

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. X.—NOVEMBER, 1885.—No. 5.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—SYMPOSIUM ON PROHIBITION.

SHOULD PROHIBITION TO BE MADE A POLITICAL QUESTION? IF SO,
WITH WHAT LIMITATIONS?

NO. V.

IS PROHIBITION A WISE POLICY?

By HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D., NEW YORK.

THE right of a State to prohibit the sale and use of alcoholic liquors is undoubted. A State can, for its own protection, prohibit even the most harmless occupations and habits. Embargoes are based upon this principle. The human conscience is the only justified limit to the authority of a State. Mere dislike to a State law, or annoyance under it, gives no right to resist it. The State is to be considered as acting for the good of all, even when it acts unwisely or unjustly. State laws and State Constitutions (which are merely State laws generalized and emphasized) are the rightful expression of legitimate government, and when conscience, the only justifiable opponent, acts against them, it must be so divine as to take calmly the issue of its opposition, whatever it may be. God only is above the State, and the true conscience is God-speaking. But men are too apt to call their taste or their opinion or their interest or their blind prejudice by the sacred name of conscience.

Prohibition may be unconstitutional in a given State, but a State has a right to make it constitutional. In our own country there is the same right to alter the National Constitution. It has been altered, and can be altered again. It is not, then, in the sphere of right and wrong, but in that of the expedient and inexpedient in which we are to argue for or against Prohibition.

Will a prohibitory law be a benefit to a nation? That is the question. That drunkenness is a fearful evil, and that the drinking habits of the people are destructive to health, life and property, cannot be too strongly stated. We need not repeat the trite, but most important statistics of our alms-houses, insane asylums, hospitals and