



DEBATE
AT
MIDDLETOWN

*Between Elder G. Beebe of New Vernon, N. Y., and
J. J. Pierce, Esq., of Columbia, Pa., October 3d,
1842, upon the following propositions:*

NEW VERNON, N. Y., Feb. 15, 1843.
Beebe's Editorials Volume 2
Pages 146-239

This e-book has been republished electronically by Tom Adams for “A Sweet Savor” web-site. It is being distributed free of charge for the edification of those that are of like precious faith. My hope is that it will prove a blessing to you as much as it has been to me!

Tom Adams

DEBATE AT MIDDLETOWN

Between Elder G. Beebe of New Vernon, N. Y., and J. J. Pierce, Esq., of Columbia, Pa., October 3d, 1842, upon the following propositions:

1st. That the fundamental principles of the “Temperance Society,” that to “*make, vend or drink* liquors which when used to excess produce intoxication, is immoral and sinful,” is anti-scriptural, and implicates the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles as immoral and wicked.

2d. That said society assumes to be “wise above what is written” by setting up a standard of temperance which the scriptures have not authorized, and attaching to it a superiority over the bible rule.

3d. That the temperance doctrines, as held by the said society, in which the pledge to total abstinence is made a test of church fellowship and also of political preferment, are subversive of the principles of democracy and of true religion, and that they constitute a connecting link uniting the church and state; and co-operating with kindred institutions of human invention, are calculated to overthrow those civil and religious rights, for the establishment of which the patriotic blood of our revolutionary sires was poured forth.¹

Hon. J. Finch and D. L. Harding, Esq., upon the part of the affirmative, and Wm. Bross and N. R. Conklin, Esq’s., upon the part of the negative, having been chosen Moderators; and Hezekiah T. Watkins having been by them elected President, the following rules of decorum were adopted:

1st. No expression of approbation or disapprobation shall be given by the audience, during the course of the discussion.

2d. Twenty minutes at a speaking, and no more, shall be allotted to the disputants alternately.

3d. During the twenty minutes allotted to either polemic he shall not be interrupted by any remark from his opponent.

At about eleven o’clock the above arrangements were proclaimed in the presence of an immense congregation of the most intelligent and respectable citizens of the vicinity – and the meeting was called to order, whereupon the affirmative was announced in possession of the floor.

¹ From the notes taken the debate cannot be given verbatim or with entire accuracy; but the substance, embracing the leading ideas advanced in the course of it, will be found succinctly embodied in the following synopsis. If however any idea advanced by Mr. P., which his friends may deem essential, be omitted, (which will not probably be the case) a subsequent insertion of it will be cheerfully given.

Elder Beebe then addressed the assemblage in a few preliminary remarks, in which he stated that nothing could be more foreign from his feelings than a desire of distinction in public debate; but that he had nevertheless been induced in this instance by his attachment to the principles he maintained, as well as by a conscientious sense of duty and faithfulness to the cause he espoused, to accept the challenge urged upon him by Mr. Pierce for the present discussion. He also stated that it might be proper, previously to entering upon the pending debate, to vindicate the advocates of bible temperance as well as his own sentiments, from the base and slanderous aspersions of some of their opponents. He therefore wished it distinctly understood that he and those who agreed with him in sentiment, while they opposed the doctrine of total abstinence as a standard of temperance, morality, religion and statesmanship, were the warmest advocates and commenders of temperance in the true signification of the term, and the most strenuous and sincere opponents and denouncers of drunkenness. "Temperance" had been assumed by a society of recent origin, as a badge or distinctive cognomen, but such an assumption was an act of dishonesty, inasmuch as it charged that all who did not unite with them were, in theory or practice, intemperate; and the arrogation of the term also involved a most gross perversion of language. No lexicographer defined temperance to be total abstinence from anything, much less alcoholic drinks in particular. While he held that the temperate or moderate use of wine was a sinless privilege, neither upon the present occasion or any other should he, as had been charged by some, advocate its use as a duty upon the community in general; and his opposition to this society was not therefore from any objection to abstinence from alcoholic drinks by any, as citizens of the world; but it was upon other grounds he opposed the total abstinence societies of the day. Having thus vindicated his sentiments and position in the debate from false charges that had obtained to some extent, and having explained clearly the ground upon which he stood, he took up the first position in order, and proceeded to show from the bible, the only infallible record of the will of God which had been delivered to mankind, that "wine and strong drink" were divinely ordained to be *used as not abused*, and that therefore the doctrine of the Total Abstinence Society was anti-scriptural, as alleged in the first position. As evidence thereof he brought forward the 29th and 30th verses of Gen. i.

"And God said, Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life; I have given every green herb for meat; and it was so."

Here was the testimony of divine revelation that the fruit of every herb and tree was given to man, and who could say that the juice of the grape or other fruit so given should be abstained from, although when expressed and fermented, as a natural consequence, it exhibited alcoholic properties? Who could adduce an argument from the scriptures to show that any developments of fruits thus given without reserve to man, were a curse rather than a benefit, when used as not abused, and should therefore be rejected altogether and not condemned? That development which exhibited alcoholic properties was discovered in olden time, and was made use of by holy men of God without rebuke, as would be presently proved by numerous instances; and notwithstanding this had been the case for thousands of years an inspired apostle could still say: "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if received with thanksgiving." Thus was he sustained by the word of God in the stand he had taken, and his opponent must resort to another source. He believed the truths of the sacred scriptures to be immutable and everlasting, as their Author is of one mind and changes not, and none can turn him: – but his opponents relied upon the teaching of puny creatures, like themselves, of yesterday, like the

grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast in the oven; and with these teachings and inventions of the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, they ventured to attack the wisdom and benevolence of Jehovah! Who was on the Lord's side, who?

[Twenty minutes having been occupied, the floor was yielded to the negative.]



Mr. Pierce said that himself and friends revered and esteemed the bible as highly as their opponents, and that from that volume and the book of nature he should endeavor to maintain the doctrine of his society. "Total abstinence," said he, "is a doctrine of the bible, as firm as the fundamental principles of nature." The total abstinence society had not contemplated making their pledge a political standard, and therefore the apprehensions of Mr. B. were groundless; and as to the making of their pledge a test of church fellowship, if it had been made so in any instance it had not been by his society, and hence if there was any evil in this it should not be laid to their charge, but to the charge of those churches which had made it so. He then went into an explanation of the circumstances which had led to the debate, in which he said that he had been lecturing upon the subject of total abstinence in this part of the county, and that some of his friends had expressed a desire that he should lecture at New Vernon, and he accordingly called on Elder B. to borrow his church for that purpose, supposing him, of course, to be a man of some influence, more or less, in his own neighborhood – but Mr. B. refused to lend him his church on the ground of opposition to his doctrine. They then entered into an argument, in the course of which he informed Mr. B. that if he dissented from what would be advanced that he would have an opportunity of opposing it after his lecture. But Mr. B. still refused. He then appointed to lecture at a school house in the neighborhood, and lectured accordingly, when he was informed that Elder B. had expressed a desire to meet him in public debate. He then addressed him the following note:

Otisville, Sept. 19, 1842.

ELDER BEEBE: – Sir, I am informed that you have expressed a desire or willingness to meet me in public discussion, to investigate the merits of the total abstinence cause. Investigation, sir, is the touchstone of truth, and if conducted in a proper spirit will result beneficially to the community. If such is your desire you will please let me know by the bearer. You may appoint the place of meeting, and I wish that the third of October would suit your time.

Very respectfully,

JAMES J. PIERCE.

ELDER BEEBE.

To which Elder B. replied as follows:

New Vernon, Sept. 21, 1842.

MR. JAMES J. PIERCE: – Sir, yours of the 19th was handed me this morning, with a desire that I should reply immediately. I am not aware of having expressed any desire to meet you in public discussion on the subject of total abstinence, farther than what I expressed to you personally at my office, in reply to *your* challenge. I have said that I thought it unfair that you should have selected an

evening for your lecture in this neighborhood, on which it was well known I was to be absent, after having challenged me to meet you in public.

As I told you in our former conversation, I now repeat, that although I have no particular anxiety to be engaged in a public debate, still I have no objection to meet you and attempt to sustain by scripture testimony and published documents, of what is called the “Temperance Society,” the positions I stated to you at the time above referred to, viz:

[Here follow the three propositions already inserted.]

The above positions I am ready to defend in public or private, as may suit you best. If in public it will be necessary to make such arrangements as will secure decorum during the debate, and an equal division of the time. The time you mention, October third, will suit me. If you conclude to take the opposite of my positions it will be proper to settle the necessary preliminaries as soon as possible, determine on the place, and who shall preside as moderator or moderators during the discussion.

Please let me hear from you on this subject soon, and oblige, respectfully yours,

G. BEEBE.

Mr. JAMES J. PIERCE.

Upon the receipt of which he returned the following:

Otisville, Sept. 21, 1842.

ELDER BEEBE: – Dear sir, yours of this date is received. I will be happy to meet you in public discussion on October third, at any suitable place that we may agree upon. You may select any positions that way best harmonize with your opinions, and I will defend the cause of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors as a beverage, (according to the extent of my limited abilities) in every light that religion and philosophy require a good cause to be sustained.

JAMES J. PIERCE.

Previously to receiving an answer to the last note he called on Elder B., who had declined meeting him upon the premises presented in it. He then agreed to discuss the question as embodied in the three propositions, which Elder B. had himself laid down; and the present time and place were then agreed upon for the debate. He was here, accordingly, the advocate of total abstinence from that which brought poverty, disease and death in its train, which would blast the brightest prospects and benumb the best of faculties; he was here the defender of that principle of philanthropy under which benevolent and moral citizens had banded themselves together to alleviate the condition of suffering humanity, under which they had contributed their united influence and energy to suppress drunkenness and promote temperance, and a cause so benevolent was sustained by the whole tenor of the scriptures. His opponent might bring passages of scripture to show that wine was used in Palestine, but the wine anciently in use there was entirely different from that in use among us in modern times: that wine was a kind of syrup, and used as a diet: it would not intoxicate. The wine spoken of in the scriptures was merely the unfermented and undistilled juice of the grape, as clearly proved by Genesis xi.11: “And Pharaoh’s cup was in my hand, and I took the grapes and pressed them into Pharaoh’s cup, and I gave the cup into

Pharaoh's hand." Here grapes were pressed, and the juice expressed was immediately used, without any opportunity for fermentation. But the alcoholic wine and other liquors in use among us, would intoxicate, and were fraught with evil consequences, and were therefore a curse and should be abandoned, and for the utter abolition of their use he hoped ever to be found an advocate.

[Mr. P. was here informed that his time had expired.]



Elder B. said the remarks of Mr. P. with regard to the pledge being made a test of church fellowship and a political standard, properly belonged to the third proposition: he should therefore leave them for the present. With regard to refusing the gentleman his church, he was not aware he had upon the grounds alleged, for he was not in possession of a church; but he had informed Mr. P. that the church of which he was pastor would not probably sanction his society by lending him their meeting house to lecture in on their behalf. Mr. P. had stated that the object of the total abstinence society was to promote temperance and suppress drunkenness, and had represented himself the advocate of suffering humanity. Without wishing to arrogate to himself undue honor he would merely remark, as he had already, that none more heartily approved temperance or reprobated drunkenness than himself, and no one had employed the means in his possession more fully than himself for the encouragement of temperance. So the remarks of Mr. P. under this head were entirely irrelevant, and could have no connection with the discussion. The argument of Mr. P. from the pressing of grapes by Pharaoh's chief butler, if argument it might be called, certainly had no tendency to prove anything with regard to the ancient method of manufacturing wine. It was but a detached portion of a dream, and in a dream the mind was at random, and a close connection frequently conceived between objects the most distant: works and structures which would require the labor of years, were but the result of a moment in the imagination, and by a flit of the mind the idea of them was directly succeeded by the contemplation of other and multiform objects. If the butler's dream proved that upon the pressure of grapes the wine then in use proceeded immediately from there, it proved also that the grape among the Egyptians was of momentary growth and maturity, the blossoms succeeding the buds, and the ripe clusters the blossoms with the rapidity of thought: for the language of the butler was, "In my dream behold a vine was before me; and in the vine were three branches, and it was as though it budded and her blossoms shot forth, and the clusters thereof brought forth ripe grapes; and Pharaoh's cup was in my hand," &c. If the momentary manufacture of the wine then in use was proved by the dream, so also was the momentary growth of the grapes from which it was manufactured. But we had no evidence that the grapes in question were pressed to emit their juice, as nothing was said of either wine or the juice of the grape in the connection – but the ripe grapes of such quick growth were doubtless intended as *first fruits*, and it was a custom of that time to give a measure heaped up and shaken and pressed together in token of respect and esteem for the person to whom it was given. That the wine mentioned in the bible would not produce intoxication, but was merely the unfermented juice of the grape, did not really require a serious denial. The term wine itself signified nothing else whatever but fermented juice, as defined by every lexicographer, and all intelligent persons were aware that any juice when fermented contained alcohol; but although the matter was fully set to rest by the plain definition of the term in a common dictionary of words, it might nevertheless be proper to cite a few passages of scripture in which the wine in question was proved to be like all other wine in possessing the intoxicating properties, and he

would challenge the negative to produce an instance of the use of wine, mentioned in the bible, which it could be proved would not produce intoxication if taken in immoderate quantities. The first example of the existence of wine, given in the scriptures, was recorded in Gen. ix. 20-24: "And Noah began to be a husbandman, and planted a vineyard; and he drank of the wine, and was drunken." "And Noah awoke from his wine," &c. In the absence of all other testimony this passage was amply sufficient to expose the fallacy of the gentleman's assumption, that the wines used among the ancients possessed no alcoholic properties, and were incapable of producing intoxication, when used to excess. Had the wine of Noah's vineyard possessed no intoxicating properties Noah might have drank of it in any quantity without becoming drunken, The excessive use of wine by Lot also, as mentioned in Gen. xix. 32-35, produced intoxication. The misapplied reproof of Eli to Hannah, 1 Samuel i. 14: "How long wilt thou be drunken? put away thy wine from thee," showed that intoxication was, in ancient as in modern times, the result of excessive indulgence in the use of wine. Passing the numerous instances recorded by Isaiah, Solomon and others in the Old Testament, proving the alcoholic or intoxicating qualities of all the ancient wines, it was only necessary to refer to the charge made against the apostles by their enemies, on the day of pentecost, and the frequent admonitions given to the primitive saints against being "drunken with wine wherein there is excess." On these scriptures, together with the entire absence of a solitary instance recorded in the scriptures, of the existence of any kind of wine which would not, when excessively used, produce intoxication, the argument on this point would be rested, until the negative should have opportunity to question the quotations which had been already made, and must be conclusive unless set aside by some extraordinary evidence.

[Here the twenty minutes allotted were announced to have expired.]



Mr. P. said it was true there were some wines in use among the ancients which when taken to excess would intoxicate, but wines of this description were not common. That about the time of the christian era, according to Pliny, there were 390 different kinds in use, but the most of these were preparations of the juice of the grape as a sort of syrup and used as a dessert, and unaccompanied with alcoholic developments. According to the learned Doctor Adam Clarke, the grapes of Palestine were of a very luxurious growth, extremely pleasant to the taste, and eminently adapted to preparation in this manner, and therefore it was highly probable that the wines spoke of as in use among the Jews were but the juice of the grape thus expressed and prepared. The grapes of that country were also almost wholly unfit for the manufacture of wine from, owing to their extremely saccharine nature and other qualities which they possessed. Here Mr. P. read at some length from Mr. Clarke's writings.² It was then evident that the wine of the ancient Jews was of a thick, syrupy nature, and consequently not alcoholic. But the wines and other ardent spirits of the present day every one knew were of a different kind, being drugged with deleterious matter, and the production of alcoholic distillation. Such wines and liquors were highly injurious to the health of both body and mind, and were not commended in the bible, as the

² The quotations made by Mr. P. from various authors cannot be given, as they are not in our possession. This is much to be regretted, as they comprised a very considerable portion of his addresses. From this cause the report of Mr. P's. arguments will not occupy as much space as that of our own, since our quotations are mostly inserted. The bearing of Mr. P's. authors, however, will be given as nearly as can be recollected. – ED.

wines it spoke of were the pure juice of the grape, while these were a compound of noxious materials, and possessed of qualities highly intoxicating from an invention of modern date. The art of distilling was discovered as recently as the – century, and consequently nothing contained in the bible, which was written so long before, could be construed to sanction or commend it. Mr. P. thought, however, that the debate thus far had been rather a digression from the propositions under consideration. He would prefer to adhere more closely to them, and recapitulated the first proposition, to which he wished to call the attention of his opponent. The first matter to be discussed, then, in order, was whether the total abstinence society held the doctrine ascribed to it by the affirmative, viz.: that “to make, vend or drink liquors,. which when used to excess would produce intoxication, was immoral and wicked.” That the total abstinence society held this doctrine he denied, and called upon Mr. B. for his proof that they held it. That society deemed it expedient to abstain from the use of that which they considered an evil, and to exert their influence to induce others to do the same; it was purely philanthropic in its tendency, and if there was any evil in abstaining from that which they considered it injurious to use, it remained to be shown.

[Here Mr. P’s. time had expired.]



Mr. B. said the gentleman had admitted that there were wines in use among the ancients which would when used to excess produce intoxication, but asserted on the authority of Doctors Adam Clarke and Pliny that there were 390 kinds of Wine in use in Palestine, and urged the presumption that the greater part of the wines then in use were such as possessed no alcoholic qualities.. It has already been proved by all the lexicographers that the term wine was only applicable to alcoholic liquors, and the negative had been challenged to produce from the scriptures a solitary instance where wine was mentioned that did not possess such qualities. The testimony of Adam Clarke, or that of any other arminian commentator, was altogether inadmissible when brought to bear down the testimony of the scriptures. That there were ancient preparations from the grapes of Palestine other than that of wine, was admitted; that the juice of the grape was sometimes boiled, and reduced to a saccharine substance, or syrup, and in some instances used in this state instead of honey, as an article of diet, but more commonly used to strengthen the weaker juices of the grape, and to preserve and give additional strength to weak wines by promoting additional fermentation, was also admitted; but such preparations were never called wine by Pliny or any other historian of note. That wine in all cases contained alcohol, was proved by reference to Walker, Webster, British Encyclopedia, &c.³ The argument that the ancient preparations from the grape were of a saccharine nature and therefore not alcoholic, hardly needed a refutation, as it was well known that the saccharine quality of the grape was that from which the fermentation, and consequently the alcoholic properties of the wine, were produced; rum was produced from sugar-cane, &c., wine and brandy from the saccharine properties of the grape. Mr. P. had said that modern intoxicating drinks were corrupted with drugs and deleterious articles by manufacturers and venders, and were therefore essentially different from those used in ancient times; those of the present time being poisonous, while those of former times were comparatively innocent. But the practice of

³ Walker defines wine, “The fermented juice of the grape;” Webster, “The fermented juice of the grape; the juice of certain fruits prepared with sugar, spirits, &c.; intoxication, drinking;” Encyclopedia, “All wines contain an acid, alcohol,” &c.

drugging wines was not peculiar to modern times, however, for it was common among the ancients, as appeared from Cant. viii. 2, Isa. v. 22, and Mark xv. 23; and hence the frequent mention of *strong drink* in distinction from the common wine. Whether there were 390, or as many thousand kinds of wine or not, did not effect the argument, as Nehemiah furnished his men *once in ten days with store of all sorts of wine*. Neh. v.18. Mr. P. had resorted to a very singular stand in demanding proof that the total abstinence society held that to make, vend or drink liquors, which when used to excess would produce intoxication, was immoral and sinful, and asserting this to be a point open for discussion. So far as the gentleman was himself concerned, his agreement to take the negative of the first proposition in this debate was an admission on his part that such doctrine was held by the society by him represented, and for further testimony he would refer to the following resolution, passed by the Third National Temperance Society, held at Saratoga Springs, July 28, 29 and 30, 1841:

“Resolved, That the tendency of all intoxicating drinks to derange the bodily functions, to lead to drunkenness, to harden the heart, sear the conscience, destroy domestic peace, excite to the commission of crime, waste human life and destroy souls, and the rebukes and warnings of God in his word in relation to them, in connection with every law of self-preservation and love, impose upon all men a solemn moral obligation to cease for ever from their manufacture, sale and use as a beverage, and do unitedly call upon us, as men and as christians, not to pause in our work until such manufacture, sale and use shall be universally abandoned.”

The term *moral* perhaps might require some definition, as it was rendered somewhat vague and ambiguous by the use to which it was sometimes applied. A moral evil Mr. B. considered the transgression of some moral obligation, and a moral obligation was an obligation binding alike on all intelligent creatures of God as his creatures, and alike binding under all circumstances throughout all time. [Here Mr. P. was asked whether he admitted the definition, to which he replied that he did.] It having been already proved that the doctrine of the society was unscriptural, it would be next in order to proceed to examine whether the unscriptural doctrine implicated Christ and his apostles.

To prove that Christ made, drank and furnished wine for others to drink, it was only necessary to refer to John ii. 6-11:

“And there were set there six water pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece. Jesus saith unto them, Fill the water pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bear it: When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was; (but the servants which drew the water knew) the governor of the feast called the bridegroom, and saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now. This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.”

In this scripture we had express testimony that our Lord made wine; to say therefore that to make wine was immoral and sinful, was to charge the Lord of life and glory with immorality and sin. Equally positive and emphatic was the testimony that our Lord drank wine: he had himself declared it. Speaking of John the Baptist, who being a Nazarene, “Came neither eating bread nor drinking wine,” he said, “The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous and a wine bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.” – Matt. ix. 19, and Luke vii. 34. At the institution of the

Lord's supper, which sacrament was to be observed, according to the pattern, throughout all time, Christ said, "Verily, I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God." – Mark xiv. 25, Matt. xxvi. 20, and Luke xxii. 18. These last quoted passages proved that the apostles also drank of the same cup and of the same fruit of the vine; for he took the cup in like manner, (as he had the bread) and when he had given thanks, he gave it to his disciples, saying, Drink *ye all* of it; and this commandment they obeyed. To say therefore that to drink wine was immoral and sinful, was to charge Christ and his apostles with immorality and sin.

That the wine used by our Lord and his immediate disciples was such as would, if excessively used, produce intoxication, was proved; first, from the absence of any instance of wine mentioned in the scriptures which would not produce such effect. Second, from the universal definition of the word *wine* by all lexicographers. Third, by the numerous instances mentioned in the bible where the wine used by the ancients did produce intoxication. Fourth, by the repeated admonitions in the scriptures, warning the people of God not to be drunken with wine, wherein is excess. To assert therefore, as did the society represented by Mr. P., that to make, vend or drink liquors, which when used to excess would produce intoxication, was immoral and sinful, was to implicate Christ and his apostles as immoral and sinful. Unfermented juice of grapes was not called wine in the scriptures, but in distinction from wine it was designated *liquor of grapes*, as in Num. vi. 3. Of the intoxicating effects of wine, Esther i. 10 was referred to.

With the foregoing array of *bible testimony*, the affirmative of the first proposition had been established: nothing had yet been produced by the negative from that sacred record to meet it. Mr. P. had promised repeatedly that he would meet it with scripture testimony, and establish the negative *as firmly as the fundamental laws of nature*; but his allusions to the bible had been "few and far between."

In addition to sustaining the affirmative, Mr. B. said he would now show that not only Christ and his apostles, but beside them a long catalogue of the most illustrious characters that had ever existed, among whom would be found patriarchs, prophets and holy men of God in all former ages, were also implicated by the doctrine of the total abstinence society as wicked and immoral.

1. He would begin with Noah, for with him began the history of wine; he had already proved by Gen. ix. 20-24, that Noah not only made, but drank, and became drunken with wine.
2. Lot, also, as had been already shown, drank to intoxication of wine. – (Gen. xix. 33-35.)
3. Melchisedek and Abram were also obnoxious to the charge of the total abstinence society; "And Melchisedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was priest of the Most High God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram," &c. – Gen. xiv. 18, 19.
4. Isaac: "And he did eat, and he (Jacob) brought him (Isaac) wine, and he drank." – Gen. xxvii. 25. Isaac also furnished wine for others, not as a curse, as Mr. P. and his society had dared to pronounce it, but-as a blessing. "And isaac answered and said unto Esau, Behold I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given him for servants; and with corn and wine have I sustained him." – Gen. xiv. 37.
5. Judah, personating Christ, in the prophetic blessing of his father Jacob, "Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes: his eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk." – Gen. xlix. 11, 12.

6. David, a man after God's own heart, in blessing Israel after the return of the ark from captivity, gave them wine. "And he dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel; as well to the women as men, to every one a cake of bread, a good piece of flesh and a flagon of wine." – 2 Sam. vi. 18, 19, 1 Chron. xvi. 3.
7. Nehemiah was a vender of wine, and bearer of the article to Artaxerxes the king. – Neh. ii. 1. And instead of becoming disgusted with the practice of drinking wine while in captivity, when released from bondage and commander of the workmen employed in repairing Jerusalem, he provided it for his men. The daily provision of his table was, "One ox, six choice sheep, also fowls, and once in ten days, *store of all sorts of wine.*" – Neh. v.18. Truly this governor of Jerusalem forbade the sale of wine; but not because it was sinful to drink wine, but because it was manufactured and sold *by aliens on the Sabbath day.* – Neh. xiii. 10.
8. Queen Esther prepared two banquets of wine. – Esther vii. 2.
9. Job. This man that feared God and eschewed evil, allowed wine as a beverage in his family. – Job 1. 13.
10. Elihu was rather too intimately acquainted with wine to escape the sweeping charge of modern abstinence societies. – Job xxxii. 19.
11. Solomon sought in his heart to give himself unto wine. – Eccl. ii. 3.
12. Daniel spoke of one very remarkable circumstance of mourning and fasting, in which for *three full weeks he drank no wine.* – Daniel x. 2, 3.

Besides the stigma and slander sought to be fastened on our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles, this brilliant array of illustrious names, with which as many more might be brought, was implicated by the new-fangled total abstinence theory. In this list we had the names of Noah, Lot, Melchisedek, Abram, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Elihu, Solomon and Daniel; and could the gentleman on the negative produce such a catalogue of holy men in the scriptures to sustain his doctrines? Most assuredly not. The reflection also upon the God of heaven was truly alarming; his wisdom, goodness, and even his veracity were impeached and insulted; the creatures of his creation and special gifts of his bounty, things by him given as blessings, and by him pronounced *very good*, were denounced as *an evil, a curse*, and as such requiring to be neutralized by wisdom superior to that of God!

"Shall the vile race of flesh and blood
 Contend with their Creator, God
 Shall mortal worms presume to be
 More holy, wise or just than he?

"Behold he puts his trust in none
 Of all the spirits round his throne;
 Their nature, when compared with his,
 Are neither holy, just nor wise.

"But how much meaner things are they
 Who sprung from dust and dwell in clay!

Touch'd by the finger of his wrath,
We faint and perish like the moth.

“From night to day, from day to night,
We die by thousands in his sight;
Buried in dust whole nations lie
Like a forgotten vanity.

“Almighty Power, to thee we bow;
How frail are we! how glorious thou!
No more the sons of earth shall dare
With an eternal God compare.”



Mr. P. said that the wines of ancient times mentioned in the quotations that had been made from the bible, were of an entirely different kind from those, the merits of total abstinence from which were under discussion. Those wines were, as he had before remarked, the pure juice of the grape, in most cases containing no alcohol, and in none containing a quantity comparable with that of the wines of the present day. The wines now in use were strengthened by alcohol obtained from distillation, the art of which was unknown in ancient times. Our wines were mixed with brandy, and in various other ways corrupted; therefore no analogy could be claimed between modern and ancient wines. In proof of the hypothesis that oriental wines were not used in the sottish manner of our own, he would read an extract from Joseph's travels in India.

[Mr. P. here read an extract from Mr. Joseph's travels.]

As nearly as can be recollected, the purport of the extract was that among the eastern nations the common wine was a delightful and harmless beverage, containing but little alcohol, as little or less than common claret, together with Mr. J's. opinion that the wines used in the United States were a curse, and should be dispensed with.

The resolution of the National Convention at Saratoga had nothing to do with the sentiments of the society with which he stood connected; that was a convention of the old total abstinence society, but he was attached to the Washingtonian, which had recently originated in the city of Baltimore, and was commenced by the voluntary reformation of some persons that had been addicted to drinking. These persons had immortalized their names as justly as the signers of the declaration of independence – they had signed a declaration of independence from the dominion of the worst of tyrants – and that had given the first impulse to a moral revolution, which bade fair to be as beneficent as the revolution which resulted in the acquisition of civil freedom. The Washingtonian Society did not hold the doctrine of the absolute moral obligation of all persons to unite with them; but yet from the benevolence of the enterprise it was but reasonable to expect that all who were desirous of checking the evil of intemperance would co-operate with them in their efforts to that end. Example was a powerful incentive to action, and had a tendency to exert a more considerable influence than the most elaborate arguments or efforts of any other description. Intemperance had of late years assumed a more

formidable aspect than formerly, its victims were vastly more numerous, and its effects in society much more disastrous than at any anterior date or in any other country, and therefore it was now, even if not formerly, a duty binding upon all friends of morality to discountenance the use of that which could be of no benefit, but on the contrary was extremely injurious and demoralizing in the greatest degree. It was therefore expedient for all friends of temperance to wage a war of extermination against the monster alcohol, and give no quarters: by banishing it from our land we had nothing to lose, but all to gain. There was then a moral obligation founded on expediency resting upon all to co-operate with the total abstinence society, in clearing our land from the misery and sin attendant upon the use of alcohol.⁴ Mr. B. seemed determined to nail him to the bible, and since he was so desirous he would nail him to it. He would therefore show authority from the New Testament for total abstinence from alcoholic drinks: "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." Here was full and complete authority for abstaining from whatever was found to be an evil, or injurious to society. Who could look around him upon the scene of devastation and the dire havoc made by the demon intemperance, and say that it did not cause his brother to offend? Nearly all the crime perpetrated in community was attributable to intemperance; it reduced the most prosperous to poverty, and armed poverty with desperation. Under the maddening influence of alcohol, murders, robberies, thefts, forgeries and all other outbreaking crimes were committed. It then behooved all friends of temperance, morality, religion and their country, to unite with the total abstinence society in banishing this curse from community, and excluding it from our else happy land.

There had been formerly efforts for the extermination of alcohol and in the cause of temperance, but it had not been with a zeal adequate to the magnitude of the undertaking, and after the first impulse a kind of torpidity seemed to obtain in society on the subject; but under the Washingtonian auspices the grand object of the friends of temperance bade fair to be accomplished. Much good had already been done; seventy thousand reformed drunkards were the result of that organization, and he looked forward with confidence to the time when our country would be redeemed entirely from the blighting and ruinous effects of alcohol. Judging from the spirit prevalent in the community it could be at no very distant day. Indeed he could conceive of no reason why our citizens should be slow to leave off drinking the liquor of roaches, decomposed animal matter, &c., as were the wines in use among us, since these materials were used largely in their manufacture.

Mr. P. here read some receipts for making the corrupted qualities of ardent spirits, which he alleged were sold at our taverns, that prescribed the most loathesome and disgusting ingredients, when he was informed that his time was up.



Mr. Beebe said that should the gentleman succeed in proving that the wines mentioned in the scriptures were either weaker or stronger than those in modern use, it could not effect the argument, as it had been fully demonstrated by the most positive scripture testimony, that the wines mentioned in the quotations

⁴ Here, and on many other occasions, Mr. P. was handed slips of paper by his clerical friends, several of whom had seated themselves on or about the stage. To this fact perhaps it may be proper in justice to him to say, may be attributed his vascillations throughout the discussion, and his frequent resumption of positions which he had previously and repeatedly abandoned; as also when embarrassed his assumption of new ones entirely inappropriate.

referred to did invariably produce intoxication whenever used to excess. Whether intoxication was produced by weak wines, *the pure juice of the grape*, or by wines made strong by drugs or otherwise, was a matter of no consequence, seeing both would and did produce the same pernicious effects when improperly used. The adding of brandy to modern wines, as alleged by the gentleman, served the same end as the ancient practice of adding *defrutum* or voiled juice to their weak wines. Brandy was produced by the modern invention of distilling wine. Defrutum was produced previously by boiling the juice of grapes; both produced the same effect when added to simple wines. Whether therefore this additional strength to wines was produced by adding brandy or defrutum could not effect the subject of discussion. Mr. P's. far fetched history of oriental usages as irrelevant. Mr. B. said he had been rather impatiently waiting for the redemption of his opponent's pledge, to bring forth scripture testimony to establish his theory: Mr. P. had produced some testimony from a Mr. Joseph, a traveler in India; but he would prefer the testimony of that Joseph who sojourned in Egypt, as he was more familiar with his character, and understood better how much confidence might be safely reposed in his testimony.

If by the hesitancy of the gentleman to admit the testimony of the National Convention at Saratoga, that the manufacture, traffic and use of alcoholic drinks as a beverage was immoral, or a violation of a moral duty, he meant to take the ground that it was not immoral or sinful to make, vend or drink liquors, which when used to excess would produce intoxication, he had yielded the ground on which he gave the challenge to this public discussion, and upon which it was accepted. But if he intended to yield this prominent part of the question at issue, why did he continue to harp upon moral reformation? How were our morals to be reformed by total abstinence from that the judicious use of which was net immoral? The gentleman seemed disposed to dispense with the bible as a standard of morality, and found his arguments upon *expediency*; he would only remind him of the language of the proposition, [reading it.] Mr. P's. elaborate endeavors to prove by scripture that intemperance was an evil, were superfluous, for it had not been disputed. On this very fact Mr. B. had founded his arguments that. the bible contained all that was valuable upon the subject, and therefore those who walked according to the divine rule required no other rule, and that to offer to secure even a conformity to the requisitions of the bible by any other rule, was a reflection on the wisdom and goodness of the divine Legislator. As to the superior efficacy of the Washingtonian over the previously existing abstinence society, and the claim that this had reclaimed 70,000 drunkards he had nothing to say, as he was the advocate for neither; and could the ambition of the advocates of either or both of them be satisfied without claiming a superiority over the bible itself, he, as a minister of Christ, would feel relieved from. the necessity of testifying against them. It was however his opinion that very many gentlemen and ladies included in the boasted seventy thousand, would consider it no compliment to be presented before the public as *reclaimed inebriates*. General Washington himself, and "Lady Martha Washington," if living, might decline the honor of the association of their names with reformed drunkards: the former used spirituous liquors, and gave it to the soldiers of the revolution; and the latter furnished wine to her guests. That the wines used by them, however, was a composition of roaches, &c., he could not say, as Mr. P., claiming for himself the unenviable distinction of a reformed inebriate, might have had a much better opportunity of knowing the contents of modern bar rooms than himself; for of the sorts and composition of liquors sold at bar rooms he was willingly ignorant; but he hoped that tavern keepers and other venders of wines would not avail themselves of the receipts Mr. P. had been reading to them, for manufacturing spurious liquors. The gentleman had brought forward one passage from the scriptures, but with what relevancy to the subject of total abstinence societies remained to be shown. Paul, in 1 Corinthians viii.,

dwelt largely on the subject of christians eating meats offered to idols; and concluded that as an idol was nothing in itself considered, he could eat meats which were sold in the shambles without asking any questions for conscience sake, and that his brethren might do the same: but if it was said, This meat has been offered to an idol, and weaker brethren would be encouraged to offend by seeing their stronger brethren eat, then they would walk uncharitably, if to gratify their appetites, they would cause weaker brethren to offend. On this occasion Paul said, “Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.” What possible connection this passage, by any just construction, could have on the subject of discussion, Mr. P. would be unable to show. As well might this passage be urged as a reason why we should abstain from the use of bread, or any other article which God has given to be received with thanksgiving, and used as not abusing it.

That wine was a creature of God, and that God had given it to be used as a beverage by man, Mr. B. said he would proceed to prove by the infallible testimony of the scriptures, and tax his opponent with the very difficult task of producing from the scriptures a passage showing that God had ever interdicted the moderate use of it, excepting in certain cases, such as that of the vow of the Nazarene, or of the priests of Aaron’s order when ministering at the altar, &c. He would again call the gentleman’s attention to Gen. i. 29. “And God said, Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree, [if it was admitted that wine was the fruit of the vine, as our Lord. had expressly called it in the sacrament of the supper, it must be the fruit either of *herb* or *tree*, and unto man it was given for meat, or to be used,] yielding seed; TO YOU IT SHALL BE FOR MEAT.” – Gen. i. 31. “And God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good.” The omniscient eye of the Creator had not seen in the vine, nor in what the vine was to develop, what our modern reformers pretend to discover, viz: moral evil, sin, &c. So far from its having been given as a curse, as the gentleman and his colleagues had ventured to denounce it, it was universally spoken of as a blessing.

2. Isaac, after having eaten Jacob’s venison and drunk wine, had blessed Jacob with PLENTY OF WINE, and could not recall the blessing. “Therefore, God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, AND PLENTY OF CORN AND WINE.” “And Isaac answered and said unto Esau, Behold I have made him thy Lord,” &c. “And with corn and wine have I sustained him.” – Gen. Xxvii. 28-37; and in verse 33: “I have blessed him; yea, and he shall be blessed.” . Would it not have been strange if Isaac had entailed a curse on that son in whom all nations were to be blessed, and through whose loins the Savior was to come into the world? And if he had would it not have been passing strange had he called that curse an irrevokable blessing?

3. The prophetic blessing of Jacob on Judah, who was a type of Christ, sustained this position: “Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise, &c. Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass’s colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine and his clothes in the blood of grapes. HIS EYES SHALL BE RED WITH WINE AND HIS TEETH WHITE WITH MILK.” – Gen. xlix. 8-11, 12. Could the holy patriarch, by divine inspiration, have pronounced that a blessing which God regarded as a moral evil?

4. Wine was a prominent part of the blessing which God had promised to the children of Israel on condition of their obedience: “And he will love thee and bless thee, and multiply thee: he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn and thy wine, and thine oil.” Deut. vii. 13. Had God blessed wine? Who then should dare to curse it, or to call that common which God had

blessed? God had said, ‘I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain; that thou mayst gather thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil.’ Deut. xvi. 13. ‘And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, and of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks; that thou mayest learn to fear the Lord thy God always.’ Deut. xiv. 23.

5. A provision for the priests, &c., was, “The first fruits also of thy corn, and of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the first of the fleece of thy sheep shalt thou give him.” Deut. xviii. 4.

6. Moses, the man of God, had blessed the children of Israel thus: “There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky. The eternal God is thy Refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms: and he shall thrust the enemy from before thee, and shall say, Destroy them. Israel shall then dwell in safety alone; the fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine, also his heavens shall drop down dew. Happy art thou, O Israel! Who is like unto thee, O people, saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency! and thine enemies shall be found lars unto thee, and thou shalt tread upon their high places. Deut. xxxiii. 1-26-29.

7. Nehemiah had reproved the Jews for depriving their brethren of their vineyards and their wine. Neh. v. 2

8. “Thou hast put gladness in my heart, more than in the time when their corn and their wine increaseth.” Psa. v. 7.

9. The Lord by his prophet had shown the awful degeneracy of Israel, by the similitude of an inconstant, ungrateful, and adulterous wife, so wretchedly depraved that she did not know that he gave her corn, and wine, and oil, &c. Hosea ii. 8.

10. “Behold I will send you corn, and wine, and oil, and ye shall be satisfied therewith, and I will no more make you a reproach among the heathen.” “And the floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats shall overflow with wine and oil.” Joel ii. 19-24.

11. “The Lord hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength, Surely I will no more give thy corn to be meat for thine enemies, and the sons of the stranger shall not drink thy wine, for the which thou hast labored; but they that have gathered it shall eat it and praise the Lord, and they that have brought it together shall drink it in the courts of my holiness.” Isa. lxii. 8, 9.

12, “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all hills shall melt. And I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel, and they shall build again the waste cities and inhabit them: and they shall plant vineyards and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens and eat the fruit of them.” – Amos ix. 13, 14.



Mr. P. said his opponent had boasted that he was not acquainted with the liquors of modern bar rooms; be this as it might he evidently had the tavern keepers for his friends, and advocated their cause. To discern the difference, however, between modern and ancient wines did not require a very intimate acquaintance with either; it could but be apparent to the most careless inquirer. But to the quotations

which had been made from the bible, and indeed to the general tenor of his argument he did not object. Whatever use had been made of wine by any of the persons referred to by his opponent as related in the bible, that its use was not thereby justified; for wine was spoken of in the sacred volume as the figure of a curse, “The wine of the wrath of God,” &c. The divine estimation of it was thus clearly given; and most truly it was a fit and appropriate emblem of a curse. Its effects from the earliest history of it in our possession amply vindicated its adaptedness to this figure. Noah indeed used wine, and that too of the sort that would intoxicate; but what was the consequence? The pronouncement of a curse upon one of his sons and his posterity forever. And what had been the consequence from that time to the present? It had invariably resulted in a curse. It was not then incompatible with the scriptures to abstain from it entirely.

Mr. B. had been continually calling upon him for scripture authority for total abstinence, and he should by-and-by proceed to show such authority; but for the present it was his purpose to prove that the principles of his society were compatible with moral philosophy. He then read a lengthy extract, occupying a large portion of his time, from “Paley’s Moral Philosophy,” in which neither wine nor alcohol was adverted to, it being a mere abstract metaphysical disquisition, the exact bearing of which is not remembered, since not the slightest relevancy to the occasion could be perceived in it.

Mr. P. said that his position was the morality of the doctrines of his society; this was his position; and his opponent might take what one he pleased, yet he should endeavor to maintain this. Here, having apparently detected the ludicrous light in which he appeared from having avowedly abandoned the first position agreed upon for discussion, and assumed one entirely independent of it, and having no relation to it, he seemed very much confused and took his seat, notwithstanding but part of his time had expired.

[It being now nearly two o’clock, a recess was given until three.]

AFTERNOON, THREE O’CLOCK.

The meeting was called to order, and Mr. B., having the floor, proceeded: –

His opponent had thought proper when last up, to repeat arguments which had been previously met and disposed of. It had already been shown, on bible authority, that the wines of ancient times were capable of producing all the pernicious effects produced by our modern wines. Whatever arguments, therefore, could be made to bear against the modern were equally applicable to the ancient. If wines which, as had been proved, were given to Israel, and to other nations ‘by the Creator as a blessing, were to be rejected as a curse, ‘because there were those who by an improper and wicked ‘perversion of their use had injured themselves with them, why was not the same reason for such rejection equally valid in Old Testament times? And why should not the use of other things be rejected for the same reason? Fire, for instance, had done immense mischief in our world; cities and towns had been laid waste by its un pitying conflagrations, and many had perished in its flames. Why then were we not bound by moral obligation to combine our names, our talents and our influence for the total abolition of the destructive element? Again: why was it not equally immoral to manufacture knives, razors, &c.? Had they not been used for the destruction of human life? There was not a temporal blessing enjoyed by mankind that

might not be improperly used, and even perverted so as to prove an injury instead of a blessing. We were admonished by the word to use these things, and wine among them, as not abusing them, knowing their fashion passeth away. The principal argument brought by the gentleman, in support of his hypothesis, had been the assertion that the wines of the ancients were comparatively innocent drinks to those now in use; that the art of distilling was unknown among them, &c. It had already been proved that the wines used as long ago as the days of Noah, would, and did produce intoxication. And he would proceed to show that the ancients also had both wines and strong drinks, either of which, when used excessively, produced intoxication. Whether the strong drinks mentioned in the scriptures in distinction from ordinary wine, were produced by distilling or by drugging the common wines was a matter of no consequence. Even if this could have a bearing on the subject of discussion, it might be difficult for the gentleman to prove that the art of distillation was not known in the eastern world in former times, and had been lost, like the art of embalming and other arts, for a time, and was but revived at the time at which he thought it was originally invented, or that some superior chemical art of manufacturing the strong drinks mentioned in scripture with which we are unacquainted was not known among them. The charge given to Aaron to abstain from wine, was when officially engaged in divine service: “Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die.” – Ley. x. 9. The ancient wines and strong drinks were distinguished from each other, and from simple grape juice. Num. vi.1. ‘He shall separate himself from wine and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink; neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes or dried.’ – Deut. xxix. 6. “Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drank wine nor strong drink, that ye might know that I am the Lord your God.” – Judges xiii. – (the angel’s charge to the mother of Sampson, concerning her vow,) – “Now therefore beware, I pray thee, and drink not wine or strong drink, and eat not any unclean thing.” – 1 Sam. i. 14, 15., (the language of Eli to Hannah.) – “How long wilt thou be drunken? Put away thy wine from thee. And Hannah answered and said, No, my Lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit: I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have poured out my soul before the Lord.” Prov. xx. i: ‘Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise.’ Prov. xxxi. 4-6: “It is not for kings, O Lemuel; it is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink, lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted. Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish, and wine to those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more.” Isa. v. 11: “Wo unto them that rise up early in the morning that they may follow strong drink, that continue until night till wine inflame them.” Isa. v. 23: “Wo unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink.” Isa. xxiv. 9: “They shall not drink wine with a song; strong drink shall be bitter to them that drink it.” Isa. xxviii. 7: ‘But they also have erred through wine, and through strong drink are out of the way: the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment.’ Isa. xxix. 9: “Stay. yourselves and wonder; cry ye out and cry; they are drunken, but not with wine: they stagger, but not with strong drink.” Isa. lvi. 12: Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink, and tomorrow shall be as this day and much more abundant.” Micah ii. 11: “If any man, walking in the spirit and falsehood, do lie, saying I will prophesy unto thee of wine and strong drink; he shall even be the prophet of this people.” Deut. xiv. 26: “And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after; for oxen or for sheep, or for wine or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth; and thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and all thine household.”

Mr. B. said he had been charged with having the tavern keepers for his friends, and that he was the advocate of their doctrines. He hoped to be able so to deport himself as to enjoy the friendship of his fellow-citizens, and not by infringing upon their rights to incur their disapprobation. He was happy in the contemplation that the same charges and insinuations were made, by the enemies of the cause of God, against the Lord Jesus Christ and his primitive disciples. His divine Master had incurred the indignant reproaches of the Jews for associating with publicans and sinners, and had not only been accused of advocating the cause of the wine dealers, but of being himself “A wine bibber, a gluttonous man, and a friend of publicans and sinners.” He was happy to be thrown into so good company; for as these things had been done in the green tree, he was admonished to expect their repetition in the dry.

Mr. P. had said that he did not object to the scriptures produced on the affirmative. Why did he then labor so earnestly to prove the opposite of what they taught? If he objected not that wine was a creature of God, by him provided for the good of his creatures, and by him given as a blessing, and that it was freely used by Noah, Melchisedek, Abram, Let, Isaac, Jacob, all the patriarchs, and by the prophets also; why did he in his next breath labor to prove that it was a curse and not a blessing? Why did he labor to trace the curse of Canaan to the wine drank by Noah? Whether the curse of Canaan could justly be attributable to his own sin, or to that of Noah, or not, the scriptures to which Mr. P. said he did not object, showed numerous examples of evil arising from an improper and unwarrantable use of wine; nevertheless, it was declared in those scriptures to which the gentleman did not object, that wine was a blessing.

It might be easy for the gentleman to prove the doctrines of his society to be compatible with “Paley’s Moral Philosophy,” on which he had lavished so much of his time, and of which he had read so copiously, but with the standard of the scriptures, as required in sustaining the negative of the position in debate it would not be quite so easy. Mr. B. had nothing to do with Paley or his philosophy, he had no more respect for that author’s than he had for Mr. P’s. Opinions; and he would take no man’s opinion as evidence against the bible. Mr. P. had, and perhaps very judiciously, thought proper to abandon the proposition in discussion, and assume as his position “The morality of the doctrines of his society.” Let him then acknowledge that he found his former position untenable, and that he could not successfully encounter the invincible testimony of the word of God; that he had found it hard for him to kick against the pricks, and then might another subject be selected for discussion.

[Twenty minutes had now been occupied.]



Mr. P. reiterated that the morality of the doctrines of his society was the point that it was his duty to establish. If therefore he should succeed in maintaining that they were compatible with moral philosophy his position would be sustained.

[Here Mr. P. read another extract from Paley’s Moral Philosophy.]

It was then a principle of moral philosophy, that if a person was aware that any course of conduct would result in the injury of another person, he was an aggressor, and guilty of injuring such person in not refraining from such course: The use of ardent spirits all were aware resulted in the great injury of thousands and tens of thousands of our countrymen and fellow-beings. Through it thousands of worse

than widowed mothers, together with their emaciated and starving children, were deprived of the care and affection of a husband and a father; and through its baneful use that creature which was formed in the image of his Maker was transformed to worse than a brute, and sunken beneath the condition of even the unintelligent animal creation. This then was sufficient evidence that there was a moral obligation binding upon all to unite in the endeavor to arrest the cause of intemperance, and abandon that from which it proceeded. The scripture had no direct bearing upon the subject. He had shown from the principles of morality which were admitted as the sentiments of the age, and taught in our institutions of learning, that the traffic or use of alcoholic drinks involved those guilty of it in the crime of wantonly and willfully injuring their fellow-men, which was of course immoral. By our common law, if a person knowingly aided in furnishing an instrument of death for the destruction of a fellow-being, he was implicated and considered accessory to the murder of that being. That ardent spirits were instrumental in the destruction of thousands of our fellow-citizens annually, was a fact universally known. In some instances they resulted in the murder of the persons participating in their beastly draught, but in many other cases in that of others unpolluted. by them, but falling victims to the infuriated and demonized passions of those under the influence of intoxication or drunkenness. The dealer in alcoholic drinks, which were not only capable but absolutely certain of such consequences, as shown by experience, was therefore guilty, according to the common law, of being accessory to the crime committed under their nefarious influence. Mr. B. had quoted Paul's direction to Timothy; but he should like to know if the wine which Paul recommended Timothy to use was like ours, and productive of such ruinous effects. Could the apostle have recommended such a nefarious article? He thought not. His opponent had also continued to quote various passages from the bible, showing instances of its use among the prophets and others, and in some cases to excess; but was the gentleman aware that God had given statutes not good, and precepts by which we could not live? This was the case, and by indulging in the use of alcohol it was found we could not live, and evil consequences resulted. [Here Mr. P. read something about "fifteen respectable gentlemen" (physicians we believe). who upon investigation had come to the conclusion that the moderate use of wine eventuated in drunkenness.] The use of alcoholic drinks in small quantities effected the faculties to some extent, and it must be evident that the moderate use of them could not but result in drunkenness. No man was ever a drunkard at the commencement, nor had he naturally a thirst for intoxicating drinks, but a taste for them was artificial and acquired, and it was this unnatural thirst thus brought on by the moderate use of them that induced drunkenness. The bible denounced the drunkard, and since drunkenness was but the effect of that of which the moderate use was the cause, total abstinence, the effectual and only preventive of it, was the doctrine of the bible. Search the scriptures and we should find that the best of God's servants had been total abstinent from wine and drunkenness, as for instance the priests of the Old Testament times, Sampson and the Nazarenes, and John the Baptist who came preaching the advent of Christ. It is true some had used wine; but the time had now come when men must abstain from meats which caused their brethren to offend. Wine was not necessary nor nourishing to mankind; but was worse than useless; it was destructive of human life, and brought many to premature and untimely graves.



Mr. Beebe said the gentleman had promised in a former stage of the discussion that he would nail him to the scriptures, and by them establish the doctrines for which he contended; but he had finally

discovered the incongruity of the sentiments for which he was the able advocate with that best of books, the bible: he had gravely asserted that the scriptures had no direct bearing upon the subject, and had therefore repeated the declaration of his assumption of a different position. That there was nothing in the scriptures which could be made to bear in favor of the doctrines by him contended for, would not be disputed; but that the scriptures bore a fearful testimony against the doctrines of his society had been fully demonstrated. The gentleman had assumed the task of establishing a theory of morality upon principles of philanthropy: a theory on which the scriptures had no direct bearing! And should he succeed in the establishment of his theory he might bequeath it to his “total abstinence” confederates, and by them it might be regarded as a priceless boon; but christians had a more sure word of prophecy unto which they did well to take heed. They did not require the new theory as either a help or an ornament to the doctrine or morality of the bible.

The gentleman had inflicted on us another copious selection from his favorite author, Mr. Paley, from which he had arrived at the conclusion that to persist in a course which we knew or had reason to believe would, or might result in injury to our fellow-men, involved immorality and sin on the part of the person so persisting, as was the case in the Jewish code, with the man whose ox was wont to push, &c. The inference drawn by the gentleman was that intemperance was an ox that had been wont to push, and the only safe way to prevent his doing mischief was by the total abstinence doctrine, and consequently a moral obligation was binding on all moderate drinkers to take the pledge, or they were otherwise held justly responsible for all the evils of intemperance. This theory appeared as strange as novel: but before we dismissed our bibles, as being distanced and thrown in the background by modern doctrines, we should examine the bearing of the supposed substitute for the precepts and examples of our Savior. It had been shown by the most irrefragable testimony, that evils, similar to those in modern times, had in every age resulted from an intemperate use of wine and strong drinks; but, by the manner prescribed *as the only safe way*, neither Christ nor his apostles had “taken a stand” against them: neither he nor they signed the pledge; neither he nor they abstained from the use of that wine which when improperly used produced such pernicious effects. The gentleman’s new theory of philosophical morality therefore charged Christ and his apostles with having been accessory to, if not the absolute cause of all the misery and crime produced by the intemperate use of intoxicating drinks. But was this imputation upon the blessed Savior, his holy apostles and all those who preferred the precepts of Christ to the commandments of men, just? Was the pattern laid down by the Savior, for the imitation of his disciples throughout all time, liable to such consequences? Well might the heavens be astonished and the éarth afraid when men dared thus openly to blaspheme the sacred name of Christ! To expose the fallacy of this novel theory, to vindicate the doctrine of Christ and the precepts of the King of Zion from such reflections, he would show from many portions of the New Testament, that although Christ and his apostles drank wine, and allowed the temperate use of it in the church, they neither countenanced nor allowed the intemperate use of it; but he would previously prove by a few clear, plain and pointed passages, that the only safe, admissible and infallible rule upon the subject was not the pledge of total abstinence contended for by his opponent; but the high imperial authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that defined by his apostles.

“And Jesus came and spake unto them, (the eleven apostles) saying, All power is given unto me, in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” – Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” – 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.

At the transfiguration a voice came out of the cloud and said, “This is my beloved Son, hear ye him !” – Matt. Xvii. 5; Luke ix. 35; 2 Peter i. 18.

And Jesus said unto them, (the apostles) “Verily, I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” – Matt. xix. 28.

By these scriptures it was taught: Ist, That Christ, as Head over his church, had all power and authority in heaven and earth.

2. That he had authorized his servants to teach the observance of nothing more nor less than what he had commanded.

3. That the scriptures were a perfect and infallible rule of life and deportment to the man of God.

4. That the whole cloud of bible testimony directed obedience to Christ in all his precepts do. That Christ had associated his apostles with himself in judgment, and. seated them on thrones of judgment, (not legislation) and their decisions in all matters relative to his kingdom were final and conclusive, and from their decisions there was no appeal.

On such authority as the above, Mr. B. said hé would now bring forward the passages by which he designed to repel the aspersions cast upon Christ and his gospel, by those who with the gentleman claimed for the modern doctrines of the abstinence society, that their pledge was the only safe and effectual barrier to intemperance:

“And be ye not drunken with wine wherein is excess; but be ye filled with the Spirit.” – Eph. v. 18. If, as had been contended, the wine here spoken of possessed no intoxicating qualities, how could the Ephesian saints have been drunken from the excessive use of it? And if the moderate use of intoxicating wine was immoral, why had not the apostle forbidden the use of it altogether. In this, with the preceding and succeeding chapters, the apostle dwelt upon the rule of the christian’s faith and practice; and in commanding the apostles to avoid drunkards and drunkenness, why had not this apostle told the saints that the only safe rule was to abstain totally from the use of wine? Evidently because he had he no authority so to tell them: had he told them so he would have conflicted with the rule which Christ had given in Eph. v. 1-18.

“But I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a drunkard, &c., with such an one, no, not to eat.” – 1 Cor. v. 11.

“Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God.” 1 Cor. vi. 10. “But, and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken, the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” – Matt. xxiv. 49-51; Luke xi. 45, 46.

“And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your heart be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares.” – Luke xxi. 34.

“They that be drunken are drunken in the night; but let us who are of the day be sober; putting on the breastplate of faith.” – 1 Thess. v. 7, 8.

“Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, Strife, sedition, heresy, envyings, murder, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” “But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law; and they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts.” – Gal. v. 19, 24.

“Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the traditions which he received of us.” – 2 Thess. iii. 6.

Having rejected the bible as having no bearing on the subject, the gentleman had availed himself of a more popular standard of morality, and one that was better adapted to his purpose; a standard which he averred was admitted and taught in our institutions of learning, and sanctioned by the present age. This modern standard would sustain him; but it would also prove the affirmative of the last proposition, that the doctrines of the abstinence society were subversive of the principles of democracy and of true religion. By his own testimony our institutions of learning were already being corrupted, as well as the sentiments of the current age, as would be more fully shown at a proper stage of the discussion.

The gentleman had charged the venders of intoxicating liquors with being not only accessory to, but actually guilty, by the laws of our land, *of deliberate murder!* Mr. B. did not profess to be very familiar with the laws of our land there might be such statutes as the gentleman had asserted in our code; but he had never heard of them before; he wondered why the advocates of the new theory did not have all venders of wines indicted and punished according to Law. If such a law could be found in our civil code, he was positive nothing like it could be found in the divine law. Mr. P. had queried whether the wine recommended by Paul to Timothy was like our modern wines. So far as intoxicating qualities were concerned it was similar, or the apostle would not have restricted Timothy to a little. Mr. P. had also asserted, that God had given statutes not good, and precepts by which we could not live, but had neither in this nor in any other case referred to chapter and verse. He (Mr. B.) knew of no such passage in the bible; he had been in the habit of believing, with David and Paul, that the law of the Lord was perfect; that the law was holy, &c. He strongly suspected Mr. P’s. passage denouncing the law and government of God, was quoted from his new theory of philosophical morality. Those who were under the impression that the divine government was not good, might well be expected to attempt an improvement of it, either by repeal or revision but this was an undertaking in which he desired to have no agency. Mr. P. had spoken of lawyers and doctors, and clergy, &c., whose aid he seemed desirous of securing, and this reminded him that his divine Lord was once surrounded by doctors and lawyers with whom he disputed in the temple, and it appeared that the dispute was not yet settled, as doctors and lawyers were still quoted to oppose what Christ had said. The gentleman had asserted that the best of God’s servants had abstained from the use of wine! According to this, Melchisedek, king of Salem, and priest to the Most High God, was a servant inferior to the priests of the order of Aaron, and Aaron was superior to Christ who came eating bread and drinking wine! But it was not true that the priests of Aaron’s family abstained from the use of wine, except when officially engaged in the service of the tabernacle or temple. Special provision was made by God himself, that those priests should be supplied

with a tith of the wine manufactured by their brethren, and they were on some occasions actually required to drink of it. John the Baptist, as a Nazarene, came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; but this was because as a Nazarene he was not allowed to drink wine, but not because he was better than our Lord who came eating and drinking, for the latchet of his shoes John was “not worthy to unloose.”

[Twenty minutes had now been occupied.]



Mr. P. said that anatomical analysis had proved that the use of alcoholic drinks of the day was absolutely deleterious and destructive to health, in however small or moderate quantities they might be used. Eminent physicians had decided that the poisonous drugs which went so largely into the composition of our alcoholic beverages, injured and incapacitated several organs of the body for the discharge of their respective functions. A person addicted to drinking had had a part of his breast torn off by the discharge of a gun, so that his heart could be seen and examined; observations were made upon it, and experiments tried by physicians, from which the nefarious effects of modern rum were perfectly visible and indubitable, as these physicians testified. Science and experience proved the propriety and expediency of abstaining entirely from that which produced such baneful effects, and which was in no case productive of good.

His opponent had referred to the wine which Christ made at the wedding, but it was not compatible with the character of Christ to suppose that upon that occasion he really manufactured a wine that was capable of producing intoxication. This could not be so. It was derogatory to his divine character to suppose that this was the case. There were six water pots, and he commanded them to be filled with water, and the water was made wine; and that was the very best of wine: it would be well if at this day there were no wines worse than that produced from water. The wine Christ produced so far from possessing the nefarious properties of the wines of the present day, would have made drunken men sober! The wine which had been used at that wedding was the pure juice of the grape, and would not produce intoxication, or it would not have been an article of entertainment for Christ and his disciples; but our wines on the contrary bore no affinity to it; as they were neither the pure juice of the grape, nor would they fail to produce intoxication. The wines of the present day were filthy and poisonous compounds of the most disgusting and deleterious materials, and their use was attended with consequences to which the wine and the six water pots could have had no tendency. Men might harp upon technicalities and quibble upon minor points, but when the evils of intemperance stared us fully in the face and surrounded us upon every hand as at present, it was a violation of moral responsibility, and a disregard of our duty to our fellow-man and to our Maker to continue to be the advocates and practitioners of that which produced it. Why should the gentleman himself refuse to aid those who were exerting their every energy to promote the happiness of our countrymen and mankind at large by discouraging: the use of alcoholic drinks as a beverage, since as he had stated, he was not accustomed to patronize the bars of our taverns? It was probable, however, the gentleman had friends that were tavern keepers, and was tenacious of their interests.

Drunkenness was not, as had been alleged, attributable entirely to the excessive use of alcoholic liquors: for were it not for the moderate use there would not be an immoderate use. If the present generation should all take the total abstinence pledge, after the present race of drunkards should die off drunkenness would not exist; but if the present generation persisted in its moderate use, that thirst for it would grow with their growth and increase with their strength, and posterity would be involved in the same degradation and distress as that from which we were just emerging, which would indeed be a gloomy prospect. But from the success of the total abstinence doctrines the moralist and philosopher had reason for a much happier hope.

The principles of his society he had shown to accord with moral philosophy, and that certainly accorded with the doctrine of the bible; for none could aver that the scriptures were inconsistent with morality, or morality reversive of the scriptures.

It was true there were in ancient times some wines that would produce drunkenness, and destroy the souls and bodies of men as at present; but that used by the patriarchs, prophets and apostles without divine interdiction was not of this sort. That kind was spoken of in the scriptures in terms of the strongest condemnation: of that sort it was said, "Wine is a mocker; strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise." This was a kind that corresponded to some extent with our modern wines, although he would not assume to say that it was composed of such noxious and nefarious ingredients as ours. Bottles of wine as they were imported to this country had been analyzed and found to contain filthy and disgusting matter, detrimental and deadly to health. When, therefore, additionally corrupted by our own venders, it must indeed be like almost anything else but the pure juice of the grape. In view of its ruinous effects upon both the mental and physical faculties, there was certainly a moral obligation binding upon us to repel this great national curse. Besides its disastrous effects in time, it had a bearing even upon eternity; it incapacitated the minds of the children of men to receive the divine influence, and had been the means of dismembering from the church many who had already joined it. In the course of the debate Mr. P. thought he should be able to make it appear that total abstinence was a bible doctrine, and that the use of the wine we had, which was a mocker, was anti-scriptural. The affirmative could not show it to be a duty to drink wine of any sort, or to traffic in it; but the traffic and use of that which was a mocker, as most assuredly was ours, was absolutely prohibited.

[The twenty minutes allotted had now expired.]



Mr. Beebe said it might be justly regarded as a fearful evidence of the depravity of the human heart that men had attempted to analyze nature, to study the anatomy of the human body, to try experiments upon and watch the palpitations of the human heart, for the purpose of raising objections to the truth of God. Studies which when pursued for nobler purposes were laudable, when prosecuted for the purpose of impeaching the veracity of Jehovah were awful indeed. No testimony could be admissible which had been wrung from the mangled body of the person whose heart was said to have been laid bare in consequence of his having had his breast shot away; nor could any such testimony bear against what God had said in the scriptures of truth. To say nothing of the inconsistency and improbability of the

case referred to, the observations made by scientific sceptics might have been produced by the deranged state of the patient's body. But the arguments of Mr. P. and his testimony from physicians and others to prove the evil effects of intemperance were altogether gratuitous and unnecessary, as that point had not been contested, and was entirely irrelevant to the propositions on which the affirmative and negative were at issue. Mr. P. might with equal propriety and relevancy have attempted to prove that a comet had fallen or a meteor had exploded. He had undertaken to sustain the negative of the propositions mutually agreed upon for discussion: it was therefore his duty in the first place to prove that the doctrine of his society was scriptural, and did not impugn Christ and the apostles; but how widely he had wandered from the subject must have been apparent to all.

Mr. P. had expressed a thought that it was incompatible with a correct conception of the character of Christ to believe that the wine made by him at Cana of Galilee was such as would produce intoxication; and to sustain this strange idea he had not hesitated to: present Christ as an impostor, deceiver or juggler: for if Christ did not really convert the water into wine the people were deceived. If that which was produced from the water on which the miracle was wrought did not possess all the real properties of wine, it was not wine. All the elements of the *real article* were necessary to constitute it wine. If in fact, as alleged by Mr. P., he had only produced from the water pots a medicine to cure drunkards, there could have been no propriety in calling that medicine wine, since its effects were the very reverse. To charge Christ with having pretended to make wine of water by a miracle, and with having led the people to believe that the article was the very best of wine, when indeed it did not possess the qualities of wine, involved the charge of juggling. Simon Magos, or the magicians of Pharaoh, might have wrought greater miracles than Mr. P. would admit Jesus wrought on the occasion referred to. But, To the word and to the testimony: if any speak not according to these it is because there is no light in them. [Here Mr. B. read John ii. 1-11.] The governor of the feast, who was of course a competent judge,⁵ without knowing whence it was, pronounced it better than any which had been used at the feast; and the wines used at wedding feasts were of the strongest kind, as was well known by all who were acquainted with eastern customs; they were old wines that had been kept for the occasion from the birth of the parties married⁶. But in how different a light would Mr. P. present this miracle in which John says, "Jesus manifested forth his glory;" and on which occasion "his disciples believed on him," (John ii. 11) from that presented by the scriptures and oriental history! It could be no more astonishing that our Lord produced weak wine, than that he drank the common wines then in use among the Jews. But that neither the making, furnishing to others or drinking of *real* wine could contaminate him or his disciples, would be established by the following, in addition to the strong array of scriptures already quoted, viz.: "Hearken unto me," said Jesus, "every one of you, and understand, There is nothing without a man that entereth into him can defile him; but the things which come out of him, those things

5 On this passage of St. Paul Theophylact remarks, That no one might suspect that their taste was vitiated by having drunk to excess, so as not to know water from wine, our Savior orders it to be first carried to the governor of the feast, who certainly was sober; for those who on such occasions are entrusted with this office observe the strictest sobriety, that they may be able properly to regulate the whole." – Oriental Customs, vol. 1, p. 320.

6 "The Abbe Mariti, speaking of the age of the wines of Cyprus, says, 'The oldest wines used in commerce do not exceed eight or ten years. It is not true, as has been reported, that there is some of it an hundred years old; but it is certain that at the birth of a son or a daughter, the father causes a jar filled with wine to be buried in the earth, having first taken the precaution to seal it hermetically; in this manner it may be kept till these children marry. It is then placed on the table before the bride and bridegroom, and is distributed among their relations, and the other guests invited to the wedding,' – Travels in Cyprus, vol. 1, p. 229.

are they that defile the man. If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear.” – Mark vii. 14, 16. To the disciples of Christ the apostle had moreover said, “Let no man judge you in meats or in drinks, or in respect to an holy day, or the new moons, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” – Col. ii. 16, 17, also to the end of the chapter. These scriptures, together with the circumstance of Christ’s having made and furnished wine as above at Cana of Galilee, his having chosen it as a symbol of his blood in the New Testament shed for many, and as such administered it at the institution of the supper, and enjoined a perpetuation of its use to the end of time, and the direction of Paul to Timothy to use it moderately, together, also, with the absence of a solitary passage in either the Old or New Testament discountenancing the moderate use of it, were amply sufficient to wipe away the stigma and reproach sought to be cast upon those who conscientiously objected to the total abstinence society, by them who would make void the law of God by the traditions of men, and who taught for doctrines the commandments of men.

Mr. P. had betrayed one leading principle of his novel system of philosophical morality, which required a remark or two, viz.: that it belonged to finite worms of the dust to determine what course it was proper for the God of heaven to pursue, to set bounds for the Almighty, and in the plenitude of our wisdom to fix the bounds beyond which the Lord might go without derogating from his divine perfections! Were these the beauties of the new-fangled system, for which the bible was to be laid aside? Then well might the saint of God say, “My soul, come not thou into their secret: unto their assembly, mine honor, be thou not united.” God was himself the standard of perfection, and under no law out of or above himself. Things were right simply because he had done them, and because they were in accordance with that will which could not be wrong, and his creatures should rather say with David, “I was dumb, because thou didst it,” than to attempt to arraign their Maker at the bar of human reason. To wrest the scriptures and say. they could not mean what they plainly said, because what they said might not comport with our weak sense of right, was most awfully presumptuous.

In reply to the demand why he did not unite in efforts which were made to suppress drunkenness, &c., Mr. B. said that he already occupied bible grounds, and he did not wish to be “wise above what was written.” On bible principles he had been engaged in a warfare against sin for many years, and he had not yet lost confidence in the rule which God had given, but desired to abide by it. As that divine rule discountenanced vice in all its multiform outbreakings, so did he. He would challenge his opponent to bring from the ranks of his boasted combination of “reformed inebriates,” one who had more uniformly contended, by precept and example, against the excessive use of intoxicating drinks than himself. But he had not been stimulated to this by any new theory that could be traced to any six inebriates at Baltimore or elsewhere for its origin. The word of God taught that we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world. But beyond the divine instruction he was not at liberty to go, and thus sin that grace might abound.

To the insinuation that tavern keepers were friendly to him, and that he advocated their cause, Mr. B. replied that he was not aware of having at any time invaded the rights of tavern keepers; he had not spent his breath in vilifying or abusing them, and if a plain exhibition of the scriptures of truth was an advocacy of their cause, then, and not otherwise, was the declaration true, for in no other way had he advocated their cause. Similar reproaches had been heaped on the head of his divine Master, who was called a wine bibber, a gluttonous man, and a friend of publicans and sinners: and notwithstanding the

reproaches of Christ his Lord might be entailed to him, he hoped to be able to so deport himself as to merit the friendship of his fellow-citizens.

The very strange argument, if indeed argument it was, that excessive drinking did not, and moderate drinking did produce drunkenness, required no reply; it was but another attempt to charge on such as Christ and his apostles the cause of intemperance, with all the evils connected with drunkenness.

Mr. P. had condescended to admit that some ancient wines produced pernicious effects; but of that sort he had given us his *ipse dixit* that the patriarchs and men of God did not drink! Would he tell the meeting whether Noah and righteous Lot became drunk on the innocent or “nefarious” kind of wine that was in use in their day? To prove that there were two kinds of wine in use among the ancients, the one harmless and the other capable of producing intoxication, Prov. xx. 1 had been quoted: “Wine is a mocker; strong drink is raging; and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise.” But to answer the purpose intended by Mr. P. this text should be rendered, “One kind of wine is a mocker, and raging,” &c. But this proverb was written of wines and Strong drinks generally, and only proved that in ancient as in modern times there were wines and strong drinks capable of producing all the evil consequences that result from them in this day. But who were the *unwise* that were deceived by them? Let the wise man reply, “Who hath wo? who hath sorrow? who hath contentions? who hath babbling? who hath wounds without cause? who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine.” – Prov. xxiii. 29, 30. The wise man and Mr. P. were at antipodes on this subject, the latter contending that the moderate use of liquors resulted in intoxication; but the wise man a continuance long at the wine: “At last,” said Solomon, (not at the commencement or in a judicious use of it) “it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder.”

In his closing remarks, Mr. P., when last up, had challenged scriptural proof that God had ever made it the duty of any of his creatures to drink wine, &c., and that he had ever authorized them to traffic in wine. A precept embodying all the testimony sought for in the challenge, was contained in Deut. xiv. 23: “And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thine herds and of thy flocks; that thou mayest learn to fear the Lord thy God always. And if the way be too long for thee, so that thou art not able to carry it, or if the place be too far from thee, which the Lord thy God shall choose, to set his name there, when the Lord thy God hath blessed thee: then shalt thou turn it into money, and bind up the money in thine hand, and shalt go unto the place which the Lord thy God shall choose. And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after; for oxen or for sheep, OR FOR WINE, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth: and thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household.” Here was the testimony which the gentleman had so exultingly demanded, that God had commanded the use of and traffic in wine and strong drink. Nor were the subjects of the command restricted in the purchase of their wines to some particular kinds: they were at liberty to buy or use wine or strong drink, or whatsoever they desired. Again in a well known instance it had been enjoined on the disciples of Christ, “Drink ye all of it;” and “Do this until I come again,” &c. These directions had been given by the highest authority, and on a most solemn occasion. What further proof did the gentleman require? He would now call on Mr. P. to lay his finger on the passage of scripture in which, as he had asserted, the use of that wine which was a mocker was. *absolutely prohibited.*

Mr. Pierce said he had been repeatedly and continually challenged to produce scripture authority for a total abstinence society, and he should now do so. He should bring an instance that would be satisfactory to the most fastidious, and that must put to silence all further demands on this score. It was a case 'precisely in point, a case in which a pledge was taken to total abstinence, and a society was formed and blessed of God in the cause. He referred to the Rechabites, an account of whom was given in the bible: – "And I set before the sons of the house of the Rechabites pots full of wine, and cups; and I said unto them, Drink ye wine. But they said, *We will drink no wine*; for Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father, commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no wine; neither ye, nor your sons for ever." "Therefore thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me for ever." Thus he had established his position, and had shown that so far from the total abstinence doctrine of his society's being anti-scriptural, that it was sanctioned and sustained by the scriptures, and that a blessing was pronounced upon those who adhered strictly to it, and God had declared that "Jonadab the son of Rechab should not want a man to stand before him for ever." Much had been said in the course of the present discussion against the total abstinence society as being a human invention, and its advocates had been charged with being wise above what was written, and with presumption and wickedness in uniting with a humanly devised institution, and ascribing moral merits to it; but here was an instance of a human invention having been adopted and blessed of God: for although total abstinence from wine had not been divinely commanded, Jonadab instituted it in his family to be preserved and persevered in by his posterity, and God had blessed him and said he should not want a man to stand before him for ever. His opponent had persisted in a very serious strain of declamation against all human inventions; but at the same time he did not hesitate to avail himself of the advantages of such inventions, for from the best information in his (Mr. P's.) possession, he was a merchant, and baker, and preacher and printer! This brought to his recollection an alleged case of a man who went into a village and denounced the various medical systems in practice, the Mineral, Botanic and Thompsonian, making a very plausible representation of the evils of each. After having succeeded in proselyting some of the townsmen, much to their chagrin and to the surprise of the remainder, he set up a doctor shop himself! The total abstinence society, although human invention, in its object and principles, which were benevolence, philanthropy and morality, accorded with the bible, and he defied any to disprove it.

Authority had been given by Paul for total abstinence societies; for he had said, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended or is made weak." This society then did as Paul had said it was good to do; and for doing so they were charged with being anti-scriptural, and implicating Christ and the apostles, and Paul among the rest, as immoral and wicked! By the means of wine our brothers were made to offend and to stumble, and were made weak, and Paul had said that under such circumstances it was good not to drink wine, and just so said the total abstinence society. Here was scripture proof of the correctness of the doctrine of the total abstinence society, and what further proof could his opponent want?

The effect of the movements of the society afforded ample evidence in themselves that the institution or invention, whether human or otherwise, was divinely approved. Under its exertions much good had been accomplished, many abandoned inebriates had been reclaimed, and certainly anything good in itself was not incompatible with the scriptures, but perfectly congenial and agreeable with them. Men who had devoted their time almost exclusively to the study of the scriptures, and who were ministers of Christ, and a large majority of such ministers throughout our country, had cooperated with this society,

and had decided that it was in perfect harmony with the bible. He had now proved, he hoped, to the satisfaction of all, that under existing circumstances it was immoral to traffic in alcoholic drinks, nefarious, poisonous and destructive as they were in their tendency.



Mr. Beebe said from the opening of the discussion his hopes and fears had been alternately excited, with regard to the willingness of his opponent to come to a scriptural test of the doctrines involved in the controversy. Frequent promises had been made by the gentleman that he would, *presently*, come to the bible and nail the affirmative to the scriptures; but, anon, all hopes based upon such promises were: dashed, by declarations that the scriptures had no direct bearing upon the subject! At length, however, the long looked for scriptural testimony was produced. A case was brought, not however for the first time during the discussion, but with increased assurance of its adaptedness to his purpose; and with it the gentleman assayed to establish beyond the power of successful contradiction, that there was a *humanly invented total abstinence society* mentioned in the scriptures of which God had approved! The scripture brought forward to support this assumption, was the case of the Rechabites mentioned Jer. xxxv., which he would read, and submit whether anything contained in it sustained the assertion that God had approved a total abstinence society. [Here Mr. B. read the chapter.]

There was then no account given in the quotations made by Mr. P., or their connection, of an organized society of any kind; the family of the Rechabites, or rather that portion which embraced the sons of Jonadab, had obeyed the voice of Jonadab their father, who had commanded them, saying, “Ye shall drink no wines, neither ye nor your sons for ever; neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any; but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land. where ye be strangers.” – Jer. xxxv. 6, 7. There seemed to be some dissimilarity between the cases of the Rechabites and the Washingtonians. If the former were a pattern for the latter, abstinence from building or dwelling in houses, and from all agricultural pursuits was as indispensibly necessary as abstinence from wine. The chapter afforded the same authority for total abstinence from sowing seed, planting vineyards, owning real estate, or building and inhabiting houses, as for abstinence from wine. The gentleman had averred that God manifested his approbation of the course adopted and pursued by the Rechabites, as a human invention! But if he had read his bible with a little more attention, he would have found that the strict obedience of the Rechabites to the command of their father, and not their abstinence from wine, was what God commended. ‘For God had commanded in the decalogue, in the first command with promise, saying, “Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee,” on which Paul, in Eph. vi. 1, 3, founded his exhortation, “Children, obey your parents in the Lord, that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.” Therefore as the children of Jonadab had obeyed their father, in doing so they had obeyed the command of God; not a command to abstain from wine, for God had given them no such command; but to honor their father, and as proof that this is what the Lord approved, the very promise connected with the command in the decalogue, was repeated and applied to them. “And Jeremiah said unto the house of the Rechabites,” (not to the total abstinence society) “Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, because ye have obeyed the command of Jonadab your father, and kept all his precepts, and done according to all that he hath commanded you, therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me for ever.” – Jer. xxxv. 18, 19.

Who would understand the prophet to be describing a total abstinence society? That which the Lord approved in the Rechabites, would not be found characteristic of modern abstinence societies; but frequently the very reverse. Children, instead of being taught to honor and obey their parents, had been, in some cases, at least, taught to disrespect and disobey them. Where it was known that their parents had conscientious objections to the societies, and had forbidden their children to join them, they had been urged to disobey, and the impression had been attempted to be made on their weak minds, that their parents were unworthy of respect. Were such the Rechabites of our age?

There was, however, one example, and but one, of a regularly organized total abstinence society, where a pledge was taken by the members, mentioned in the scriptures; the gentleman had failed to notice it; perhaps it might have escaped his recollection; therefore he would bring it forward, as he did not wish to deprive the gentleman of any example of which it would be proper for him to avail himself. A record of the organization, number, respectability, and even the pledge of the society alluded to would be found in the Acts of the Apostles, xxiii. 12-15, which he would read: "And when it was day, certain of the Jews banded together, and bound themselves under a curse, saying, that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul. And there were more than forty which had made this conspiracy," or taken this pledge. There was certainly much greater similarity between the society last described and that represented by the gentleman, than between the latter and the family of Jonadab, the son of Rechab. Mr. B. denied that he had declaimed against all humanly invented institutions. In discussing the comparative merits of the bible doctrine and that of the abstinence society, he had contended earnestly for the superiority of the scriptures over all humanly invented rules, for the doctrine of Christ in preference to the traditions of men. Christ and his apostles had also so contended, and denounced the pious scribes and pharisees for making void the law of God by their own traditions, and for teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. To the gentleman's sarcastic allusion to him, as a practical patron of human inventions, he felt but little disposition to reply. He did not consider the preaching of the gospel agreeable to the institution of our Lord Jesus Christ, as a mere human invention, however it might be regarded by those who made a science of what they called the preaching of the gospel; neither did he follow it as a worldly calling: he labored in the gospel ministry from a conviction that he was called thereto by the Lord, as was Aaron to the priesthood. In regard to his temporal affairs, and the business in which he had found it necessary to be engaged for the support of himself and family, he could perceive no similarity between it and the case of the quack doctor, alluded to by his opponent. As a citizen of the world, in common with his fellow-men, he held it as his privilege to procure his bread by the honest sweat of his face; the same privilege and duty, in his estimation, belonged to all men by a divine appointment, which the gentleman might read, Gen. i. 28, also iii. 19. As a citizen of the world he could therefore labor with his hands as did Paul and the other apostles; but as a citizen of the Zion of God, he was bound to denounce all human inventions, in all matters relating to the religious deportment of the subjects of Christ's spiritual government. If his opponent could show that during the discussion, or at any other time, he had disclaimed habits of industry, or honest enterprise in the affairs of this life, he called on him to do so; but if otherwise, his similitude was inappropriate and unhappy. The often reiterated declaration of the gentleman, that the Total Abstinence Society was in harmony with the bible, and his defiance of counter testimony; was badly timed, after it had been proved that its fundamental doctrine was anti-scriptural, and that it charged Christ and his apostles with, immorality and sin. Such testimony had been presented, and Mr. P. had admitted its force, whereupon he had denied that the scriptures had any direct bearing on the subject, and had assumed a new and altogether

dissimilar position. His positions were laid down and abandoned with astonishing agility; they served the gentleman as matters of mere convenience: if closely pursued on any one of them he could retreat to another; and if occasion required, the retrograde motion was not at all difficult.

The last reference made by Mr. P. to the scriptures demanded serious consideration. Paul had said, "It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." This text was found Rom. xiv. 21. The instructions of this chapter were given and applied to the church of God, and to the church exclusively, in which the apostle had set forth the relative duties of the saints, and in which he had enjoined upon those members of the church which were strong, to bear the infirmities of the weak. "And if thy brother," said the inspired writer, "be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou uncharitably. Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died. For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and -peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure; but it is evil to that man who eateth with offence." Then followed the words in which Mr. P. found authority for total abstinence societies as at present organized! Meat was here spoken of in distinction from drink, and the apostle insisted that the peace of the church of God, the union and fellowship of her members, ought to be dearer to all than any of the temporal blessings we enjoyed. If wine was here objected to, so also was flesh; it could not be therefore because there was evil in the wine, more than in the flesh; for Paul had declared they were both pure. And if the gentleman would read the commencement of this chapter, he would find a doctrine quite irreconcilable with that for which he contended. "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things, another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth, for God had received him," &c. The same rule which the apostle applied to eating flesh and drinking wine, he also, in verses 5 and 6, applied to special regard paid by the saints to particular days. In verse 2 he forbade their judging each other in these particulars, as also in Col. ii. 16: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days." If the gentleman could find positive, and, as he claimed, incontrovertible authority in this chapter for total abstinence from wine, did not the same authority also prohibit flesh? Would it be a fair construction of 1 Tim. v. 23, "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities," to insist that the apostle required a total abstinence from water? Certainly not; yet it would be equally as just as the conclusion which the gentleman had labored to establish from Rom. xiv. 21. If Paul intended his exhortation to the Roman church as authority for, or a commendation of total abstinence societies, pledges, &c., why had he continued the temperate use of wine himself, and recommended its use to Timothy?

Mr. P. had said that much good had been done by his society, and anything productive of good must be in harmony with the scriptures. This was a new, an ingenious, but altogether an inadmissible method of interpreting the scriptures: according to it we had only to determine by human judgment what was good, or evil, and if the bible testified against what human reason called good, or approved of what men regarded as evil, the inference would be easy, that the bible could not mean what it said. Old Saul might, on this principle, have founded a plea that he had obeyed the design of God's command, although he had spared the life of Agag, and the best of the sheep and oxen, which God had commanded him utterly to destroy, for the preservation of life must have been in itself, good. But upon this mode of disposing of the scriptures, the rule which God had given would be made void, human judgment enthroned in power to decide, and any heathen oracle would answer as valuable an end as the

scriptures, and either would be as serviceable as the plumb line of the workman who bent it to suit his defective work.

[Twenty minutes having been occupied, the floor was yielded to the negative.]



Mr. Pierce said that while he held that at the present time there was a moral obligation binding upon all to totally abstain from the use of alcoholic drinks in view of their ruinous consequences, he had not charged Christ nor the apostles, nor any who in former times had participated in the use of wine with immorality or wickedness; and therefore the whole drift of his opponent's argument had missed him. Things which at one time and under certain circumstances might be moral and expedient, at another time and under other circumstances might be immoral in the greatest degree. Hence as he had said before no instances adduced from the bible of the use of wine could have any bearing upon a discussion of the morality or expediency of abstinence therefrom at the present time. Nor could the fact that in modern times any particular thing was right, implicate those of ancient times as having done wrong in practicing it. This he had stated before, and his opponent had not met him upon it; but had found it convenient to make no allusion to it, and to persist in the same course of argument that had thus conclusively been made irrelevant. Even from a practice divinely authorized under some circumstances, immorality might result under others. For instance God had instituted a monarchical government among the Hebrews, and had ordained the anointing of kings in his name, and it was under such circumstances wrong to resist such a form of government: for David had said, The Lord forbid that I should stretch forth my hand against the Lord's anointed. But from this it would be absurd to attempt to prove that at the present time it was wrong to live under another form of government, and that our selection of a republican system involved us in the crime of being wise above what was written. What would have been said had his opponent lived in the time of the American revolution – had he been present when that august body, the Continental Congress, were about to adopt the Declaration of Independence from British power, and disavow allegiance to the king of England – what would have been said had his opponent been there to shake his bible in their face, and tell them that kings were ordained of God, and heaven forbid that they should stretch forth their hands against the Lord's anointed? Would he not have been spurned as a tory and an enemy to liberty? And now that revolutionary efforts were being made to disenthral our country from the despotic dominion of a more oppressive tyrant, the monster intemperance, what must be thought of him who would rise with his bible in his hand and protest against them, because, forsooth, that wines were used in ancient times?

But ministers of Christ and expositors of the scriptures, as he had before remarked, went with the total abstinence society in their enterprise and sanctioned it as compatible with the bible, and in perfect harmony with its precepts, having for its object the good of mankind. He would read an extract from the writings of the Rev. Mr. Barber, and he presumed that he was as good authority as the Rev. Mr. Beebe. [Mr. P. here read an extract from Mr. Barber, the amount of which was a statement that persons had been excluded for drunkenness, and that churches had consequently been diminished by the use of intoxicating drinks; and that it therefore behooved all christians to unite their efforts for the suppression of it, and thereby promoting the. Prosperity of the church; and a recommendation to all christians to abstain altogether from the use of that which resulted in the injury of the cause of christianity, (even

from the communion table, we believe.)) It made no difference what examples were brought from the bible of the use of wine; times and circumstances had changed; and he and thousands of patriots and divines said the time had come when men must abstain from that which caused their brother to offend. The total abstinence society acted upon the principle which Paul had avowed correct, viz: that it was good to neither eat bread nor drink wine whereby a brother stumbled; and while it was thus in the most perfect harmony with the scriptures its opposers were directly in the face of them. Not only did the bible teach total abstinence by precept, but also by example. When Daniel had wine set before him by the king of Babylon he declined using it, and desired to be permitted to use pure water. And at the end of a certain period, when compared with those who drank of the king's wine they were found to be fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat the portion of the king's meat. And experience had proved that the same course would be attended by the same result at the present day: when those who used the limpid fluid pure as it oozed from the fountains of nature, were compared with the drinkers of wine they would be found to present a more healthy appearance, and their countenances would be fairer and their constitutions more rugged.

[Here Mr. P's. time had expired.]



Mr. Beebe said that before replying, he would appeal to the president and board of moderators, to say whether Mr. P. had not agreed to his definition of a moral obligation, viz: That a moral obligation was that which was alike binding on all the intelligent creatures of God, under all circumstances, throughout all time. [The president and moderators unanimously decided that he had.] In his last address Mr. P. had urged the very opposite sentiment, viz: that what was, by the express law of God, binding on mankind as a moral obligation at one time, might become immoral and sinful at another time and under other circumstances! In support of this novel and curious theory, directly contradictory of his previous admission as it was, the gentleman had referred to the establishment of regal government in Israel, by the appointment of God, under which opposition to it would have been a violation of moral obligation, and argued that therefore if the moral obligation of submission to regal governments was done away in our country, so also the principles of moral obligation in reference to drinking wine and strong drinks might also be reversed. In behalf of the society by him represented, he had labored hard and long to prove that the manufacture and use of wines and strong or intoxicating drinks had always been immoral and sinful, and even in his closing remarks when last up he had attempted to show that Daniel so considered it in his day. Strange incongruity! Could any good cause require such conflicting arguments? If the gentleman had at first taken the ground which he now occupied, and admitted that it was once perfectly moral, and that the scriptures sanctioned the manufacture and temperate use of alcoholic drinks, but that by a change of time and circumstances the bible was no more to be regarded as an infallible rule, much time might have been saved. But he had assumed to prove that the doctrines of his society, by him advocated, were as firmly established by the scriptures, as were the fundamental laws of nature – and how had he succeeded? At one time he had brought forward some detached portion of scripture, and with a triumphant air asserted that he had established his first assumed position, and when beaten off from this ground by counter arguments and scripture references, he had asserted that the bible had no direct bearing upon the subject! When driven from this subterfuge, he had

admitted that the scriptures had to do with the subject, that the scriptures had sanctioned and even in some instances enjoined the use of wines and strong drink; and now to evade the effect of this admission he had made the most ridiculous somerset and come up at antipodes with his first avowed sentiments on moral obligation. He had now taken the ground that in modern times and under existing circumstances it was immoral and sinful to make, vend or drink wine or other intoxicating liquors; but denied that he thereby accused Christ or the apostles of immorality or impropriety, because he conceived the fixed principles of morality to be mutable, and changeable with times and circumstances! He had said that it was at the present-day immoral and sinful to make, vend or drink wines, &c., but admitted that Christ and his apostles, together with Noah, Abram, Melchisedek, and nearly all the saints of the Old and New Testament times, had made, vended, and drank wines, &c., and yet he disclaimed all intention of charging Christ and these holy men of God with immorality! So much for the consistency of the gentleman and the doctrines by him so ably advocated. But he had gravely complained that his allusions to regal government, although they had been previously made, had not been met; and had drawn the very sage conclusion that they were unanswerable. He, as also his clerical advisers, must be lamentably ignorant of the scriptures, and of the history of Israel, if they had yet to be informed that the government under which God established them, was not a regal, but a republican form of government, under which they lived for about four hundred and fifty years, when, becoming weary of the government: which God had instituted, which government knew no king but God, Israel desired a king that they might be like the nations around about them, and as a judgment for their wickedness, “God gave them a king in his anger, and took him away in his wrath.” – Hosea xiii. 9-11. As well might the gentleman urge that polygamy, which our Lord said Moses suffered Israel to practice, as a judgment for the hardness of their hearts, and which was not so from the beginning, was to be regarded as a precedent of moral rectitude, as that the form of regal government with which that nation was punished for a season was to be so regarded. When God in anger consigned that nation to the curse of kingcraft for a limited term, there was no moral principle involved, farther than what related to obedience to God. And as God for their wickedness had bade them honor a king, they could not lift their hand against such king without transgressing the authority of God. But this state of things was for a limited period, and neither Mr. P. nor any other person could show where God had limited the duration of moral obligation. Times and circumstances might change, but moral obligation would endure throughout all time, alike under all circumstances, as the gentleman had once himself admitted.

Mr. P. had seemed to invoke for him the same odium and contempt which was justly due to the tories who opposed the patriots of the revolution, because he tenaciously adhered to the bible as the rule of his religious faith and practice. To obloquy and reproach he had become inured; and of it he would not complain if no weightier charge could be brought than that of raising his bible against unscriptural practices.

The gentleman claimed the opinions and co-operation of the clergy of our country in support of his theory; and so also the advocates of popery, of the inquisition and cruel persecution of the non-conformists to the prevalent opinions in all ages might have done. The most corrupt, abominable and murderous schemes ever invented had been sanctioned by an interested priesthood, and that this was the case of modern religious inventions, should rather excite alarm. Than allay our fears.

That Mr. Barber was as good authority as himself, and that any other man was as good authority as either, Mr. B. would freely admit, as the doctrine for which he contended was not based on any human

authority. No commentator in particular, nor all commentators combined, could have weight when brought against what God had said; and the gentleman might save himself the labor of his frequent references to commentators, as his commentators' views were no better testimony than the gentleman's own opinions without their aid. The testimony of his authors that total abstinence societies were calculated to fill up churches with members, who without such unscriptural machinery, would keep their places in the world, only proved that thousands were brought into the churches and retained, who were unprepared by regeneration for discipleship to Christ. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." The church of Christ was the kingdom of God; regeneration was an indispensable prerequisite to membership. The total abstinence pledge was, as shown by the gentleman, substituted in place of regeneration; in bringing total abstinence converts into a profession of the christian religion, and where there was no grace to incline them to love holiness or to obey the gospel, the pledge was the agent by which they were to be retained in the church connection. This theory might answer for the new orders of religionists, but not for the church of Jesus Christ of which he had said, "Every plant that my heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up." The arminian branches of anti-christ were welcome to monopolize the whole advantage of this paper substitute for saving grace; but the christian church would never regard it as being necessary. It was no wonder that such churches had suffered such diminution by drunkards; but this could not establish the gentleman's notion of an inefficiency of divine grace, and that the church required the aid-of total abstinence societies.

Mr. P. had made another but a fruitless attempt to wring from the apostle Paul, some countenance to his society. Paul had decided that it was good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby a weak brother was made to offend; and Paul was willing to even forego his undoubted right rather than offend his brethren or cause any of them to offend: but what he said of wine in this case, he said also of flesh, of preference for particular days, and everything whereby a weak brother was made to offend: but that the apostle did not consider it immoral or sinful to use wine, the gentleman might read in the same chapter: from which he had quoted, verse 7: "I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean:" and the whole drift of his exhortation went to impress the members of the church of Christ with the importance of the strong members bearing the infirmities of the weak. But this had no bearing beyond the bounds of the church. This same apostle charged the members of the Colossian church, "Let no man therefore judge you in meats, or in drinks, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." And certainly if Paul had held the doctrines contended for by the gentleman and the society by him represented, he would not have recommended wine to Timothy. To assert that the society was acting upon principles approved by Paul, required other and more direct testimony than what the gentleman had adduced.

Daniel had also been mentioned as an example of total abstinence from wine. As a Hebrew it was true Daniel refused the meats and drinks provided by the king of Babylon. If his abstinence from wine was to be regarded as an example to others throughout all subsequent time, then his abstinence from the king's meats, pulse, &c., should also be regarded in the same light; but the prophet of the Lord did not object to the king's meats and wine from any conviction that it was immoral or sinful to drink wine: for it had been already demonstrated that Daniel was in the habit of drinking wine; that so habitual was his use of wine, that he only abstained from it on certain occasions, such as fasting, and when in captivity as when he refused the wine of Babylon. It had been mentioned, as one remarkable instance of his fasting, that "for full three weeks he drank no wine." Those who at this day drank wine, if not more

frequently than once in three months or years, if they refused to take the pledge were denounced as enemies to temperance. What would be said of Daniel, if he were living in our day, and only abstained from wine temporarily for a few days, and only on fasting occasions? Would such as he be quoted as patrons of modern total abstinence societies? The gentleman might search the scriptures in vain to find authority for his doctrines: he had mistaken the book. There was a book, however, regarded by a large number of the human family, as being very far superior to our scriptures, which would answer the gentleman's purpose much better than the bible. The *alcoran* was a very popular standard work among the disciples of the prophet Mahomet, and the very sentiments of the society for which the gentleman so zealously plead were laid down so plainly that he that run might read. Being unwilling, as he had before said, to deprive the gentleman of any testimony from any quarter whatever; and as the gentleman had seemed to have overlooked the book that authorized the total abstinence doctrines, he would read for the edification of the gentleman, the following passages from the *alcoran*, viz:

"They will ask thee concerning wine and lots. Answer, in both there is great sin, and also some things of use unto men, but their sinfulness is greater than their use." – *Sale's translation of the alcoran, chap. ii. p. 39.*

"O true believers, surely wine, and lots, and images, and divining arrows are an abomination, and of the work of Satan, therefore avoid them that ye may prosper; Satan seeketh to sow dissension and hatred among you by means of wine and lots, and to divert you from remembering God, and from prayer. Will you not, therefore, abstain from them." – *Chap. v. p. 149.*

"In those that believe and do good works, it is no sin that they have tasted wine or gaming before they were forbidden." – *Ibid.*

"Moreover, whatever inebriates shall be esteemed wine, and all wine is prohibited. God has cursed wine, and the persons drinking it, tasting and presenting it to others, buying it, selling it, treading grapes and expressing it; and also the persons receiving it, or eating anything bought with the money for which it was sold. Shun wine for it is the key to all evils." – *See Refutatio Alcorani, p. 237.*

[Twenty minutes had now been occupied.]

As it was now nearly dark, an intermission was taken until "early candle lighting."



EVENING – SEVEN O'CLOCK.

[The meeting convened according to appointment; but was detained for about half an hour by the absence of Mr. Pierce. At length, however, (but not until messenger after messenger had been despatched for him) he made his appearance upon the stage, and stated that he was not ready to proceed. After having waited a few minutes more, the President arose and announced that Mr. Pierce had the floor. Mr. P. still continued leafing and examining books, apparently much perplexed – but at last abruptly arose to prosecute the discussion, as nearly as can be recollected as follows:]

The affirmative had endeavored not only to make it out that it was anti-scriptural to abstain from the use of alcohol, but also that those who did so abstain were Mahometans! They were charged with being Mahometans because the alcoran recommended abstinence from wine. But carry out this principle and where would it end? Would not the gentleman and his friends be obnoxious to the same charge because they believed in the existence of a God, since the alcoran also asserted such belief? It was not necessary to abandon principles which were in themselves correct, simply because the Mahometans also maintained them. His opponent professed to believe the bible, and so did the Catholics, but did it follow as a necessary consequence that he was a Catholic? Certainly not: nor any more did the maintenance of the doctrine of total abstinence by the alcoran involve all the advocates of that doctrine in the charge of being Mahometans.

In answer to the argument previously advanced in favor of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks as a beverage, from the example of Daniel, Mr. B. had said that Daniel also refused to eat pulse, which he had properly defined to be a vegetable preparation for food; and had therefore drawn the inference that it was not on account of any innate evil contained in the wine any more than in the pulse that Daniel rejected it. But it was not true that Daniel also abstained from pulse: on the contrary Daniel requested Melzar, in behalf of himself and his Hebrew brethren, Give us pulse to eat and water to drink; and in this request he had expressed the sentiments of the total abstinence society: for in it he manifested a preference for water rather than the best of wine – the portion of the wine which the king drank. Nor could the import of Daniel's request be set aside or misconstrued by what his opponent had said in his remarks upon it: for they were based upon the false assumption that pulse was rejected together with the wine, and that therefore it was not because the wine any more than the pulse contained any intrinsic evil.

He had said, and he would repeat that traffic in alcoholic liquors, deleterious and deadly as they were in their effects, was the direct cause of death. If it were not for the traffic in them the many of our countrymen who find premature graves would not be placed in possession of the means of their destruction, and would consequently be saved from their dreadful fate. In our country, by means of the traffic in them, thirty thousand souls and bodies were destroyed annually – and. would they be so if there were no traffic in them in our land? In view of the awful consequences of this abominable traffic, it could not be a problem of difficult solution to any lover of his country whether the advantages resulting from it were sufficient to justify its continuance. It should be totally and entirely abolished: then, but not till then, would our country be cleansed from its foul pollution.

Mr. B. affected to oppose the total abstinence society upon religious grounds; but the denomination with which he stood connected did not sustain him in taking this stand. He (Mr. P.) was acquainted with a number of Old School Baptists in the State of New Jersey who had united with it, and were using all their efforts in its support. Were these Old School Baptists, the gentleman's own brethren, anti-scriptural and Mahometans, too? What could he say when his own churchmen decided against him?

Notwithstanding what his opponent had said, he would still assert and maintain that what was strictly proper at one time might be highly improper and injurious at another. For instance the scriptures sanctioned slavery among the Jews, and but few Were to be found who would advocate the propriety of slavery at the present day. Many things which were recommended in the scriptures might become destructive under certain circumstances, as was the case with the use of ardent spirits, which should therefore be abandoned.

The truth was that whoever looked in the bible for a specification for every moral doubt would be disappointed, constantly upon the change as were times and circumstances. Mankind were rational beings, placed in possession of intellectual powers, and were of course expected to exercise reason, which was given to them for that purpose.⁷



Mr. Beebe said he had just been informed by one of his opponent's moderators, that Mr. P. did not represent either the total abstinence society or their doctrines! Had he been aware of this he should have declined the acceptance of his challenge to public discussion. Mr. P. had been introduced to him at his office by a member of the total abstinence society, as a lecturer in behalf of its doctrines, and as such had offered the challenge. At a subsequent interview Mr. P. had informed him that he had consulted with Rev. Mr. Wood, and other leading members of the society, and they had encouraged the discussion, and furnished the meeting house for the occasion: he had also been informed that it would be hazardous to encounter the gentleman in public debate, as he had been bred a lawyer, was talented, &c.; from all of which he had supposed that the society would be as ready to share with their champion the mortification of a defeat, in ease of such an event, as to claim a portion of the spoils of victory, if the gentleman should succeed agreeably to his and their sanguine expectations. But at this late hour the society had found it convenient to retire from all responsibility and leave the gentleman to bear the whole responsibility of the defeat.

Mr. B. said he had not pronounced the members of the 'total abstinence society Mahometans: he had only referred them to the alcoran as containing those passages on the subject, for which they might search the bible in vain. He had directed the attention of the gentleman to the alcoran as the more suitable book for his purpose, as Mahomet had recorded in that book the very words insisted upon by the advocates of modern temperance societies. Christians were by no means exposed to the retort of the gentleman for believing in the existence of God, for they had direct testimony to establish that truth in the scriptures, and were not, like the society, under the necessity of going to the alcoran to find a passage in point. If christians contended for any doctrine which the alcoran so strongly enjoined, and for which they could find no warrant in the scriptures, they might be obnoxious to the retort of the gentleman; but otherwise it was wholly gratuitous.

He thanked the gentleman and his clerical assistants for correcting him concerning Daniel's having refused to eat pulse. By reference to the first chapter of the prophet Daniel it would appear that Daniel refused the portion of the king's meat, and the wine which the king drank, and desired to be fed upon pulse instead of the king's meat, and water instead of the wine which the king drank. This error however did not effect the argument favorably to Mr. P., as meats as well as wine were rejected by Daniel. The example of Daniel would go as far to establish a total abstinence from meats as from wine, and could therefore be of no service to the negative.

⁷ Here Mr. P. seemed more embarrassed from overhearing one of his moderators [Mr. Bross] disown him as a representative of the Washingtonian society; and he soon after stated to the meeting that he wished it distinctly understood that he had assumed the negative of the propositions under discussion, entirely upon his own responsibility.

Mr. P. had referred to some Old School Baptists in New Jersey, who he said co-operated with the agents of the total abstinence society. Mr. B. said he had no knowledge of any such Old School Baptists, either in New Jersey or elsewhere. Old School Baptists, as such, occupied scriptural grounds, and rejected the doctrines and inventions of men, as having nothing to do with the rule of their faith and practice: but he had been looking for higher authority than that of New Jersey Baptists. The Old School Baptists whose testimony would be authority with him, were John the Baptist, Paul, Peter, Jude, James, or the Savior himself, for these were all Baptists of the Old School. If men, professing to be their successors, in New Jersey, had corrupted themselves by worshiping the gods of the nations round about them, they were no longer entitled to the distinction of Old School. Baptists. He could not perceive that the question of ancient or modern slavery had anything to do with the controversy in progress.

From Mr. P's. closing remarks it appeared that he had finally concluded to dismiss the bible altogether as a rule, as in his estimation it was not sufficiently specific, and to substitute in place thereof human reason. He had indignantly spurned the alcoran which taught his doctrine, but he had now settled upon the broad ground of deism. The: scriptures were to give place to human reason, and so taught the champion of infidelity, Thomas Paine.

The president and. board of moderators had thought it best that the discussion of the subject should be brought to a close by nine or ten o'clock; and, as in their opinion the second proposition had been 'merged in the first, they requested that the remaining part of the evening should be occupied with the discussion of the third and last proposition. He had come prepared to spend any amount of time that a defence of the truth might require; he had scarcely begun to draw upon the arguments with which he had come prepared to maintain the affirmative of the propositions; but if it was determined to disown Mr. P. as the representative of total abstinence societies, and hurry the discussion to a close, he would not object.

The affirmative of the third proposition had already been very well established by Mr. P. in his references to some of his authors, by whom he had shown that the pledge was considered as an indispensable prerequisite to church membership, and the only safe and infallible preventive against the destruction of thirty or forty thousand souls and bodies per annum. If all the churches in this village (Middletown) had not, there certainly was one or more which had adopted the rule to admit no member whose name was not previously attached to a total abstinence pledge; and, if necessary, he would show from undoubted authority that the same order was observed by many professed churches of the present day. He had also himself heard leading men of the abstinence party declare they would vote for no man to hold any office of honor or trust, who was not a member of the society and signer of the pledge. That this policy was corrupting to both church and state; that it was incompatible with true religion, and subversive of the principles of pure democracy, could easily be demonstrated. According to this theory the same qualifications were necessary to qualify for political preferment that were required for church fellowship, and any person, however dissipated he might have been, if he but signed the pledge was to be eligible to church membership or any office in the gift of the people. This policy must corrupt such churches as adopted it by bringing in graceless souls to their communion and fellowship, while on the other hand our civil and political offices would not only be filled with improper incumbents, but a large portion of our citizens who had always been temperate and deserving must necessarily be proscribed, because they had conscientious objection to taking the pledge. The legitimate tendency of this doctrine was, therefore, In the church to make void the law of Christ, and substitute the doctrines of men, and

thus insult the divine Legislator of Zion; and in the state to subvert the democratic principles for which our fathers poured out their blood in the revolutionary struggle and, instead of equal rights, a system of intolerance and proscription more cruel than the inquisition of Spain must be supplied.

The proscriptive and anti-democratic tendency of this system was already very sensibly felt among the citizens of our republic. Men of the basest character were, unfortunately, ever to be found, who would not hesitate to take any popular pledge to secure popular favor, while men of worth would scorn to stoop to any dishonorable means to secure lofty and lucrative stations. Our magistrates and legislators must give place to professedly reformed inebriates, and every office from the president of the nation to the pathmaster of a district must be supplied by pliant tools of the clergy who had taken the pledge.

Not regeneration, but the pledge; not the holy religion of Jesus Christ, but the pledge of the inebriate was to be the inlet to church membership; not patriotism, integrity nor talent, but the pledge was to be the test for all sorts of office of profit and honor among the people. In all their lawful avocations, our mechanics, farmers, merchants and professional men, must be proscribed, persecuted and avoided; and “temperance taverns,” “temperance” workshops, boarding houses, stores, groceries, doctor-shops, churches and intelligence offices, were to be patronized; and all who did not lay aside their bibles and adopt the doctrine of the society, might bid a long, a final farewell to freedom, and to equal rights.

[Twenty minutes had now been occupied.]



Mr. Pierce said that nothing could be more unfounded than a fear that the reformation to be brought about by the total abstinence society would result in the subversion of our civil institutions. It had not been contemplated by its friends to compel any to conform to it; but more effectual means were employed in its behalf than coercion. Conviction was more efficient than compulsion for the dissemination of sentiments and the propagation of principles. Motives of policy alone were therefore sufficient to induce the friends of temperance to desist from forcible measures for its advancement, even if no higher motive were ascribed to them. Moral suasion was that upon which they relied for success. This alone could produce a real and radical reformation. Those who were desirous of checking the nefarious career of intemperance, had united together in organic compact with those who had reformed and taken the pledge, for the sake of encouraging others to the same course; thus as it were extending their hands to the drunkard in the gutter and leading him from his degraded condition to occupy a respectable station in society. Lecturers were sent out to persuade and encourage those who were indulging in intoxicating beverages to relinquish them – the moderate drinker that he might save himself from the ultimate degradation of a drunkard; and the drunkard who had advanced a little further in the use of alcohol as a beverage, that he might abandon his miserable course of life, and assume a respectable standing in society, and become a useful citizen. But while the society was engaged in this laudable enterprise, evincing philanthropy and friendship to their country and their countrymen, they were charged by the language of the third proposition under discussion with the most diabolical

designs, and with a desire to destroy those free institutions which the triumph of the cause of temperance was so eminently calculated to perpetuate.

Through the influence of intemperance thousands of votes had been cast at our elections without the direction of reason or sentiment, but which were dictated by a desire to gratify a depraved appetite. In this way the voice of the people had been drowned, and their liberties and immunities as a rational, self-governing people had been threatened; but the object of the society was to reinstate reason on her throne, to effect a moral reformation, and thus insure the preservation of our institutions in their primitive purity. While the ballot box had been corrupted by the means of alcohol, who could say that such had been the case by means of total abstinence? It was a well known fact that a neighboring state (Pennsylvania) in which he himself resided, had been sold to the banks by its legislature through the influence of rum. Our halls of legislation were filled with bickerings and quarrels, while the interests of the country were neglected through the nefarious influence of alcohol. And when would this state of things be changed and these evils be remedied? Not until a moral reformation should be effected, and men should be sent to compose them to whom the interests of their country were dearer than the gratification of a degenerated appetite, and men who would not dabble in that which destroyed the exercise of reason and sound judgment. While men were incapacitated for the discharge of the responsible duties of legislators by the use of intoxicating poisons, by total abstinence they were left in possession of their better judgment and in the exercise of reason; and to men of the latter class he felt more willing to entrust his rights than to those of the former. He could not perceive in what manner the liberties of our country would be endangered by the election of moral and temperate men to our legislatures, instead of such as we had been in the habit of sending. Nor could he any more perceive in what manner strict temperance and morality could be any injury to the church. While men were in a state of intoxication they were incapacitated for receiving spiritual instruction, and therefore the interests of the church were promoted by temperance.

Many who before spent their time in the grog shop, would attend meeting and listen to the preaching of the gospel, after joining the society and becoming temperate; none would be excluded for drunkenness if all would observe the pledge.

Apprehensions of a union of church and state were but phantoms of the gentleman's imagination; there was no real cause for such fears. Was there any connection between the church and state at that time? Certainly not. Nor was there any ground for fearing any, either from the disposition or intelligence of our countrymen. But even if there were any danger of such an unhappy event, wherein had the total abstinence society designed the subversion of our government?



Mr. Beebe said that the time being limited, this would probably be his last opportunity to be heard on the subject, and after replying briefly to some things said by his opponent, he would therefore proceed to sum up the arguments upon the subject. Mr. P. had most emphatically dissented from his views of the anti-christian and anti-democratic bearing of the doctrines of the total abstinence society; but his arguments had gone to confirm rather than controvert the conclusions arrived at: he had informed us that the state of Pennsylvania had been sold to the banks by means of rum that the legislature of all our states and federal government were becoming corrupted in consequence of the intemperance of their

members; and that our churches were in danger of becoming extinct from the same cause, and therefore the all-sufficient pledge had, in his opinion, become indispensable. These declarations, if true, but gave additional confirmation of the correctness of the conclusions he had made when last on the floor. They but confirmed the statement that the pledge was held by the society as a test of church fellowship and standard of political preferment, and that according to their doctrine nothing short of the pledge would answer. The gentleman had endeavored to repel the charge of proscription, but let him or any other person walk through the streets of our cities and principal villages, where these doctrines had prevailed, and his eye would be greeted on every hand with the evidences of monopoly and proscription. On one corner he would see the sign of "Temperance Hotel," on another that of "Temperance Grocery," then a "Temperance Oyster House," &c.; and in Nassau Street, New York, he would find a "Temperance Intelligence office." The object of this last named institution was to fix the screws of oppression upon the poor laborers. The honest and industrious working man or woman, wishing for employment, might call at the intelligence office, and he or she would first be catechised thus: "Are you a member of the total abstinence society?" On the reply their success or the reverse would depend. If the answer was, "Sir, I have unquestionable testimonials of unexceptionable character; I never drank a drop of intoxicating liquor in my life, but] am not a member of the society, neither have I ever taken the pledge. I have conscientious scruples as to the propriety of foreswearing myself," &c. The reply would be, "Well, we can furnish you no employment. If you will join the society and take the pledge we will furnish you with a good place, otherwise you must go to the 'drunkards' intelligence office." This was a fair sample of the oppressive proscription of the society. And the fact would not be denied that the members of the societies were urged by their public lecturers and through their public prints to avoid patronizing taverns, merchants, mechanics and all others who refused to take the pledge. If this did not amount to proscription, it would be hard to define the term.

As Mr. P's. moderators had disowned him as a representative of their society, he wished them to examine a document, purporting to be from a committee of the society, and published in the city of New York under their supervision, and give a decision whether the said document was a true or a spurious one. [Mr. P's. moderators examined the paper and pronounced it a legitimate document of the society.] This paper contained an account of the review and inspection of fourteen armies of children under drill, which had been inspected by governors and other characters in high standing in different States of the Union. One of these armies was said to have been reviewed on the last 4th of July by Governor Seward of New York State. They were represented as being marshaled for the work of a revolution, and lauded in this sheet by unmeasured applause. The nature of the war in which they were engaged, and the revolution they were about to effect, was fully explained in the following stanzas which floated upon their banner, and which Mr. P's. moderators had admitted as good authority, viz.:

"GOING TO TEXAS.

"Our nation's hope, the temperance band,
In many a town erect is,
And he who hates what we have plann'd
Had better go to Texas.
The pledge, the pledge, it is the thing,

A shield that now protects us;
Nor will we cast it off and wing
The vagrant's flight to Texas.

“To ‘touch not, taste not, handle not,’
For every one a text is;
And he who'll strive the pledge to blot,
Must slide away to Texas.
The pledge, the pledge, &c.

“Let drunkard-makers sigh and weep,
But never dare to vex us,
Or with the pledge their law we'll sweep,
And roll them off to Texas.
The pledge, the pledge, &c.

“The wine and cider toppers quail,
Our pledge their soul perplexes;
But they with those who guzzle ale,
Must pledge, or off to Texas.
The pledge, the pledge, &c.

“The brewers and distillers prate –
‘This pledge so ill effects us,
That we must soon absquatulate
And hide ourselves in Texas.’
The pledge, the pledge, &c.

“Let those who sell the poison groan,
Our pledge their conscience vexes,
When left by whiskey friends alone,
They'll think of death, or Texas.
The pledge, the pledge, &c.

“In empty beer rooms let them cry,
‘Our customers neglect us;’
Then take the eagle's wings and fly
Away – away to Texas.
The pledge, the pledge, &c.”

How remarkably modest is this society of mushroom growth to claim that it was “our nation's hope!” Pray, what had been the hope of this nation when the six constituents of this famous society were lying

in the gutters of the streets of Baltimore? After this arrogant assumption of the protectorship of our nation, it was altogether in keeping to menace all non-conformists, that

“He who hates what we have plann’d
Had better go to Texas.”

But why was it better that those who did not choose to fall down and worship this image should go to Texas? Was it because our civil and religious rights were to be invaded, trodden down and annihilated? This was truly bold language, that fourteen armies already marshaled were now under discipline to strip the citizens of America of their inalienable rights, or drive them with the lash of persecution to another land.

The second verse began with a most profane perversion of a portion of the word of God: “Touch not, taste not, handle not,” quoted from Colossians. ii. 21, as though the inspired apostle had been discoursing upon rum in the context, and had concluded his teetotal lecture with these words, or had directed them to be used as a motto for total abstinence banners. But why not conclude that the direction given in verse 16 of the same chapter was also “For every one a text?” “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, nor in drink, nor in respect of an holy day, nor of the new moon, nor of the Sabbath days.” Ah! this would not answer their purpose. The text thus stolen from the epistle to the church of God, and offered as a booty to the abettors of humanly devised institutions of rebellion against God, was found in connection with solemn warnings against all such institutions as were to perish with their using, as was indisputably the case with the abstinence institution. In this connection the apostle proclaimed the jubilee, or the release of the church of God from the hand-writing of ordinances which had been against them, and charged the saints: “Let no man beguile you o’f your reward in a voluntary humility, and worshiping of angels; intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and not holding the Head, from which all the body, by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ, from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using,) after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility and neglecting of the body, not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh.” Did it not appear from these scriptures that in the prostitution of this portion of holy writ, the scriptures were handled deceitfully, and counsel darkened by words without knowledge, and this too by the society, in a published document, acknowledged as valid testimony in this place? To this perversion of scripture was added another hint that all such as would not approve their heaven-daring course, “Must slide away to Texas!”

The third verse was still more bold. Mr. P. had defined “drunkard-makers” to be sober, upright, temperate men, of strictly moral habits, who refused to take the pledge. These, although not obnoxious to the charge of being themselves drunkards, were charged with being drunkard-makers, and accused of doing more to encourage drunkenness by with-holding their names from the pledge, than the drunkards, from their limited influence, could do. Thus rendered, let the stanza be read: Let sober and moral men who fear God, and will not wrong their consciences by taking the pledge, “sigh and weep,” “But never dare to vex us;” [the fourteen armies now being trained for the onset, and their co-operators] “Or with

our pledge” we will revolutionize the government of the United States. Thus were the fires of liberty and of civil and religious rights lit up at the expense of the warmly flowing heart blood of our revolutionary fathers, threatened with extinguishment. The boasted laws of free- men were thus threatened in direct terms, that the cherished constitution of America should give way to a code that should consign such as dared to speak out in defence of freedom, liberty or truth, to a foreign land or legal punishment.

The fourth and fifth verses seemed principally designed to brand with reproach those who refused the pledge, and they presented as the only alternative the pledge, “Must pledge, or off to Texas.” The sixth verse threatened the assassination of those who manufactured or vended beer or distilled liquors. These “Must think of death or Texas!”

Had it come to this so soon, before the little remnant of the surviving revolutionary heroes had joined the departed spirits of their companions, the threat of death or banishment for non-conformity to schemes of priestcraft were to be reiterated from Maine to Florida, and from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains? Were proof demanded that the doctrine of the total abstinence society was anti-democratic and opposed to true religion, it might be heard thundering from nearly all the pulpits, and teeming from nearly all the presses of our country. From their high stations of honor and trust in the councils of our states and congress of our nation, men were sallying forth, joining the clamorous shouts of the infatuated, priest-ruled and priest-ridden multitude, eager to secure for themselves a share of the spoils of vanquished freedom.

But to sum up, it had been proved by a great number of passages of scripture, embracing nearly every passage in the bible in which the subject was mentioned: first, that the fundamental doctrines of the society charged Christ and his apostles with immorality and sin. Second, that the society assumed to be wise above what was written in the scriptures. Third, that the doctrines held by the society were subversive of the principles of democracy and of true religion, and were calculated to overthrow those civil and religious rights, for the establishment of which the patriotic blood of our revolutionary sires was poured forth. On the other hand, not a single passage of holy writ had been made to bear against the affirmative of the propositions agreed upon as the subject of discussion. The gentleman, on whom devolved the support of the negative, had closed his bible, and concluded that nothing in that book contained had any direct bearing on the subject, and was at length disowned by his party, and by them left to enjoy the honor of his defeat solitary and alone.

As a few minutes yet remained of his time, Mr. B. said he would compare the general characteristics of anti-christ, as delineated by the apostle Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 1-5, with those of the society.

“Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry; and commanding to abstain from meats that God hath created to be received with, thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.” These were the general characteristics of the man of sin, which, according to the express declaration of God, should be developed in the latter times; and that these characteristics were all developed in the institution, doctrine and order of the T. A. Society, he would proceed to demonstrate.

By departing from the faith in this case he did not understand the grace of faith, as that was the fruit of the Spirit and the gift of God, a vital principle in the hearts of God's children, from which it was impossible to depart; a principle which the society under consideration never possessed, but from the doctrine or standard of faith, the bible. From the bible as a standard of faith and rule of practice, the society had very widely departed, as had been very fully demonstrated by the testimony of perhaps more than a hundred direct portions of scripture in the course of the debate. To depart from the precepts and instruction of the bible, always required the agency of seduction and seducing spirits, both of which were very apparent in the society, its agents and its doctrines.

And doctrines of devils. By doctrines was intended teachings, and all doctrines adverse to the scriptures were of the devil; for our Lord said, He is a liar and the father of it. The teachings or doctrines of the society, as had been proved, were not only unauthorized by the scriptures, but positively in contradiction of the word of God, and justly ranked as doctrines of devils. To the tenets, teachings or doctrines of the society, its members tenaciously adhered and gave heed.

Speaking lies in hypocrisy. All lies involved the crime of hypocrisy, as they were uttered with the design to deceive; but it was peculiarly so in the case of the modern anti-christ. The apostle had decided that no lie was of the truth, and all truth, in a religious sense of the word, was embraced in the scriptures; that doctrine, therefore, which was religiously taught, for which there was no warrant in the scriptures, was false, and every such doctrine was a lie in the sense of this text. Such doctrines or lies were uttered by the society, when, for instance, they declared their pledge was the only sure and infallible rule of temperance, thus denouncing the rule which God had given in his word; or when the society claimed to save thousands of souls and bodies by their pledge, or complained that 30,000 souls and bodies were annually lost which might be saved by taking the pledge. These were all lies, for they contradicted what God had said; "Salvation is of the Lord;" "I am God, and beside me there is no Savior;" "Neither is there salvation in any other," &c.; and these lies were spoken in hypocrisy to deceive, to allure, to decoy, and to turn men away from the scriptures, that they might be turned unto fables.

Having their conscience seared with a hot iron. Could any rational creature account for the contempt and careless indifference with which the numerous passages of the word of God, quoted in the course of this debate, had been treated upon any other ground than that of a callous state of the conscience, or a conscience seared in the manner described by the Holy Ghost? They that feared the Lord trembled at his word; but had his word produced any such results on this occasion? In the absence of the fear of God, the conscience must be seared indeed.

Forbidding to marry. It was but recently that this horn of the beast had sufficiently developed itself to be perceptible; but by close attention it would be found to be quite apparent. In the public lectures and printed documents of the society the young ladies had been required to refuse the hand and avoid the company of any young gentleman who had not taken the pledge, but were advised when such called upon them to be "not at home."

[Tremendous cheering. Order was soon however restored, and Mr. B proceeded.]⁸

⁸ We subsequently learned that the clergyman of the most popular denomination in the village (in the meeting house of which the debate was conducted) had for some months been zealously descanting from the pulpit in favor of the course recommended to the young ladies, which we had just touched upon; and to this fact the for a time irrestrainable

And commanding to abstain from meats which God has created to be received with thanksgiving, &c. It had been shown from Gen. i. that all the trees of the field, and every herb, with seed in themselves to produce all their future developments, were created of God, and by him given to be meat for man, and to be received (not rejected) by man with thanksgiving. Such meats the society required all its members to abstain from, when it imposed on them a total abstinence from the developments of the vine. For every creature (or created thing) of God is good; albeit, the society were at issue with this express declaration of the Spirit; for they denounced some of the creatures of God, or things which God had created, as evil, and as a curse, and forbade their use. The Spirit farther said expressly, “Nothing is to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified (or set apart for the use of man) by the word of God, (Gen. i. 29, 30) and prayer. It was to be received with thanksgiving, devotion or prayer, inasmuch as it came from God, of whom christians were taught to ask, “Give us this day our daily bread,” and to be used as the scriptures direct, temperately, as not abusing, knowing that its fashion must pass away.

This testimony had presented the society in a fearful light, but he had not dared to withhold it. As the advocate of the bible in its superiority over all humanly invented rules, he had not, according to the limited opportunity allowed, shunned to declare what he honestly believed to be the truth – truth that would endure when every refuge of lies should be swept away. For the severity of the application of scriptures, he dared not apologize. By these scriptures, severe as they might sound. in the ears of the enemies of truth, God would judge the world in righteousness at the last day by that Man whom he had appointed.

Being informed that he had occupied twenty minutes, Mr. B. concluded his remarks with an expression of thanks to the audience for their patient and respectful attendance.

Mr. Pierce said the plan proposed by his society was the only effectual one of producing a moral reformation from intemperance. The advocates of total abstinence had preached themselves drunk on their “doctrine, and they had preached their churches and congregations drunk.⁹ Yes, they had preached their total abstinence doctrine until they had preached their hearers drunk. [Mr. B., “Amen.”] Their churches had been diminished by intemperance, and had dwindled away, and this was sufficient evidence to induce all true friends of temperance to unite with those who were endeavoring to encourage it by abstaining themselves and inducing all others with whom they had influence to abstain entirely from all that would intoxicate.

Mr. B. had asserted great fear of a union of church and state in our country, and its horrid consequences. But when called upon for his reasons therefor, he had not been able to bring such as to satisfy the friends of total abstinence societies that they were engaged in attempting the overthrow of civil and religious freedom: yet he continued to vehemently urge that such would necessarily be the effect of such a moral reformation as the friends of temperance were laboring to produce. Mr. B’s. perceptions must be far keener than those of the community in general; for few had been able to discover the bugbear which he described.

burst of applause should doubtless be attributed. – [Ed.]

⁹ A friend of Mr. P. suggested to amend this remark by substituting “the advocates of the moderate use of alcohol” instead of “the advocates of total abstinence,” to which alteration Mr. P. consented.

“He must have optics rare I ween
To see what is not to be seen.”

Mr. B’s argument had reminded him of the oration of a student: (as nearly as can be recollected as follows:)

I stood upon a lofty mountain: before me spread the vast expanse of ocean. As I mused, gazing thoughtfully upon its bright unruffled surface, I saw deep in its bosom an image that seemed reflected from the sky. I turned from gazing upon the boundless blue and briny deep, to view its anti-part in the vaulted heavens above, when for the first I saw a dark and frightful cloud rising in terrific grandeur and floating furiously forward from the precincts of the horizon, upon the light ethereal azure that before had overspread the canopy. It soon secluded the glorious king of day from sight; and as if freighted with supernal vengeance, it poured out the tempest as it came, and uprooted in its course the oaks of centuries. Swept by the wild tornado, the bottomless and boundless deep swelled high, and heaved, and roared with wrath; billow with billow joined, and with their might and bulk combined they dashed and burst against each other and the shore until their spray met with the very clouds above, and then the sea and sky, united, seemed to brook no bounds. It seemed as though the deep was being to its bottom scooped to surge the spot on which I stood! Trembling with fear that at each succeeding moment the angry ocean would engulf me, and bewildered by the wildness of the scene, I sank into a swoon, and swooned into a trance. But when I woke the war of elements was hushed; the gloom had left the heavens; and the bow of the Almighty’s covenant with man was shining in its brightest colors. Now that all was calm again except the lazy tossing of subsiding waves, I repaired to the margin of the shore to see what the mighty ocean in its boisterous heavings had thrown up, When lo! my fellow students, I beheld *a frog!*”

The verses which his opponent had read from a periodical of his society were not intended to seriously threaten coercion in the cause of the society, but were merely meant as a satire. Since Mr. B. had read a document he would also read one – the Declaration of Independence of the Washingtonians:

[VERBATIM COPY.]

“When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one community of people to dissolve the bands which have connected them with pernicious habits, and to assume in the moral world that sphere of dignity for which the laws of nature have fitted them, and to which the laws of God entitle them, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, and a prudent regard for their own character, requires that they should declare the causes which have impelled them to such a procedure. We hold these truths to be self evident, that our Creator has given us two great sources of wealth, viz: the earth and the mind of man: and that from the proper cultivation of these great sources, emanate certain rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; he has made these rights inalienable by creating all men equal; and to inculcate the practice and duties of life, he has designed that governments should be instituted among men, which governments must give man a relative position to his fellow-man. Prudence indeed will dictate, that long and established customs should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience has shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the habits to which

they have been long accustomed. But when a train of demoralizing habits have emanated from abuses, pursuing invariably the same object, evincing a design to incapacitate us for the development of the gifts which nature and nature's God has endowed us, and to render abortive the two great sources of wealth, and eventually to reduce us to a state of total depravity; it is our right – it is our duty, to abolish such customs, and to establish new ones; laying their foundation upon such principles as will elevate us in the scale of civil and religious liberty. And such is now the necessity which constrains us to abolish our former habits and customs. The history of that nefarious prince, king alcohol, is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having a direct tendency to the establishment of an absolute despotism over us, morally, physically, and intellectually. To prove this let facts be submitted to a candid people.

He has dethroned reason, impaired our intellectual faculties, and subjugated our moral endowments..to the animal propensities, and in many instances he has totally suspended the operations of the mind; and when so suspended, he has confined many of our most valuable fellow-citizens within the walls of lunatic asylums, and at the same time tortured others: with the agonies of *mania-a-potu* or delirium tremens. He has frequently presided in our legislative councils, and there exercised such a despotism over the minds and morals of our representatives as to totally unfit them for the duties assigned them by the people, and in some instances he has made them conspire against each other; inciting them to disorder and disgraceful 'scenes, to fight duels, &c.; making them believe at the same time that they were acting the part of honorable men. He has frequently refused his assent to laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good. He has called together large assemblies of our people at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from their families and friends, for the sole purpose of bringing them under the influence of his demoralizing despotism, and has finally converted them into bacchanalian worshipers. He has dissolved meetings for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on our tranquility and happiness. He has refused for a long time after such dissolutions, to permit the people to peaceably convene for the discussion of their grievances, exposing us in this way to all the dangers and turmoil without, and drunkenness and an endless train of diseases within. He has tried to prevent the population of our country, by destroying the souls and bodies of thirty or forty thousands of our Citizens annually, thus rearing up in our country an army of helpless orphans and widows. He has refused to pass such laws as would put an end to this iniquity; but on the contrary he has enacted laws to encourage the migration of foreign spirits who aid him in the work of death, desolation and misery among us. He has impaired our judgment, debased the finer sensibilities of our hearts, and made memory dependent on his will for the tenure of its office. He has erected a multitude of new officers among us, under the name, style and title of distillers, wholesale dealers, retailers, coffee houses, hotels, taverns, inns, &c., who have harassed our people by inducing them to swallow a liquid fire, which excites them always to folly, generally to wickedness, and sometimes to madness. He has kept among us in time of peace a standing army of four hundred thousand drunkards, who are the vassals of his despotic will, but whom he finally abandons to the appetites of ruined animals, and throws upon the community for support. He has affected to render the animal propensities independent of, and superior to the moral endowments; thus inverting and violating the mental laws of our nature. He has combined all his powers to subject us to drunkenness, thus rendering us incapable of civil life, enjoying liberty, and pursuing happiness. For quartering large bodies of his troops in our lunatic asylums, alms houses, jails and penitentiaries. For levying a tax upon us to support them under the plea of the license system, which is worse than no equivalent. For cutting off our intercourse with moral and religious

beings. For destroying our property, both by sea and by land, and transporting us to jails, penitentiaries, to the highway and the gallows. For abolishing education, virtue and religion from our dwellings, and establishing therein ignorance, vice and barbarous practices, thus enlarging the boundaries of his kingdom so as to completely enslave the rising generation. For taking away our characters, undermining the vital laws of our nature, altering and breaking our constitutions, and in some instances declaring himself our ruler, sole legislator and governor in all things, spiritual and temporal. He has abdicated all moral and religious government among us, at the same time inciting us to immorality, irreligion and nefarious habits; thus severing the bonds which bind man to his fellow-man, incapacitating us for self-government, and waging an internal war of drunkenness against us. He has impoverished and plundered our people, both by sea and by land; broken the hearts of our wives and made our children wretched. He is, at this time, importing large quantities of spirits among us, to complete the work of death, desolation and misery already begun, with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous nations. He has constrained our people from doing their duty either as christians or patriots; and has frequently caused us to take up arms against our families and friends, and in some instances to become the murderers of our own brethren. He has excited domestic insurrections, by letting loose upon us a flood of foreign spirits, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished extinction of everything that dignifies our nature, or elevates our persons or character. In every stage of these oppressions, we have met in conventions and petitioned for redress in the most respectful manner: but our repeated petitions have been answered by a pretended treaty, under the appellation of wine, beer, and cider, which is a new mode of enslaving us – of giving another color to our depravity, and a facility to his despotism. A prince, whose character is thus marked by every thing that may define a tyrant and a demon, is unfit to be ruler of. rational and intelligent beings. Nor have we been wanting in attention to king alcohol and his allies; we have warned him from time to time, to desist from extending such an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us; we have reminded him of the conditions upon which we would receive him into the bosom of our families; and in return for all this, he has subjugated all ages, sexes and conditions.

We have conjured him by all laws, moral and physical, to disavow such usurpation and despotism, which would inevitably cut off all connection between us; but he has been deaf to the voice of reason, justice and humanity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity which denounces our separation, and hold him, out of his province, as we hold all bad spirits, enemies now and forever.

We, therefore, the members of the American Temperance Societies in general assembly met, do in the name and by the authority of said societies, solemnly publish and declare, That all connection between us and king alcohol is now dissolved; and as a free and independent people, we will be untrammelled and unfettered, morally, physically and intellectually; and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on divine Providence for assistance, we mutually and voluntarily agree to sustain and carry out the principles and pledges of our respective associations.”



Mr. Beebe asked for and obtained liberty to repel some personal insinuations made in Mr. P’s. last speech. He said he regretted the necessity of detaining the audience after having concluded, as he supposed, his defence of the position by him assumed; but the gentleman, who had throughout the

former part of the debate avoided making any personal attack upon him, had taken advantage of the opportunity to attack him personally at a time when he was not to reply. Mr. P. had, when last on the floor, asserted that with the doctrines by him [Mr. B.] advocated, preachers had preached themselves drunk, and their churches and congregations were preached drunk with this moderate doctrine. This was the wrong place for the gentleman to throw out such insinuations. He, Mr. B., was in the vicinity of his home; more than a thousand persons present had been acquainted with him personally, many of them intimately for almost twenty years; and he would challenge the assembly or the united world, to name an instance of his ever having made an improper use of intoxicating drinks; and the churches which he had the happiness to serve in the gospel ministry, could suffer nothing by a comparison of temperate habits, with any other church or congregation in the universe. He knew not that there belonged to either of the churches which he served a single habitual drinker of spirituous liquors, and certainly there was not a drunkard among them. Drunkenness, or immoderate drinking, was by him and the churches of his connection, regarded as a departure from the order of the gospel; and should any such case occur among his people, such an offence would subject the offender to expulsion from the church. For himself and for his brethren, he claimed the bible as the guide: it had never directed them wrong. The grace of God that bringeth salvation, had appeared unto them, teaching them that denying themselves of ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world.

But the time had come, when men, claiming to be reformed inebriates, could be taken out of the gutters of our streets, and before the fumes of whiskey could pass from them, they were ready to prescribe rules and regulations for the church of the living God; for the ministers of the gospel, and the legislative councils of our nation. This required a great amount of effrontery, and more than they could work themselves up to, were they not encouraged in it by an interested combination of aspirants for power and fame, who could turn such arrogance to their own advantage, and were therefore ready to unite with them in denouncing all, without distinction, who refused to submit to their dictation. If men who had been habitual drunkards, had reformed and could manage for themselves to avoid their disgraceful course of profligacy, they would do well; but a little more modesty on their part than was evinced by the “reformed drunkards” of the day would be more becoming. If by reformation they could regain their station in society, they should not think to prescribe rules for those who had ever been able to walk circumspectly. At least they should let the winds of heaven blow from them the sickening fumes of their own disgrace, before they take it on themselves to denounce the church of God, the ministers of Christ, and the legislatures of our states.



Mr. Pierce requested permission to reply, which being granted, he said that Mr. B. had altogether misapprehended him. He had not intended to charge him or his friends with preaching themselves and their churches and congregations drunk. In the remarks in his preceding address which Mr. B. had thought intended for him, he had reference to the temperance society under its old organization, which allowed the use of beer, cider, &c.. And to illustrate the truth of what he had said he would relate an anecdote of an occurrence which was alleged to have taken place in New England. Deacon Rugers had united with the old society, but was of a jovial and social disposition, and a great lover of cider. One evening a neighbor who was not a member called upon him to argue the merits of the society; and after

conversing awhile the deacon brought on a mug of cider: the neighbor quaffed and complimented liberally, and by the aid of the deacon the mug was soon drained. Another mug was filled and disposed of in a similar manner. As both grew more and more social in the ratio of the cider quaffed, the deacon now remarked in reply to the superlative compliments of his neighbor that he had another barrel which he thought to be a little better. By this time the neighbor concluded that he did not care if he joined the society too! But in going down cellar after more, the deacon fell down stairs. It was the patrons of the society to which the deacon belonged that he had alluded to, and not to Mr. B. or his friends. With these remarks he would yield the floor.



The debate was then closed, without any formal decision by the officers as to the merits of the argument, as Mr. P. and his friends had requested that a public decision should not be given by them. But the officers as well as the audience in general were unanimous in their opinion, so far as we have been able to learn.