever wine is referred to in the Bible with approbation it is unfermented wine. Of this class of men Dr. Crosby says : "Their learned ignorance is splendid ;" they are "inventors of a theory of magnificent daring ;" they "use false texts" and "deceptive arguments ;" "deal dishonestly with the Scriptures ;" "beg the question and build on air ;" their theory is a "fable" born of "falsehoods ;" supported by "Scripture twisting and wriggling ;" their arguments are "cobwebs," and their zeal strips their judgment, and they plan to "undermine the Bible." Who are these daring, ridiculous and illogical sinners ? As I call them up in my memory the first one who comes to me is Moses Stuart of Andover, whose lifelong study of the Bible, and profound critical knowledge of both its languages, place him easily at the head of all American commentators. "Moses Stuart's Scripture View of the Wine Question" was the ablest contribution, thirty years ago, to this claim about unfermented wine, and still holds its place unanswered and unanswerable. By his side stands Dr. Nott, the head of Union College, with the snows of ninety winters on his brow. Around them gather scores of scholars and divines, on both sides of the Atlantic. In our day Taylor Lewis gives to the American public, with his schol-