

been cursed by the introduction of a more powerful stimulant than they possessed before. That fine race, the Maories of New Zealand, the Indians of North America, the inhabitants of the South Seas and the teeming multitudes of India have to thank their European conquerors for a far worse stimulant than they would ever have thought of using if left to themselves.

An eloquent convert to Anglican Christianity not long ago admitted that the Hindoos do not object to the introduction of the Christian religion on account of its dogmatic teachings, since, in their primitive state, the two religions bear a remarkable resemblance to one another, but a firm and logical stand is taken on some questions of ethical doctrine, and the most prominent of these is the objection they have to a God who permits His children to damn their (the Hindoos) souls with drink. Can it be doubted but that the people of China would long ago have gone back to their milder teas and coffee, if the British Government had not been accessory to the crime of poisoning them with opium?

The answer to another attempt to excuse moderate drinking meets with a sufficient answer in the challenge which at the outset is given to one of the premises in Dr. Bayard's syllogism:—"a certain amount of self-control is implanted in the mind of every individual; he knows that danger attends many of his daily acts; he commits the act and avoids the danger. So with the *use* of alcoholic drinks—the danger lies not in the use of them but in the improper use of them." The fallacy in this argument is by no means on the surface. Instead of being, as it first appears, composed of a single proposition, the statements that lead up to the conclusion are best expressed in and really form part of a double proposition. Stated seriatim these are as follows: *A* 1. Many (rightful) daily acts are attended with danger, but (2) man is endowed with self-control, therefore (3) man ought to be capable of doing the act and avoiding the danger.

*B* 1. Drinking alcohol in health is one of these (rightful) daily acts, and (2) man is endowed with self-control, therefore (3) man ought to drink alcohol in health, but avoid its dangers. Now, unless Dr. Bayard will say that he refers to other than *rightful* acts, I think he will acknowledge that before the conclusion in *B* can be admitted he must show that (Prop. *B* 1.) drinking alcohol in health is a *rightful* act; he has failed to do this (nay, more, on his own showing it is a *wrong* act)

consequently (*B* 3) the conclusion is unproven and unreliable. I quote further: "He should know that the highest attribute of a well-regulated mind is the power of self-control, that the act of self-government is *noble* when exercised in the face of temptation, nothing without it, and he who will not restrain an injurious appetite degrades himself to the level of the brute creation." True; but it may well be doubted whether there is anything ennobling in temptation *per se*; that all depends upon whether the individual exposed to it has sufficient will-power to resist. If he has, doubtless the endeavor to overcome an obstacle gives strength and confidence to the man, and it does raise his moral status, but what will be said of him who needlessly runs into the way of temptation, who exposes himself, body and soul, to danger when there is no justification whatever for the act? Surely, there is nothing noble or ennobling in action of that kind. The driver on an express engine runs many risks in the pursuit of his avocation, and we all admit the nobility of his calling, but can any excuse be found for the traveller in the Pullman who needlessly takes a ride on the cow-catcher?

The good which Dr. Bayard sees in the withstanding of temptation and the exercise of self-control can be had to a greater and nobler advantage in the practice of total abstinence. Let him who doubts attempt to abstain from wine, and at the same time mix in that society where the temptation that goes along with moderate drinking is assumed to be had, will his way be altogether a path of pleasantness? Will he find his burden light? Or will he be likely to learn to his cost that there is room and to spare for the exercise of all his powers of temper and self-control if he refuse to drink when, in consequence, all his companions and friends regard him in the light of a "spoiler of the feast" and when the symposiarch reminds him that in Rome it is the custom to emulate the Roman practice? I hold that the moderate drinker never resists a temptation that will compare with such a one. If the truth were known I believe it would be found that many men are moderate drinkers only because they lack the moral courage necessary to become total abstainers. If it be thought that we have so few "ennobling" temptations in this life that search must be instituted for a "temperance" one, let it be looked for in the life of the total abstainer and the searcher will not look in vain.