



Surgeon General's Office

LIBRARY

~~INDEX~~
Section, *Alcoholism*

No. *38087*

CORRESPONDENCE
ON THE *L. W. Jones*
PRINCIPLES OF RIGHT REASONING,
APPLICABLE TO *640*
TEMPERANCE,
AND TO THE
EFFECTS OF FERMENTED AND DISTILLED LIQUORS;

BETWEEN

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS

AND

GERRIT SMITH, REV. DR. JUSTIN EDWARDS, AND REV. DR. SAMUEL H. COX.

with other papers and notes, by the editor.

PART I.

Collected and published by

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.

Library
1238087
Geneva, N. Y.

JOHN C. MERRELL, PRINTER.

1836.

Entered according to act of Congress.
December, 1836.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I. MR. SMITH TO MR. HOPKINS,.....	5
II. MR. HOPKINS TO MR. SMITH,.....	9
III. MR. HOPKINS TO MR. SMITH,.....	15
[On reasoning from facts actually observed—General and particular facts—Fundamental propositions.]	
IV. MR. SMITH TO MR. HOPKINS,.....	20
V. MR. HOPKINS TO MR. SMITH,.....	22
[Of the fabrication of facts—General facts cannot be fabricated—They must be truly collected from general observation—Can drinks be allowed either on the test of weakness or of not producing intoxication?]	
VI. MR. HOPKINS TO MR. SMITH,.....	28
[On the effects of fermented and distilled liquors respectively upon mankind, considered in a national point of view.]	
VII. MR. SMITH TO MR. HOPKINS,.....	47
VIII. MR. HOPKINS TO REV. DR. J. EDWARDS,.....	47
IX. DR. EDWARDS TO MR. HOPKINS,.....	51
AND MR. HOPKINS' REPLY,.....	52
X. REVIEW OF DR. WASHINGTON'S LETTER,.....	53
XI. OF THE DIFFERENCE IN THE EFFECTS OF FERMENTED AND DISTILLED LIQUORS RESPECTIVELY, UPON INDIVIDUALS, 64	
[The peculiar ruin of modern intemperance—It is a proper ground for universal associations to exclude spirits—Points of opposition between the effects of distilled and fermented liquors—Proofs.]	
XII. REV. DR. COX TO MR. HOPKINS AND REMARKS IN ANSWER, 95	
[Did our Saviour, when on earth, usually drink the usual wines of Palestine?]	
XIII. PROSPECTUS OF PART II, AND MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS, 105	

ERRATA.

PAGE 15, line 18, for facilities, read *faculties*,

“ 33, line 19, for some, read *sour*.

“ 41 and 42, the 2d and 3d propositions at the bottom of page 41 and top of page 42, should be interchanged—place the 3d as 2d.

“ 71, last line, for this, read *the*.

“ 91, line 26, for last, read *best*.

CORRESPONDENCE, &c.

From the Albany Evening Journal.

No. I. MR. SMITH TO MR. HOPKINS.

PETERBORO, March 25, 1836.

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR: The reading your letter of the 14th instant,* addressed to the editor of the Albany Evening Journal, has left me very desirous to obtain your views on a question of great interest to the friends of temperance. This question is, how shall the half million of drunkards in our land be reclaimed; and the millions who are connected with them in the family relation, be lifted up out of the depths of their debasement and wo? Can drunkards be reclaimed whilst they drink intoxicating liquors; and can they be induced to refrain from them whilst the sober, with whom they associate, continue to drink them? I know your humanity and intelligence; and am sure that the theory of temperance which you would have adopted, does not leave this mass of our wretched fellow-beings unprovided for. What is the provision which your theory makes for them? I am led to

* It may be allowable to explain that I was not at all a volunteer nor concerned in the commencement of this correspondence, though not sorry to be called out. It originated in an article in the Albany Evening Journal of the 1st of March last, beginning thus: "*It is very erroneous to suppose that there is any division among the friends of temperance,*" and then going on to show that those who differ from the writer were not real friends of temperance, but that they followed or opposed it as fashion and popularity turned; that they were eleventh hour men—governed by interest, appetite, and the ambition of leading—the writer taking due care to associate himself and friends, with the Luthers, Wickliffes, Miltons and Hampdens of the world.

On this article Mr. Weed, the editor, commented in some very forcible remarks. He mentioned some of the most estimable and eminent men in the country, as being virtually denounced by the writer of it; and in such a list inserted my own name. But as Mr. Weed's comments, in that and a subsequent paper, might possibly seem to put my temperance on grounds not exactly such as I mean, it appeared necessary to say publicly so much as would prevent misconstruction; and in doing this, there was no choice but to write under my own signature.

this inquiry, because your letter informs the public that you drink intoxicating liquors.

In this neighborhood, the friends of temperance gave up, years ago, fermented as well as distilled liquors. They thought this necessary, that they might become successful instruments in reforming the drunkards among them. These drunkards were, under the blessing of God, nearly all reformed. Some of them returned to fermented liquors; and thence, by a step which was sure to follow, to distilled liquors. Now, whatever other, and however good reasons might have been presented to these friends of temperance to induce them to abstain from fermented liquors, I think no better of them than to believe that, if they had not thought the interests of the reformed and unreformed drunkards made it their imperative duty to abstain from such liquors, they would not have screwed themselves up out of their wine and cider and beer-drinking habits, to the point of their present self-denial. And even now, weakened as the force of these habits must necessarily be, if they could learn from yourself or from some other source, of a way to save drunkards short of abridging the pleasures of their own palates, I believe that not a few of them would return again to their long-loved drinks.

I beg leave to advert to some other portions of your letter. I must think that you misapprehend the feelings of your temperance brethren towards you. They are, so far as I know them, feelings of great respect and kindness. The difference between yourself and most of us, on the subject of fermented drinks, does not prevent our loving and honoring the man who, having been "pledged against the use of ardent spirits more than forty years before (he) ever heard of any pledge from any society," was first among the foremost against the giant enemy to temperance.

I believe you are very nearly right in your position, that it was "universally understood," in the first stages of the temperance reformation, that we were to combat the use of distilled liquors only. There is, however, reason to believe that a few men, even at that early day, desecrated enemies to our cause beyond distilled liquors. I admit the change in our plan of opera-

tions ; and that we have adopted a plan little thought of when we began the war against intemperance. You speak of this change as if you thought it morally wrong ; and morally wrong, not only because it is rash or unwise or otherwise improper, but because it is a change. Here we differ. I do not see why the old pledge, and the principles of action corresponding with it, should be deemed, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable. If the change is for the worse, then, indeed, we are to lament it, and, perhaps, to blame its authors ; but if it be for the better, then we are to rejoice in it and to thank those who promoted it. I am aware that there is a numerous class of minds which have a great dislike of change ; and doubtless the pride of consistency often contributes to this dislike : but I believe God requires far more frequent changes at our hands than we perform. Only let us see to it that these changes are all improvements, and then they cannot be too numerous. If our old principles of temperance do not meet the necessities of the drunkard, then, in the name of humanity, let us substitute principles which do ; and let us not be ashamed to own that the developments of Providence, in the course of the temperance reformation, have instructed us.

You are doubtless right in saying that it was originally intended to embrace in the temperance societies, “men of all sects, parties, denominations and opinions, religious and irreligious :” And I am amazed, my dear sir, at your declaration that these societies have become “the property of a *sect* or a *party* in morals.” I assure you that it is not so in respect to the temperance societies of this county. They are, as much as ever, made up of men of all sorts of religious and irreligious opinions.

It seems to me that you lay undue stress on the importance of what you call the “universality,” or universal spread of temperance principles. Now, instead of agreeing with you, that “the very point to be obtained (is) universality,” I would say, that “the very point”—the point above all others—is to have the principles we disseminate, and the system we recommend, the

best which can be chosen. This point being secured, then follows the importance of diffusing these principles, and extending this system to the utmost limits—if possible, even to that “universality,” which it seems is not too wide for the grasp of your hopes. Besides, it is far from apparent to my mind, that your favorite point of “universality” would be more nearly approached under the old than under the new temperance pledge. Both these pledges are too good—have too much of truth to commend themselves extensively to any others than the friends of truth. The most and the heartiest suffrages, therefore, might be counted on for that one which is found to be best suited to the wants of our corrupted world. And when we add to these suffrages the power of that blessing which accompanies human efforts in proportion to their fidelity to truth and virtue, we have only to learn which of these pledges is the more marked with “the wisdom that is pure,” and the more fraught with safety, in order to determine which would outgo the other.

I look as unfavorably as you do, on the scheme of crushing men by the force of public sentiment. The apostolic scheme of “speaking the truth in love,” and winning the hearts of men, is an infinitely better one for correcting their errors.

If what you say about “the registry of the adhering clergy,” is aimed at the simple publication of the names of those ministers of the gospel who sanction the new temperance pledge, then I do not see any justification for the warmth and alarm with which you speak on this topic. The same papers that publish these names, inform us that physicians and members of Congress, and the President and ex-President of the United States, are the friends of temperance: and is there in this exhibition of names of power, the exertion of an unfair influence? And let me ask, too, is it altogether candid and charitable to cloud with suspicions this well-meant endeavor to serve the cause of temperance? Surely, my dear sir, you do not think, when our excellent friend Delavan publishes, in the joy of his pure heart, a list of temperance clergymen or physicians, that he does this in aid of a system of denunciation and despotism: and yet readers of your

letter, who are strangers to your candor and generosity, might suppose that you really intended what your language implies.

I am sorry that you think so unfavorably of the efforts of our temperance friends who control the Albany publications; and most sorry that you should think it necessary to characterize those efforts by such hard names as "delusions, sophistry, impostures," &c. Do let us deal kindly with one another, and check our spirits when they would impel us to employ reproachful charges, instead of persuasive arguments.

If, my dear sir, you will condescend to accept of me for your correspondent, I shall be pleased to exchange a few letters with you on the subject of the drinking of fermented liquors. But, let me here say that I must decline such a discussion, as you justly think it appropriate to yourself and to "professors of mental and physical science:" for besides that I have no learning to fit me for such a discussion, I have no taste for it, where it is so little demanded as in the present case. If we engage in a discussion, let it be of such a character that the democracy of the temperance society—the farmers and mechanics, who compose the great body of it—will be able to understand the benefit there is to the drunkard in keeping open the streams of intoxicating liquor, and the good reason there is for continuing to adhere to a system of temperance, which, as it takes from them their jugs of whiskey, and leaves to our lawyers and statesmen—the fashionable and polite—their decanters of wine, bears too much resemblance to "the bad rule that does not work both ways."

With great regard, your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

From the Albany Evening Journal.

No. II. MR. HOPKINS TO MR. SMITH.

[THE writer of the following letter in answer to one of Mr. Smith's which appeared in the Evening Journal of the 29th of

March last, desires to explain that the delay of this answer has been caused principally by an intermediate correspondence. He suggested to Mr. Smith that these discussions would be more in place in the *Temperance Intelligencer*; but that, for certain reasons, Mr. Smith must see to the insertion of his (Mr. Hopkins') letters. This led to a correspondence by Mr. Smith with the chairman of the executive committee of the temperance society; after which the latter invited Mr. Hopkins to write in that paper—and to that letter of the chairman the following has reference. The only reason for publishing this letter at all is, that Mr. Hopkins has been invited by Mr. Smith to discuss the subject in question, and it seems necessary to state publicly what has been, or is like to be done, upon that invitation. The reference in the following to some letters not published, will be sufficiently understood.

Mr. Hopkins rejoices in a hope of being able to lay before the public (even though in the confined circulation of a pamphlet) those views of the temperance question which he supposes are supported by fact, observation, sound reason and common sense; and in connexion with the views of the intelligent and manly opponent who has called him forth. And he avows without hesitation, that no small part of his ambition is to rescue our age and country from the disgrace of seeming to receive without dissent, the floods of sophistry and imposture which have proceeded from the temperance presses.]

ON THE ERIE CANAL, May 28, 1836.

GERRIT SMITH, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR: I received, about the 24th of April, your note of the 21st, with Mr. Delavan's letter of the 14th, in which, as chairman of the executive committee of the state temperance society, he writes me in very kind terms, but under certain peculiar restrictions, to send my views on the use of fermented liquors for publication. His letter was predicated on yours to him of the 6th of April. Incessant personal engagements have prevented my earlier answer.

I did not hesitate a single moment whether I should reject the restrictions proposed, and with them the offer to write in the *Intelligencer*. I should, indeed, of my own accord, have generally confined myself to all the limits which the committee wish. But having before experienced their desire to misrepresent and embarrass me, and then to exclude me, I will come under no conditions to suppress the facts regarding it, nor again subject myself to the probability of receiving the same treatment as formerly. It was for this reason I wrote you that I could ask no favors of those gentlemen, and that if we undertook the proposed correspondence, *you* must see to the insertion of my papers.

I deny that there is any thing in my motives, my character, my conduct, or in the manner in which I was conducting the discussion before begun, which should authorize the Albany committee to take me under their special supervision, or subject me to unusual restrictions.

The committee say that they "*cannot devote to any single communication in the discussion which may probably arise, more than a column and a half.*" And they "respectfully suggest that I will abstain from all allusion to the past." Sir, my first letter to them was shifted off, under various and sometimes contradictory pretexts, from January, 1834, (but say February,) until October following, before publication. It was a letter of earnest expostulation against the discussion about fermented liquors; and it foretold, though imperfectly, the evils which have followed—declaring at the same time that, if they *would* bring up that question, I was ready and should proceed to discuss it. If argument is to be measured by the column, (as prejudice and delusion in some sort may,) then the committee had published, in those eight or nine months while my letter was withheld, about one hundred and sixty columns against me, before my numbers were allowed to commence. In one year and a half since, they must have published upwards of four hundred columns more—making in all five or six hundred columns, very nearly all on one side. And now they will allow me a column and a half per month! These are the same gen-

tle men who could formerly admit pieces of three or four columns of frothy anonymous matter against me ; and that, too, *after* they had excluded me, and when they knew I had no opportunity to answer.

In more than two years, during which the *Intelligencer* has contrived to exclude very nearly all discussion on one side, that paper has been circulated with immense industry and vast pecuniary means. It has also been a great vehicle of those real and most important truths which it was the great object of the former temperance society to disseminate. With truth, it has artfully mixed up the new delusions—pressing them, in endless forms, upon multitudes of most sincere friends of the best of causes, and boldly challenging an answer, when the editors of that paper well knew that I, for one, declared myself ready and willing to refute every part of the new doctrine, and to submit that answer to a candid and intelligent world. Neither ought you, Mr Smith, at all to doubt whether such challenge for an answer, (though you have yourself innocently repeated it,) was a disingenuous measure on the part of the committee. For you now know that I stated the whole of this matter of the exclusion of discussion, at the late Buffalo convention : and you now know that both the *New-York Evangelist* and the *Intelligencer*, combined to suppress nearly all that part of the debate which contained my statement. If I brought a railing and unjust accusation against the committee, have they not ample means to confute me?—To hold me up to public disgrace? Is it come to this—that papers professing in a peculiar sense the principles of the gospel, must take the ground of Jesuits? What—when I, a man *whom they say they respect*, stand forth exclaiming that the best of causes is perverted ; when they pick a quarrel with me and exclude my statement ; and when, in convention, I formally state the facts in the face of the committee, and the committee being present do not deny the substance of this statement—do Christian newspapers mislead a Christian public, by suppressing the material parts of this debate ?

Well may this committee, if they can, make me stipulate that,

if they will only allow me to publish, I shall omit all reference to the past. Such things as these are “*misunderstandings!*” and Mr. Delavan suggests that, in our discussion, we “abstain from all allusion to them.” Sir, there was no “*misunderstanding,*” unless causeless and abusive oppression be such. The editors of the *Intelligencer* made themselves parties to the discussion, before they had opportunity to understand my views; when the argument began to “*pinch,*” they put forward two direct and palpable misstatements in quotation, which perverted the whole substance of the case. When I kindly pointed out these as “*unintentional errors,*” (we were all friends, and I did not suspect malice,) they declined the correction. I again formally appealed to the committee, as men of honor and Christians, to set the matter right, and they took no notice of it. I remain now two years before the public, under the effect of two statements, palpably untrue, and which at any moment I could point out to you in the documents. These are “*misunderstandings!*”

In what discussion that ever took place, was it thought improper to allude to the *history* of the question? The history of opinions is often vital to the grounds of them: and matters of extensive public delusion can, in many cases, be no wise disentangled, without referring to it.

Mr. Delavan intimates that they have rejected *but one* of my communications. The truth is, they rejected *three*. Two of them however were matters of personal vindication, rendered necessary by their own incorrect allegations.

In your letter to Mr. Delavan, you are pleased kindly to say that on these topics “few men have thought as much as myself;” that I am “one of the ablest men in the temperance society, who advocate the use of [fermented] liquors;” and you call me a “long devoted friend of our precious common cause;” and Mr. Delavan says, in his letter, that he has the highest respect for the “purity of my motives and the maturity of my judgment.”

Can all this, *or the half* of it be true? And if so, am I the man who cannot be allowed to sift this question, unless hand

cuffed and shackled?—Unless under restrictions never before imposed? When the committee began the perversion of that great and most noble temperance association, had they the opinion of one man, of whom half as much could be said? Is not such a man entitled to be heard?—to be heard fairly, and have his views candidly considered? Was it right in the editors to make themselves first parties and then judges; to drive me into personal vindication by untrue suggestions, and then to exclude my defence because it is personal? And now when they propose new restrictions, am I so dull as not to see that the same play is to be acted over again?

No, sir; if I write, it must be in a free press: if not, I commit this cause of temperance to Him that judgeth righteously. My personal vindication is of little consequence, though I have deeply suffered under a sense of unprovoked wrong.

You and I have spent too much time in negotiating how we shall write. I now put an end to that, by saying, that on my return from New-York, I will, if life and facilities are continued to me, address to you personally, an outline at least of the true grounds, as I suppose them, of every branch of the temperance argument. I am perfectly satisfied that the spirit and manner of this discussion will be grateful to both of us. To all questions I put, I shall hope for your answer; and I promise to answer any question you *can put*, or else avow my inability. All this matter may be published by either of us; better if by both of us jointly, in a pamphlet. But for myself I can join in no discussion nor publication, without full power to refer to the doings of the Albany committee, so far as may be necessary to trace the grounds of public delusion, and the perversion of the temperance society.

I am, dear sir,

With respect and friendship, yours,

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.

No. III. MR. HOPKINS TO MR. SMITH.

On reasoning from facts actually observed—General and particular facts—Fundamental propositions.

GENEVA, June 25, 1836.

GERRIT SMITH, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR: The fundamental delusion, as I suppose it to be, which has led to the perversion and ruin of the temperance cause, is the opinion that all alcoholic liquors are, according to the quantity of alcohol, alike in their effects upon the human system. This opinion is grounded, professedly on *theory*. On theoretical grounds alone, so far as I have ever heard, is it adopted and inculcated. To the discredit of the age in which we live, there have been found, perhaps thousands of men, capable of writing and speaking, who, in the sincerity of their hearts, believe that this proposition is founded on an universal law of nature, and embraces the whole merits of the question. It is plainly taken for granted, by such men, though not always expressed, that it *is* so, because it *MUST* be so: and it must be so, because *they suppose* that such is the course of nature generally.

To you, sir, versed as you are in science and the history of science, I need do no more than merely allude to the two great and opposite systems of reasoning which have prevailed, viz: the theoretical and the inductive—and to the difference between them. Theory dreams and imagines: induction or common sense looks at realities. Theory sits in a study, and draws from the brain an imaginary history of nature's laws: true philosophy walks abroad and laboriously examines the operations of nature herself—makes experiments—collects facts—and then, by a just and rigorous logic, deduces such conclusions, and such only, as truly result from those observations, facts and experiments. Theorizing on imaginary or insufficient facts, is the original sin of intellectual man, as selfishness is of the moral. It kept the world in darkness as to almost all natural science, until Francis Bacon, that "*brightest*" of human beings, began to teach the use of common sense, of fact, of experiment and actual observation.

The truth is, that all questions regarding the use of fermented liquors, stand upon the same ground as all other questions regarding the effects and operations of natural things, or mere physics. That ground is, that we can know nothing on these subjects, except from facts observed. In all cases not connected with the exact sciences, these facts are general, not particular; that is, the true result of any process in medicine, diet, agriculture, manufactures, and so forth, is to be gathered from the collective observation of all facts relating to it, or of as many as can be collected. And, according to the evidence which facts furnish, we are bound to say of one proposition, that it is *certainly true because we find it so*; of another, that it *seems probable*; and of a third, *that we know nothing at all about it*.

So much seemed necessary to be said, as introductory to certain propositions which I shall state, in order to give you, in the fewest words and plainest manner in my power, a view of what I suppose to be the truth in relation to temperance and the temperance reformation.

1. The opinion above referred to, that alcohol is alike in its effects, in all mixtures and combinations, is utterly unfounded *in point of fact*.

2. The opposite proposition is *almost* universally true; and, as regards the substantial interests of temperance in the world, the opposite is universally true, that is to say: Distilled and fermented liquors are not only *unlike*, but *opposite* in their effects upon mankind, in the article of temperance.

3. On these temperance questions, there is a right and a wrong; a true and a false side, in the medical or dietetic sense. That is, these are questions which admit of as much demonstration as can be applied to other cases of the effects of substances taken into the human system—as much as belongs to the effects of bread, opium, bark, or animal food. These are not, therefore, questions to be properly determined, by whim or caprice; by getting up a party; by great numbers or great names; nor by odium or proscription—nor yet, by taking it for granted that God is on one side.

4. On the contrary, right and truth are the objects to be sought ; and the way to find them is, by a bona fide and diligent use of our best faculties for that purpose. In such an inquiry, and in every other, it is the duty of an honest man and a Christian, to admit the full force of truth, even when coming from an *opponent*, and to answer all questions frankly. The truths proved by an opponent and admitted, ought to be incorporated into our own system of opinions.

All this, according to my best ability, I promise towards you.

5. On these questions there is a *moral right* and a *moral wrong* side—depending on the truth or falsehood of propositions in morals. Under this head should be considered the question of *expediency*, as distinguished from the results of physical truth, and also the doctrine of Christian charity, as taught by St. Paul. To this head, I apply all the remarks and obligations mentioned under the third and fourth heads.

It would be my wish to make clean work in this discussion as we go on ; and for that purpose, I shall add a postscript to this, showing the manner in which I would keep in mind the state of points admitted or denied, or reserved for discussion ; and of such questions as may be put by either of us, admitting of a *yes* or a *no*, or very short answer. You are authorized to put any questions you may wish on these subjects, and to expect such answers in my postscript, or full discussion in the body of my letters. Or if any difficulty occurs, which I should be unable to meet, I engage to confess it.

But before leaving this question of the proper method of reasoning, or of searching for truth, I desire to call your attention to a clause of your public letter to me, of 25th March last. You say, “I must decline such a discussion as you justly think is appropriate to yourself and the ‘professors of mental and physical science ;’ for besides that I have no learning to fit me for such a discussion, I have no taste for it, where it is so little demanded as in the present case. If we engage in a discussion, let it be of such a character that the democracy of the temperance soci-

ety, the farmers and mechanics who compose the great body of it, will be able to understand the benefit there is to the drunkard, in keeping open the streams of intoxicating liquor," &c., &c.

When I first read this paragraph, I exclaimed against what I took to be the whole sense and spirit of it, as most erroneous and unfitting in itself, and as portending a wrong spirit in our discussions. But a common friend who was present, assured me that you could have meant no more than modestly to deny your qualifications for nice, scientific investigations; and in doing so, to associate yourself and cause, with the interests and attainments of the farmers and mechanics. I adopt this latter interpretation as far as it goes; but even then I have somewhat against you. And since some others may understand it as I at first did, I seize the occasion to cultivate with you, that frank and manly spirit of discussion, through which alone we can be kept from the habitual errors and misfortunes of controversialists. A few words may be well spent on this point.

For what purpose do we write these letters? Is it to stand before the public as gladiators, and show our skill? Is it to confirm the faith of partizans? And unless our discussion is conducted with that spirit of candor and equity, and of mutual confidence, which is so unhappily rare, what can we look for but affections alienated—esteem lost—a discreditable end, a useless result? But I declare beforehand, that notwithstanding the very excitable character which we both possess, I have such a respect for you and for myself, and especially I have such undoubting confidence in the radical piety of your own heart, that I believe we may afford the rare example of a discussion, which, though it may fail to unite opinions, will not break friendship.

Now then frankly, fairly, what is the true meaning of your remark about the "*benefit* there is to the drunkard in keeping open the streams of intoxicating liquor?" Is it not really both ironical and invidious? Have you a right, in one and the same letter, to ask me what my views are, (knowing, as I think you do, that I have been effectually prevented from bringing them

before the temperance public,) and then, in that same letter, to cast a slur of any kind upon those views, when they are yet to be explained to you?

Let all this pass over in kindness; but let it inspire us both with caution. I mean just what I have said, and no more; and, so far as I am concerned, ask for no explanation.

And as to my remarks about "mental and physical science," you now see, by this letter, what I meant by it. By *physical science*, I mean the knowledge of the nature of things as it really is—as it is found to be by actual observation, fact, and experience. And by *mental science*, I mean the knowledge of the powers and faculties of the mind; and among other things, of the right use of those powers and faculties in discovering truth.

Trusting that we both understand this subject in the same sense, I must, notwithstanding, say to the public for whom we write, that I deny that there is any such thing as one sort of truth or doctrine for the democracy of farmers and mechanics; or one way of reasoning for them, and another sort of truth or way of reasoning, for more instructed men. True, indeed, men of science are to lead the way in discovering truth and detecting error. But when they do this, the appeal is always made to the body of people upon the point—*where lies the real truth?* All free institutions, whether religious or civil, stand upon the ability of the mass of mankind, to distinguish between truth and error, in morals, and in theology, and in the complex operations of civil government. On this ground went the preaching of such men as Owen, Hooker, Tillotson, and Edwards; on this ground stand the hopes of liberty; and all depends finally upon the question, whether the people can and will see the truth, and adopt it. Here lies the delinquency with which I reproach our professors of mental and physical science; excepting Professor McLean. They have stood by for years, and have seen the nation deluged, in the name of temperance, with floods of the most extraordinary sophistry; *facts grounded on theoretical reasoning, and the theory itself false.* To what purpose have we chairs of logic, ethics, and physics, if the youth of our colleges

are to be untaught and unwarned, in the midst of public delusions, which would have disgraced the schools of the fourteenth century? This, however, is partly an anticipation of what I am to prove hereafter. I have been led to it by the special occasion.

I am, &c.

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.

P. S. STATE OF THE SEVERAL QUESTIONS.

1. I presume you utterly deny my first and second propositions, and therefore some of my subsequent letters will be intended to prove them; particularly the second.

2. This letter is chiefly prefatory; and perhaps contains not much else that you will dissent from. But if you see much to object to, pray advise me.

3. I remember and admit my promise to answer you, respecting the five hundred thousand drunkards.

4. I suppose there can be no difference of opinion between us as to the principle with which this letter begins; namely: that theoretical reasoning, applied to questions of this kind, is **UTTERLY DELUSIVE**, and that the whole is a question of *fact*; what is **IN FACT** the effect of "fermented liquors upon mankind, as to temperance." I can consent to no mitigation of the contempt with which we ought to regard that abuse of reason, the misapplication of theory. If, therefore, you should here disagree with me, please to mention it, as it will, unhappily, cost me a separate letter.

No. IV. MR. SMITH TO MR. HOPKINS.

PETERBORO, June 27, 1836.

MY DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of 23d instant, reached me this day. I suppose the question before us to be substantially this: "Is it proper for our countrymen to use fermented liquors, as a beverage?" Whatever, therefore, is said by us, should be said to promote the solution of this question.

I can neither assent to your first proposition, nor dissent from it; for I know not whether it be true or false. Your second does, in fact, present two distinct propositions. Of one of them, viz: "The opposite proposition is almost universally true," I would speak as I have done of your first. If, in the other, you mean to say, that, so far "as regards the substantial interests of temperance," the effects of "distilled and fermented liquors are opposite;" so opposite, that, whilst, in the one case they are hurtful, they are, in the other, beneficial; then do I disagree with you. But, if you mean no more than this, viz: that the same amount of alcohol, when drank in a fermented liquor, is less injurious to the drinker and to the "interests of temperance," than when drank in a distilled liquor; then, as in the case of the first proposition, I do not feel competent to give either an affirmative or a negative answer.

You will perceive, that I do not know whether the effect of alcohol is various in its various combinations. I add, that for the purposes of this discussson, I am not, in my judgment, concerned to know. For these purposes I feel it to be enough to know, that large numbers of our countrymen are wont to get drunk on fermented liquors; and that the drinking of them is not indispensable to the preservation of health and life.

Let me here state, that I intend by "fermented liquors," the wine, strong beer, porter and cider drank in this country. If there are fermented liquors, on which men do not get drunk, I have nothing to say of them. Let it be distinctly understood, that my war is not with alcohol—for I have no certain knowledge of its nature and properties. For aught I know, it is possible that this is not the rogue in wine, porter, &c., which makes men drunk. But this I do know, that wine, cider, porter, and strong beer, do make men drunk: and, therefore, it is against each of these liquors, as a whole, that I take my stand. With this knowledge of the principle of my warfare, you will be able to account for the fact, that I am not of the number of those, who assail the drinking of small beer. I have never seen men made drunk on this liquor; though there are, as I think, good

reasons against my drinking it, and for my regretting to see others drink it. I leave it to scientific men to fight for and against alcohol: and to ascertain, as I have no doubt it is important for them to do, what it is in distilled and fermented liquors, which causes drunkenness.

I shall be happy, my dear sir, to receive your further communications, and to attend to your proofs, that it is proper for our countrymen to continue to use, as a beverage, their wine, cider, strong beer, and porter.

With great regard, your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS, ESQ.

No. V. MR. HOPKINS TO MR. SMITH.

Of the fabrication of facts—General facts cannot be fabricated—they must be truly collected from general observation—Can drinks be allowed, either on the test of weakness, or of not producing intoxication?

GENEVA, July 1, 1836.

GERRIT SMITH, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR: Your very candid letter of the 27th ultimo, received yesterday, has relieved my mind from some anxiety. For, really, I had some little misgivings, lest you should adopt the theoretical way of our temperance papers—taking it for granted that a thing must be so in the nature of the case, and therefore that it *is so*. You, on the contrary, by answering me concerning my first two propositions, “that you do not know whether they are true or not,” have thrown the door broadly open for our joint investigation, whether those propositions are supported by the full and fair result of fact, experience and general observation, or not. In thus doing, you have enrolled yourself as a disciple in the schools of Bacon, Newton, Black, Lavoisier and their associates—the fathers of all real science in natural things. The glory of those men was, that they “did not know” and “could not tell,” until they had examined how

the facts were. I may as well add now, for it bears essentially upon my argument, that in consequence, you must and will reject the plan of *manufacturing facts*, as I have seen it at our packed temperance conventions. When a sufficient number of men have been long enough steeped in delusive sophistries, collect them together—all sincere and ardent in every good work; any man being well-grounded in the theory, knows how the fact *ought to be*; he has seen a case which he verily believes *ought* to support it: he rises to say, “*Mr. President, I knew a man in our village, &c.*” The fact he states is recorded in the *Temperance Intelligencer* and *New-York Evangelist*—who that values his Christian character will dare to contradict *an Evangelist?*—and by that time, even such an estimable and admired man as Professor Stuart may innocently adopt the base imposture, and say: “It is now admitted on all hands,” or, “*It is now certain.*”*

You will say I am fanciful and too ardent; and *I say*, that this vivid statement of things as they have been, is necessary to impress strongly the *logical* difference which exists between *particular* and *general* facts, even if the particular facts were true. That difference is not understood by the man who “knows a case in our village,” nor by his copyists. In the *exact sciences*, one clear experiment will reveal a certain law, pervading all

* It is now certain, that the least mischievous form of alcohol, is that in which it is diluted with pure water.—*Professor Stuart's Letter to Dr. Sprague.*

Whiskey, then, is a comparatively safe article! But cider and hop beer! there lies the danger! *It is now certain!* So that the whole testimony of ten thousands of the best and wisest men in this country, for many years—and the official testimony of all our societies, for at least seven years—and the accredited and formal doctrines of the text volume of the American temperance society—and the universal sense of all mankind—and all the results of experience and facts of history, are to be set aside, on the authority of three or four monomaniacs. If such a doctrine as this could be believed, it would be, of all the doctrines ever advanced against temperance, the most balefully “mischievous.”

Again: It results from Professor Stuart's several essays, that our Saviour did indeed ordain, as a perpetual memorial of his blood, in the church, the use of an article, more dangerous in its moral tendency and example, than brandy and water!

But there is a particle of consolation in all this. The most celebrated biblical critic in our nation, has not descended quite to the level of the Rev. Mr. Parbut—nor of the *Temperance Intelligencer*.

time and all systems, as in the case of Sir Isaac Newton's pebbles. But if the question be, whether calomel is proper in cholera—when, how, in what stages, in what quantities—then it becomes prodigiously complex, and variously limited: no judgment can be formed but upon the *general fact* resulting from a collective view of all the individual facts; and yet, perhaps, not one single case that ever happened, will exactly represent that general fact. But in many cases, the results of such general facts, become a certain rule of action. That bark is proper at some stage in intermittents, and alterative doses of calomel in bilious fevers, is as certain a truth, for practical purposes, as the rule of three. Yet no one case could ever prove it, or give the rule.

This brings us to our question of fermented liquors, and to the only true way of examining that question. You see, therefore, that, in what I have been saying, I am not beside my subject. The facts bearing on this question are the *general facts*, derived from general observation of the state of mankind with, and without fermented liquors. Such facts cannot be manufactured in any single village upon earth.

But there seems to be no end of preliminaries. You say you do not “assail small beer;” yet you exclude strong beer and porter. Now, with entire respect, I must doubt whether you can ever get along on that ground; and I suppose you cannot: that is, if, by “assailing,” you mean *excluding*. A word on this subject, will help in sifting the ground of principles that are vital to our cause.

“*Strong beer*”—how strong? “*Small beer*”—how small? Suppose the porter is so mixed with water, as to be as weak as the small beer? You put it on the ground of drunkenness. Suppose then a person should drink enough small beer to get drunk. I hear so many persons affirm that they have known Indians get drunk on vinegar, that I hardly dare deny it.

Can you put the temperance cause on any safe ground, if you admit or reject liquors *according to strength*? It is plain that you have no great objection to small beer *as it is in itself*; and

on your principles, you cannot consider it really hurtful. Probably you go upon the *example*; and would not think it really hurtful to your children. Will you then dare to allow brandy and water to be drunk as weak as small beer? You will not assail small beer, "because you have never seen men made drunk by it." Now, upon this principle, mix brandy and water so weak that you never saw men get drunk upon it, *and are convinced that no person can get drunk upon it*—mix it one part to one hundred—and will you not "assail" that brandy and water? DARE YOU GIVE IT TO YOUR CHILDREN? If you do, in my opinion, your children are as certainly ruined, as if you gave them arsenic, and much more terribly. I have always thought, that for children and females, and all persons of delicate nerves, the weak mixtures were even more dangerous than the strong. They are better relished; they give no alarm; and they form the appetite as certainly as the strong form it.

Taking now your principle, that it is "DRUNKENNESS which is the rogue," and then excluding or including liquors according to strength, and so "*not assailing*" those which are so weak as not to cause drunkenness, and I ask whether your system makes any provision against the idea I have just mentioned, of the formation of *habits*? Will not very weak whiskey and water *form the habit* most fatally? Will any man who looks to nature and truth, venture, in the face of this nation, to say the same thing of small beer when just as strong?

Let us pause here and think. Excuse me for asking you to think over again what I have just written. If you take the test of weakness and strength, will it not fail you? If you take as a test, the possibility of drunkenness, will not that fail you also? Is there not some radical error? I do believe, sir, that on any ground you have yet taken, you *must* "assail small beer." And when that is seen, you will be prepared to bear with me when I suggest, that the whole system is wrong; WRONG.

I suppose it was the deep perception of this difficulty, which led the editors of the *Intelligencer* to take that course, which has excluded me from laying this subject earlier before you and

the public. And, be it vanity or not, I do suppose, that if the few common sense notions which I was indicting, had been allowed to appear before the public, we might have escaped all this difficulty. You will see in my first number, (for October, 1834,) that I set out with putting this same case of small beer which you have put; and I asked, was there no difference between a glass of small beer, and a glass of brandy and water, from which exactly the same quantity [respective quantities] of alcohol could be distilled? You will see in the same number, that they answered this question evasively. I pressed the question for a direct answer, but in unobjectionable terms, in my next communication. No answer was attempted; and I have always supposed that the dilemma presented, was one main reason for excluding my papers. The question brought them to a dead stand. If they said the small beer was as bad as the brandy and water, "all the people would stone them," for the absurdity. If they admitted there was a difference, it was, in precise terms, denying their own argument, that "there is no difference." Besides, they must have foreseen, that the moment they admitted a difference, I should press them with the question, "what is it?" which would get them deeper in the mire. They were confounded at the outset, and they must quarrel with me, or be disgraced.

THERE IS A DIFFERENCE. That difference is radical—generic—deeply founded in the nature of things; and on that difference alone, it is, that any permanent temperance reformation can ever safely stand.

I have nearly matter enough reduced to writing, to show what, according to my views, that difference is, and to exhibit my proofs. But I incline to think it better to write short letters when I can; and to take ideas, one by one. I only regret, that I now seem to leave the subject in a kind of maze, by stating difficulties in your system, instead of exhibiting my own.

But though I may fail to interest you, or the public, yet I do conceive that we are, now even on this point of *beer*, in appearance so trifling, brought to the discussion of principles as impor-

tant to the welfare of the human family, as can be stated, excepting only the great salvation. For, on either system, we are calling upon many nations and millions of men, to change their personal habits, in a most difficult point. Can any such change be carried forward and finally effected, except on grounds which will finally receive the sanction of calm, reflecting, right-reasoning men—common sense men? Then the question still is between us, which is the course of right reason: and in saying this, I do not in the least mean to imply any thing to the disadvantage of your views. I say it as an apology for dwelling so long upon *reason* and *principles*. If either of us is *right*, it must be because he has *right reason* on his side; that is, *truth*. If *wrong*, we are misstating a question of stupendous consequence.

Unsatisfactory, therefore, as this letter may be, I will hereafter advance as fast as I can, to state where I suppose the truth lies.

I am, &c.,

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.

P. S. STATE OF SUNDRY QUESTIONS.

1. My second proposition *does mean*, that distilled and fermented liquors are so opposite, that, while one kind is hurtful, the other is beneficial, in view of the interests of temperance. Therefore,

2. I adopt in substance, your form of stating my position; and I say that it is proper for our countrymen to continue to use as a beverage, their cider, their real (not factitious) wines, and their strong beer and porter, of the usual strength: not if they have alcohol in chemical excess.

3. You say that "large numbers of our countrymen are wont to get drunk on these fermented liquors." I shall hereafter state what my means of observation have been, and that *I never saw one such case in my life*. I admit that such cases can happen, and have happened, in all ages; but I did suppose not frequently. At a proper time, let us compare our observations; and I shall then ask you, how many cases *you yourself ever actually knew*.

4. This leads me to anticipate a question intended for some time hence. Did you ever know a regular *ruined sot*—made such, and continuing such, on wine or cider? How many?

5. There is no doubt, that alcohol is the rogue in question, in fermented liquors. H.

No. VI.* MR. HOPKINS TO MR. SMITH.

On the effects of fermented and distilled liquors respectively upon mankind, considered in a national point of view.

GENEVA, JULY 9, 1836.

GERRIT SMITH, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR: If nations that are brought up without vinous liquors, are generally temperate, that is, if they voluntarily abstain from inebriating substances when they can get them, there must arise a reasonable presumption in favor of that way, on temperance grounds. If such nations are intemperate whenever they can find the means of indulgence, and on any and every intoxicating substance, then the contrary presumption arises; and it is a strong presumption, if the fact is universal, and if there appears no other reasonable way of accounting for it. How are the facts?

The wine region of the earth has been much the same from the earliest times. In a general sense, it is embraced between about north latitude 30° and 45° , but varying somewhat according to other circumstances:—and between the strait of Gibraltar and Persia. This portion of the earth contained all that we commonly call the civilized nations of ancient times; and also all of modern times, except America and the north of Europe. The amazingly populous nations of Asia, from India eastward, do not appear ever to have cultivated the vine extensively. Northern Asia was too cold; most of Africa, too hot; Spain, Gaul

* This letter was not actually sent to Mr. Smith, but being mostly prepared before the receipt of his of the 11th, it is presented in the form originally intended.

and the nations about the Danube, too barbarous, until the decaying ages of Rome. In the time of Tacitus, as we shall see, wine was an imported article on the banks of the Rhone. Italy, Greece, the Lesser Asia, Palestine, and the rest of Syria and Persia, have ever been the chief wine countries, except that for the last eight hundred or one thousand years, we must add the residue of Southern Europe. In nearly all the rest of the world, wine is unknown, or only known as an imported article ; necessarily so in all barbarous countries.

These are exactly the countries of which we have the fullest accounts : First, from the Bible—next from the classics ; and in late and present times, from every sort of information ; history, travels, tradition, the observation of others ; and among those who have had opportunity, each one's personal observation.

In these wine countries, the article is exceedingly abundant ; so that, poor and oppressed as many of the peasantry are, I believe they generally have it. As to some, I know this from the best information. In France, I myself paid two sous, less than two cents, for a common sized junk bottle of wine, at an inn ; tavern prices ! Within three or four years, the papers have mentioned that in France, a *barrel of wine* was the price of a *wine barrel*, in a plentiful vintage—just as I remember it respecting cider, in New-England.

We, therefore, know certainly *all that wine can do*—and the *worst it can do*, in wine countries.

We also know well enough, though perhaps less particularly, what vinous liquors can do in barbarous countries, ancient and modern ; that is, among water-drinkers. But you and I, and nearly all this generation of Americans, do most intimately know it, from our own observation ; and we are recreant to our highest duties, if we do not sometimes turn aside from the speculations of brain-cracked theorists, to look at things as we have personally seen and known them to be, from our earliest recollections.

You now begin to see the bearing of this argument, *nationally*. I am drawing towards the question as you expressed it—

what is proper for "*our countrymen*" to do? The whole answer is to be derived, only from the history of many nations of men for thirty centuries; and is contained in the records of many thousand volumes. All these we cannot search; but we know the result sufficiently. They all tend to the same result, and "the vision is one."

1. Wine has been occasionally misused, in every nation upon earth where it has been used at all. There have been instances of drunkenness—even *bestly drunkenness* on wine, in many places and times.

2. Drunkenness on wine, in different degrees, belonged *first to wine countries in early times*, and before the article was common. Wine was then a peculiar luxury, and like all others, liable to be abused. Next, it belongs to *all barbarous countries in every age*, and for the same reason. They are all brought up on water, and wine is a rarity. In all these, the intemperance is frequently brutal. Beginning from Noah, you afterwards come to the times of the principal Jewish prophets, and then to the earlier times of Greece and Rome. The abuse of wine excited the apprehensions of good and wise men, and was often the subject of legal restraint. Three hundred years before our era, Alexander killed Clytus in a dispute at dinner; but both Noah and Alexander, I suppose, (certainly the latter,) were educated on the principles of abstinence. However, the *use of wine increased, and intemperance decreased*. You come to later times of classic countries, and less and less is said of the abuse, even by the severest moralists, Pagan or Christian. Less, much, is said of it in the New-Testament, than in the Old. I suppose Juvenal meant to bestow a systematic chastisement upon the vices of his age; and there, drinking appears incidentally only; but gluttony appears prominent. You follow down history to modern times in the same countries, and for every practical purpose it may be said, that *intemperance has not been known in them for the last eight hundred or one thousand years*. I do not mean literally, that no person drinks too much; nor deny that in trading towns, where there is much mixture of

northern men, there may be some tipping. But *nationally*, and among the great body of the people, high and low, there has not been for many centuries, any thing *approaching our notions of intemperance* to be seen in Spain, France, Italy, Southern Germany, nor among the Greeks. So much for the fact, in wine countries: my proofs, by and by.

3. Every people under heaven, (with one limitation hereafter mentioned,) who have not vinous liquors as a home product, or who cannot obtain them plentifully for ordinary use, are, and ever have been, madly intemperate on wine if they can get it; and if not, then on every other known intoxicating substance. This sentence embraces the history of more than one hundred generations of men, and of perhaps six hundred millions in each generation; that is, of perhaps sixty thousand millions of men.

Read Gutzlaff, and see all China, from the emperor's family downwards, rushing to dissipation with [on] opium. That's the proof for half my numbers. If you doubt then, or if you suspect some other cause than the one I allege, look at Hindostan, where the same process is going on, though indeed less marked. If you still doubt, look at the two hundred millions of Mahomedans. Many indeed of them can get neither wine nor opium; but all that can get the latter, are following on the way of the Chinese.* The one people is kept from wine by political circumstances; the other by religious: they are very diverse in other respects—but both take to opium. This makes out three fourths of my numbers.

All the northern Asiatic nations are drunkards—Tartars on a liquor from mares' milk; and some extreme northern Siberians, (Ostiacks I think,) drink an intoxicating liquor made of toadstools. All the millions of Africa are drunkards, when they can get the liquor, or other fit substance. All Europe, north of the wine country in ancient times, drank metheglin to madness,

* We are informed by those whose opportunities of observation entitle their opinions to deference, that the decline and approaching dissolution of the once gigantic power of the Turkish empire, is attributable to the abuse of opium, more than to any or all other causes. [Editorial article in *American Temperance Intelligencer* for October, 1834.]

when they could not get Roman wine. So thoroughly was this wrought into their own habits, that they introduced it into those of their gods; and the great amusement of Odin was, to drink hydromel out of the skulls of his enemies. All barbarous nations (with the limitation to be mentioned*) are constitutionally intemperate; and also all civilized people who have not the general use of some fermented liquor.

A sapient man from "*one of our villages,*" in the Buffalo convention, astounded that meeting by the mention of a tribe of Gauls spoken of by Cæsar, who drank nothing but water. The remark thrilled through the convention, and I presume every man took courage and determined to go ON—"onwards"—"*farther*"—and to "*take higher grounds.*" What amazing things can be proved when you can find means to smother both the mouths of men and the press! I have not looked up the passage in Cæsar; but two passages in Tacitus will show you the effect upon Germans who were brought up in this boasted simplicity—being much the same in manners and the degree of civilization—a little later in time; and on a territory which is now partly in France.

"To continue day and night in drinking is a discredit to no one. The frequent disputes which occur when they are excited by wine, result in wounds and slaughter, oftener than in mere words." * * * * *

* The limitation intended, is that of tropical climates. But the extreme length of this letter, forbade me to enter upon that case. See the postscript. As it will be impossible to recur to the subject again, I will just now mention what I suppose the facts to be.

The inhabitants of tropical *spice* countries, (that is, nearly all in hot latitudes,) are little inclined to intemperance. But if destitute of the spices, as in the Polynesian Islands, they are intemperate. Compare the *stupid* drunkenness of the Sandwich Islanders, and the light-hearted inebriation of the Africans, with the wild, frantic and bloody orgies of our Indians—of the ancient Gauls—or of the modern Irish. Then again, compare any of these with the Hindoos and Malays, among whom even opium intemperance makes a slower progress, I believe, than among any other people who are destitute of the vine. But every pore of the latter is imbued with aromatics. I apprehend that the exceedingly different degrees and kinds of intemperance, among different nations, should be examined with reference to three circumstances: their other diet—their climate—and the inebriating substance used. To the candid and ingenuous inquirer into the history of man, the subject may be commended, as very curious; and I think it is new. My limits forbid any thing more than this allusion.

“For drinking, they have a liquor made of corn or barley, corrupted so as to have a likeness to wine. But those who are near the river bank buy wine also. Their food is very simple: wild apples, fresh meat and curdled milk. They drive away hunger without display, or the niceties of cookery. They use not the same forbearance in respect to thirst: and if you indulge their ebriety by giving them as much as they desire, they will be conquered, not less easily by their vices, than by arms.” [Tacitus demoribus Germ.*

I need hardly remark that the beer which Tacitus refers to, could not have been, among so rude a people, a common drink. It was plainly only for the chiefs on festive occasions.

All the northern half of Europe is afflicted with the evils of intemperance, varying in degrees according to the greater or less simplicity of drink and diet, and subject to the *limitations* which vinous and fermented liquors create. Sweden is said to be as bad as our own country. The very government of Prussia is alarmed for the public safety. But the national *quass* or some rye beer of Russia, with the poverty of her boors, makes it appear less there. Still it is only about one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty years, since Peter the Great issued an Ukase that no lady should get drunk in a ball room, under the penalty of the knout. I think it was *brandy* which these noble ladies had used.

And here the case of Ireland comes in full confirmation. I speak the more boldly here, because in my youth I carefully examined the state of the mass of that people—east, west, north and south. No doubt they are the poorest fed and most temperately brought up, of any people on earth, called civilized. They come nearly up to the ideal perfection of Doctor Mussy’s system. In all the south *I saw* them having only potatoes and

* Dicam, noctemq; continuare potando nulli probrum. Cræbræ ut inter violentos rixæ, raro convivii, sæpius cæde et vulneribus transiguntur.

Potui humor ex hordeo aut frumento in quendam similitudinem vini corruptus. Proximi ripæ et vinum mercantur. Cibi simplices, agræstia poma, recessa fera, aut lac concretum. Sine apparatu, sine blandimentis expellunt famem. Adversus sitim non eadem temperantia, si indulseris obrietati suggorendo quantum concupiscunt, haud minus facile vitii quam armis vincuntur.

water generally; and often, perhaps *most* often, without salt. But some, by carrying potatoes on their backs to the market towns, bought skimmed milk, as a luxury. No meat, except the offal parts of the single pig which was annually raised and sold, to pay rents; a lamentable breach, I admit, of the new temperance diet. In the north they live better. Now I need not say, that the Irish hold in the scale of intemperance, the exact rank which the cold water scale assigns them: the most intemperate of all civilized nations, and only inferior to a few of the savage.

This brings us to the American Indians, whom we both know intimately. Let us place ourselves in idea, at the landing of the pilgrims; and I suppose you do not expect that our countrymen will be more imbued by education in temperance habits, than were the tribes of Massachusetts and the Pequods two hundred years ago, or the Osages, Camanches, &c., now. If we suppose ten millions then in all North-America, and only six generations, you have sixty millions: and though we have not proof of the effect of rum or cider on each one of those, yet I presume you will agree with me, that we know enough to be reasonably sure, that every Indian that ever was in North-America, was constitutionally a drunkard—a drunkard, I say, if he could get any possible substance the least inebriating—and whenever he could get it. In a few cases, moral, religious, or prudential restraints may have operated partially,* and the impossibility of getting rum and whiskey, more generally—but still, unnaturally;

* The celebrated Red Jacket, who was certainly one of the greatest masters of eloquence, that has lived in any age, was a striking example of this. In national councils, when arduous questions were at issue, he would remain perfectly cool and sober, even for weeks together. He has begged a six pence of me, in the streets of Buffalo, to buy drink; and he, with his wife, have dined at my table, when my family thought they never saw any finer examples of the propriety and delicacy (though unused to our customs) of a *natural* gentleman and lady. He drank what was offered him, and this with perfect moderation.

I never heard Red Jacket on any very important occasion. But a most intelligent and accomplished friend, who heard him in one of his great efforts, gave me an account of his oration, which, after many years, still leaves upon my mind the strongest impression I ever received, of the dignity and power of speech. Such was the man, who, when business was over, would lie drunk for weeks together.

and the natural tendency in all, is drunkenness. I think the most eminent religious man they have ever produced, died intemperate. Now, whether you admit this in all its extent or not, I still allege, that these following things about our Indians, are specially observable.

1. Of all the tribes of men, their living is the most simple—having neither spices, milk,* nor generally much salt; but only fresh meat and some fresh corn and beans.

2. Of all the tribes of men, they are the most universally intemperate, when they can get any means for it.

3. Of all the tribes of men, they are the most easily affected by inebriating substances, and most frantic when so affected. So that the blood and slaughter which Tacitus mentions among the Germans, are far more indiscriminate at an Indian drinking match. When this is published, I ask leave to annex in a note, an extract from a piece in the Temperance Intelligencer, or one or two others which I have in mind, giving a description of such a scene. I do not now trouble you with a subject so perfectly familiar to you.

4. I said "*frantic.*" The passions excited in them by any spirituous drink, become almost immediately angry—and then furious—and hardly any other emotion is observed.

5. "God has made of one flesh, all the nations upon earth." These Indians have not only our constitutions, but our air and climate, and differ from us only, physically, in the perfect temperance of their bringing up. I have here used this word *temperance*, rather in a popular sense than my own. You see that I consider such a bringing up as the foundation of *intemperance*.

I said that there has been some drunkenness in every country where wine has been used; and I said that in the wine countries, there has not been *nationally, any thing approaching our notions of intemperance*, for several centuries past. I expressed this too feebly. There never was any such thing seen in any plentiful wine country under heaven. I do not say these

* "Nor acid, or acidulous fruits," should have been added.

things from any love of paradox. But I am compelled to write with extreme brevity. While I am annihilating one fallacy, you and many a reader exclaim—"What's that to the purpose? Are there not twenty other points against him, which he does not dispute?" I am like one man trying to drive twenty cattle to pasture against their will: while he is pressing one, the rest run back.

"What! a little wine in any country where it is scarce, makes men drunken; but a great deal makes them sober! *We know that large numbers of our countrymen are wont to get drunk on fermented liquors.*" And he says, that wherever those liquors are vastly more abundant and cheap, such intemperance as ours is not seen! What monstrous contradictions! We know from the *nature of the case*, that it cannot be so!"

Certainly, gentlemen: and I know from *the case itself*, that it is so, and always has been so. Nay, I hope you will finally acknowledge that you know it too.

4. *Of the general propositions in this letter.* In a national and general sense, there is no voluntary temperance among mankind, except where fermented liquors are common. But in laying down this, I do not include tropical countries, which must either be omitted or receive a separate consideration.

5. In a national and general sense, the use of fermented liquors will exclude opium, spirits, and all deleterious substances of that class—and we know of no other way to exclude them from use where they can be had. And strong beer, be it good or bad, was never in general use where vinous liquors were plentiful.

6. The wine region of the world, as before described, is, in a general sense, temperate; that is, it is not only mainly shielded against opium and spirits, but also against all such abuse of wine itself, as to be specially observable as a public evil.

What further I expect to say in this letter, will refer in some sense, to all the three last propositions—principally to the sixth.

As to this, the issue seems to be joined upon the temperance of France. It ought properly to embrace all the wine countries I have mentioned. But as the case of France is most known

and most unfavorable to me, let us take that first. I allege respecting France :

1. That we and our ancestors for about thirty generations, have been much conversant with French people ; and that in this country, ever since the war of 1756, we have seen a sprinkling of Frenchmen—often prisoners or stragglers from armies, and presumptively the worst part of their population. Now I say, that with this knowledge, there is one uniform traditional account and present statement, that Frenchmen are always temperate. I allege, (subject to your correction if erroneous,) that you have always heard so, from old people, and that you never saw an instance, or scarcely one, to the contrary.*

2. I allege, that after the time that Europe settled into some quiet from the great convulsions of the middle ages, we find France an *exporting*, and England an *importing* country, of wines. This appears from statutes, tariffs, commercial history, travellers, and all other sources. In the British kingdoms, wine prompted the boisterous mirth of feudal festivity ; and the common classes had plenty of sour beer. But in France, the high (and I believe the low too) drank wine. Now the uniform current of all history and literature, so far as I have ever heard, makes French and English alike speak one language, as to both nations on this subject. BOTH, *both* speak of the the English as hard drinkers, and of the French as temperate. By mere accident, I have before me an extract from Froissart, which I found in chance reading. The time referred to is somewhere about the year one thousand three hundred, when the English possessed some provinces in France ; and speaking of the English there, he says—“ They besotted themselves very much, and diverted themselves very sadly, after the manner of their country.”†

* Accordingly in France, Spain and Italy, where wine in its unsophisticated state is the general beverage, intemperance is scarcely known ; such are the observations of Dr. Franklin, Mr. Jefferson, and of many later travellers. This fact holds out great encouragement for the culture of the vine throughout our own country, &c. [Dr. Hosack's Address before the New-York City Temperance Society, p. 8.]

† Ils se saouillerent grandement, et se divertirent moult tristement, a la mode de leur pays. [Saouiller is old French for souiller.]

Just as Tacitus speaks of the Germans, so Froissart speaks of the English, more than one thousand years after; and so we speak of Indians five hundred years after that: "*their way*"—*the mode "of their country."**

3. I allege, that according to public opinion, the number of Americans at any one time travelling in Europe, is now not less than five hundred. And there are generally now at home many more than five hundred, who have well examined the south of Europe; and that excepting only my excellent friend Doctor Hewitt, their uniform testimony is, that there is *no* or next to no intemperance in those countries. I have now before me a letter of which I give you extracts. It is from an American young gentleman of piety and an excellent understanding, and a signer of the total pledge.

Extract of a letter to a gentleman in the state of New-York, dated Paris, April 29, 1836. [The words in brackets are my own explanations.]

"I have performed a journey of some one thousand five hundred miles, [in France.] My companion [a French gentleman] is full of kindness and affection, a man of ardent piety, and I trust my intercourse with him as a Christian, has not been lost. By his introduction, I have become acquainted with the pastors in most of the principal cities we have visited, and have learned more than I otherwise should have done of the moral state of France. [He goes on to describe it as most deplorable.] *
From Bordeaux, we followed the rich valley of the Dordogne to Bergerac, through the finest vine regions of France. * *
On the subject of temperance, I found the state of things just as [Mr. Hopkins] has often represented it. They drink wine like water, and care not for brandy, except in minute quantities. They export however immense quantities to the north and our own country. Reasoning with them is very difficult, because

* So the single word "skythizo," among the Greeks, to Scythianize, or drink deep like a Scythian, tells the temperance history of the two great divisions of mankind, Greeks and barbarians, for ages. It was exactly equivalent to our saying "drink like an Indian."

they have not as we have, the evidence all around them, of the destructive nature of the poison. An excellent minister who had resided several years in the country, told me he had scarcely seen more than three or four cases of drunkenness. Not so at the north. There, as wine diminishes, the consumption of brandy increases and becomes great!"

In a note at foot I give you the name of the writer of this letter, in confidence and not for publication.*

"Wonderful! Mr. Hopkins' paradoxes 'are becoming realities! People that drink wine like water don't desire brandy nor drink it, though they make immense quantities; nor does the eagle eye of a protestant pastor see more than three or four cases of drunkenness in years! And as to the *proper ruin* of spirit, (a very different thing, he says, from mere drunkenness,) he will pretend that not a case of it can be found in all France. At this rate he will go on and compel us to admit the same thing as to cider. He does not seem to reason at all like a philosopher, from the nature of the case. He just calls witnesses and makes them tell how the fact is."

4. Certainly so: and I may be allowed merely to mention my own testimony, though I must state it more at large hereafter.†

* Since this letter was sent, I find the following extract from Mr. Dewey's late work on America.

Temperance—total abstinence.—Dr. Beecher has given in for the pledge. The best way for temperance men to make us a temperance people, is to introduce the vine, and then we shall be as temperate as are the people of the wine growing countries. Dewey, in his statement of the universal temperance witnessed in all public assemblies upon the continent in the south of Europe, confirms this fact. [Express.]

"In seven months, (says he,) upon the continent of Europe, though living amidst crowds, in taverns, in hotels, and in public houses, I have not seen four intoxicated persons! But I have seen in parks, in gardens, and in places of public assembly, millions of persons, exhilarated by music, by spectacles, by scenery, flowers, and fragrance, cheerful without rudeness, and gay without excess."

† No; I had better finish my own testimony here. Twice I was in a collection of probably from one to two hundred thousand Parisians; one of which was at a public reception of Bonaparte. To my best recollection, I never saw any wine or other liquor sold on those or any other public occasion, nor saw any person drunk in France. I was never drunk in my life; nor saw any person who was drunk on wine: never saw, any where, any quarrel or serious dispute or offence at table; never saw any case where wine produced habitual intemperance or ruinous sottisness, (as referred to in another part of this pamphlet,) nor any thing approaching such a state;

I lived eight months in Paris—keeping much in French society, endeavoring to observe and study their manners—speaking their language well for a foreigner, and traversing their whole territory—and I never saw a drunken person in France, nor heard such mentioned; nor ever saw a tipling house of any kind there.

5. I allege, that in all the fury of the French revolution, where the lowest populace of the cities were often embodied in mobs, I never read nor heard, that any party accused the other of being excited by liquor.

6. I allege that drunkenness is so rare in wine countries, that the very name cannot be mentioned in decent society without a breach of decorum. At least I know this as to France; and as to Spain, the imputation of intemperance is so disgraceful, that M. Slidell, in his “Three years in Spain,” mentions that a man killed himself, merely in consequence of being called a drunkard.

The last six heads are subdivisions of my sixth general proposition, which joined issue on the question of French national temperance. On this, I am weary of accumulating proofs. But I write for a public, so long and so perversely steeped in the deceptions of the Temperance Intelligencer, that I must call upon you to look and to wonder at the three following propositions, which are connected with the general course of argument from the beginning of this letter.

7. The exceedingly temperate people, on and about the rivers Rhone and Rhine, are of course the descendants of those who were maddened, like Indians, by wine, when they brought up their children on water, and imported Roman wine for revels: for conquest makes little difference in the blood of a people.

nor ever heard of any such thing, except from the temperance publications of the last two or three years, and from some letters which will appear in the sequel.

I never saw nor heard of any such thing as tipling in the morning, or on an empty stomach, on wine or cider—except as to cider, that it is often drank in the morning, under a notion of its being healthy; and that once only, I heard of some hard drinkers of spirits, who used cider in the morning to brighten up.

Here, then, the common use of wine has *cured* a people that were [previously] intemperate.

8. In all European writings on temperance, you hear much of the drunkenness of the "*lower classes*." And again, some writer in the *Intelligencer*, supposing that he had a great hit against wine, asked, If wine will not make people intemperate, whence comes the intemperance of the *higher classes*? How triumphant! How many people would suppose me confounded by that! The exceedingly wonderful fact is, that there are no drunkards among the upper classes in Europe. If once in a century, such a person as the Marquis of Waterford appears, it is a phenomenon. Nor is this from concealment; those gentry practise every other possible vice, and their vices are most freely reported. Even the Russian nobility have become temperate, since they imported wine freely.

9. In the wide extent of the Turkish empire, Mahommedans and Christians are mixed in numbers not very different; in civilization much alike; in diet and manner of living the same, except that the Turks are forbidden wine, (pork being not here in question.) Now while the Turks are going to ruin on opium, the Greeks drink wine; but among all their vices—and bad they are—the vice of intemperance is not named among them. Yet their ancestors sometimes got drunk at public festivals, in early times.

Can any fair answer be made to these three last propositions? Are the facts so or not? If really so, how deeply must they interest every candid inquirer after truth! For these propositions embrace three trials, each upon a vast scale; and they place wine against water in three different attitudes, resulting from three diversities in the condition of man; all exceedingly interesting and instructive. These diversities are:

First: In the same people passing from barbarism with wine as a rarity, to civilization with wine as a plentiful product.

Second: Two different races of men, on the same ground and very similarly circumstanced, except that religion prohibits wine to one.

And Third: The same nations and blood, divided by wealth and rank into different classes of society; being north of the wine region, and only differing in this; that one class can, and the other can not, afford to drink imported wines.

It strikes me that if an experimentalist were to set about devising a series of experiments on the use of vinous liquors, and if he could make nations of men and ages in time, obedient to his will, he could by no ingenuity, devise any trials more perfectly adapted to elicit truth, nor more conclusive in the result, than these three which we have ready furnished to our hand.

But there remains the testimony of my friend Doctor Hewitt. He is an excellent man, but it was not wise in him with his means of information, to place himself in opposition to all history and to thousands of living witnesses. [See Temperance Intelligencer, for October, 1834, and many other papers.]

His means of information was very limited. He speaks not a word of French, and was in France but a very short time—perhaps three weeks.

He does not say that he ever saw a drunken man in France: if perhaps he did so, he could not tell whether such a man was a Frenchman, or a straggler from the late armies of the allies: he does not say that he ever saw any collection of men tippling—nor a tippling house—nor that any person told him of intemperance or tippling: he does not state a single thing in the nature of fact, except the “*complexions of the common people*”—that “they are burnt up with wine and look exactly like the cider-brandy drinkers of Connecticut, and New-England rum drinkers of Massachusetts.”

Doctor Hewitt should have staid long enough in France to know, that the complexion he speaks of, is, to a certain extent, national, and results from climate or blood. Or you yourself may verify that fact here: go to a ship or a canal boat filled with newly arrived emigrants from the upper Rhine, and you see the same complexion in all the women and children. Those who remember Lafayette, will know what is meant by this complexion, of which he was a striking example. True indeed,

he had drunk wine regularly as much as fifty or sixty years ; (except when at Olmutz ;) but if at the age of seventy-seven, Lafayette had one of the coolest heads and soundest judgments in Europe, there can not be great danger in French wines.

The other idea of Doctor Hewitt is, that the French drink up to the highest possible pitch of excitement ; only short of stupefaction, and this on system ; so as not to cut short their pleasures : and this extreme excitement also accounts for the horrors of the French revolution.

Such exceedingly incautious statements made by good men, are among the great causes that keep our benevolent and religious efforts more or less in disfavor, with a great mass of our people. Adventurous and rash assertions will no doubt stimulate the violent to greater extremes. But they lead vast numbers of the calm and thoughtful, to contemn and forsake us.

What ! people worked up by wine to the highest point of stimulation, stop there—just there—on a cool calculation ! the ignorant, degraded and vicious do it!—a whole nation of thirty millions do it—by one universal and common consent ! What !—among the ignorant and thoughtless in their cups, none to go beyond the point ! And this secret of epicurism so well kept by a great nation for ages, that no one made the discovery before Doctor Hewitt !

No man will say he ever saw a single case of the kind beside ! And this accounts for the excesses of the French revolution ! What then accounts for the mildness and amenity of the French before and since ? All this is asserted by a sincere minister, in the face of a London audience ; and read by great numbers on both sides of the Atlantic, who perfectly well know that the whole is an utter delusion. What weight will such people give to the preaching of the same minister, on the next sabbath ?

This subject of rashness in statement, is a vast subject. It enters vitally into the whole spirit of our benevolent efforts. I have written these few lines on it, departing from my main course. I have but a dim hope that I can find time or room to write you a full letter upon this subject. Lest I should not do

so—and as there seems to be no one else to rebuke the error, I now say to our ministers and lecturers on these subjects, that there must be a sound mind; a reason for their faith; more logic and less theory; more candor and more knowledge with our zeal; that a man who, in an anniversary speech, affronts the common sense and actual knowledge of his audience, has impaired his influence as a minister; and finally, that if our clergy are to leave the logic of the Edwardses and Witherspoons, for “old wives’ fables and endless genealogies,” they will land Christianity in this country, where their prototypes (as in such case they will have been) have landed it in Italy, France and Greece.

One last word as to Mr. Hewitt: He was honest in his theory; a sound man, with nothing fanatical in him—though with little knowledge of the world at that time. But I think his narration must have been dishonestly circulated by many—and for this reason: We all know how industrious our editors are to collect testimony, and fortify their system. We know too, that resort can, at any time, be had to vast numbers of respectable men—many of them pious men, and active friends of temperance—to sustain Dr. Hewitt’s statement, if sustainable. In New-York you may meet half a dozen such men in a morning’s walk. I think we must believe that such inquiries have been made, and we know that not a single witness has appeared on the same side. Now, I allege that there is high probability that it has been ascertained that no support for Dr. Hewitt could be found. And then, as the statement has not been withdrawn, but insisted on, I allege probable dishonesty in some quarter: and I ask you whether my inference is reasonable or not? However, I intend, if I can, to write out a list of selected cases of disingenuousness, cheaterly and dishonesty, in relation to temperance: and if I do so, there shall not be a dog to move his tongue against it.

The real fact is this: take the wine of France and of the world at large, and it is not a thing particularly enticing to the taste. Our farmers’ common cider represents it pretty fairly; but is not, I think, quite so good. This cider-like wine is drunk at meals as our cider commonly is—and with as little ceremony

or epicurism. At dinner there is a bottle set for every two or four persons, and, during the first courses, every one helps himself to some wine in a tumbler, with water to his liking. After the cloth is removed, a bottle or two of better wine (one of them generally champagne) is sent round so as to give every one a glass. The company then rise, gentlemen and ladies together, and repair to the drawing room, where coffee is served; and then a glass as large as one's thumb, of liqueurs or cordial; which last had better be omitted. This at dinner: but the old French national *breakfast* was also on wine, and I believe has not wholly given way yet, to the English and American style. It is or was, a very informal meal, little more than a luncheon, chiefly on bread, wine and fruits, with a little meat—or in stylish breakfasts, with an array of cold sausages, ham, &c., &c. Now if you take away the greater elegance of manner, the genteel use of wine in France is just the common use of cider at an American farmer's dinner; and if that farmer takes a hasty luncheon with cider, and does not wait for tea or coffee, it is just the substance of a French breakfast. If then we go to the higher ranks, we find the wines more select and delicate, but not stronger, nor the excitement more. And this excitement is just that which was experienced by our ancestors, generation after generation, on taking their hard wring-jaw cider.

And finally as to these wine countries:—France is *actually* the greatest producer of wine that ever existed,* but my impression, perhaps erroneous, is, that Spain is *naturally* the best wine country in the world. And I think that the Spaniards may be actually somewhat more temperate in wine, than the Italians or Greeks, and that they are, therefore, as a nation, the most temperate that exists. The French mix much, and the Spaniards little, with the world at large; and some use of bran-

* Perhaps this was too hastily said. Some learned men have contended that the produce of ancient Italy, in its best state, was even three times as great as in modern days. The astonishing vestiges of ancient improvement in Palestine, with the recorded wonders of its population, and the importance assigned to wine throughout the Bible, might give a like impression as to the Holy Land. The frequent allusions of our Savior to the vineyard and vintage, seem to assign to them an importance, not inferior even to that of corn and oil.

dy is creeping into the towns where sailors and soldiers from northern nations resort, not only in France, but in all the southern ports, even to Sicily. Such armies as those of the Allies, must have left many stragglers in five or six years' residence. I should not be greatly surprised, if a drunken Englishman or Russian were now and then seen in Paris. But the wonderful fact remains, that in the very places which are the greatest producers of brandy in the world, the article is not used "except in minute quantities." And it is glory enough for wine, that for two hundred years, it has kept up temperance there. Without wine, and with the spirits, that same country must have become a desolation of intemperance; or otherwise all history and experience teach us a falsehood.

I leave this subject for the present very incomplete; and I commend these remarks to all your candor. Who can write any one branch of the history of all nations, through all ages, in the compass of four or five newspaper columns? How much less could I have been at all understood, if cut up into pieces of a column and a half per month, as proposed by the editors of the *Intelligencer*! Meantime I offer this, not as history, but as presenting my views of the manner in which the history of mankind, as regards temperance, ought to be studied.

This is not the letter which I intended now to have written you; but I preferred to begin instantly to meet your question, "Whether it is proper for our countrymen to continue to use their wine, cider," &c.

I am, &c.,

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.

P. S. STATE OF SEVERAL QUESTIONS.

1. You now perhaps understand so much of my views, as may enable you to press me with difficulties, should any occur to you. You observe, for example, that I have wholly passed over, 1st. The scripture history of temperance. 2d. England. 3d. Our own country, where I say we have cider very cheap, though others say we have not. 4th. All tropical countries. If

either, or all of these, or others, strike you as needing explanation, I should like to know it; much preferring, for the sake of brevity, to discuss only such points, as may appear to you most against me.

2. My next, unless you lead a different way, will refer to the respective effects of fermented and distilled liquors on individuals.

No. VII. MR. SMITH TO MR. HOPKINS.

PETERBORO, July 11, 1836.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your favor of the 1st. instant. I yesterday buried my only son—a lovely youth, in the 12th year of his age. In my deep affliction, I have no heart to continue our discussion, and must beg you to excuse me from continuing it.

Very respectfully,

Your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS, Esq.

No. VIII. MR. HOPKINS TO REV. DR. JUSTIN EDWARDS,
AND ANSWER.

GENEVA, JULY 16, 1836.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: You may possibly be acquainted with the fact, that, in consequence of some observations on temperance in an Albany paper, in which my name occurred, a letter was addressed to me in the same paper by Mr. Gerrit Smith, asking an exposition of my views, and proposing an interchange of letters between us on that subject. I eventually acceded to this proposal, upon the understanding that our letters were to be first actually interchanged between ourselves, and afterwards

might be published by either, in a pamphlet—or in my opinion better so, if published by us jointly. The correspondence was proceeding in a perfectly kind and courteous spirit, and beyond all doubt would have been so continued, had it not pleased Divine Providence to send a trial for the heart of that excellent man, which will also send a pang into the hearts of all that know and love him. I copy at foot, his short and sad letter, which shows why I must look out for another correspondent.

From what you heard at the Buffalo convention, you know in a general sense, that I consider the late change in the principles of the temperance society, as founded in error, both of fact and reasoning. You will remember also, that, at that convention, I complained much, that every means of laying my views before the temperance public had been denied me. *You saw the fact that then they were there actually denied me*—because you saw me confined to ten minutes of time, by a set of regulations, which selected four other gentlemen, with opportunity to address the public at unlimited length. You heard some of those gentlemen address that public with powerful and often burning eloquence, and wholly or chiefly upon the very point of opposition between them and me. But possibly you may not have reflected, though on being reminded you will recollect, that in convention, when my ten minutes came, I very emphatically, and as I may say graphically, represented the hardship of having had arguments put into the mouth on my side, which had never been used nor thought of—in order that the speakers might triumph in refuting them. I say you *heard* this. You *saw* the same process go on, of imputing supposed arguments, and then repelling them with odium and reproach. You heard a reverend gentleman offer me time to be heard, and cold water enough at Niagara Falls, that is, after the convention should have adjourned and determined all the questions. You saw that convention unmoved by the flagrant injustice of all this. And, finally, if you will recur to the reports of [its] proceedings in the New-York Evangelist and Temperance Intelligencer, you will see they omit nearly all I said on these subjects; but they *wholly* omit the very

pointed complaint I made of the injustice of insulting an adversary who was refused the liberty of speech, by imputing opinions to him which he never entertained. I suppose you must agree with me, that the published reports which omitted all this, were virtually false—so far as it can ever be false in a professed narration, to omit a material part. But, sir, I mention these facts, chiefly for the sake of expressing my deep sense of your personal justice on that occasion—since, being one of the four evening speakers, you wholly refrained from all that could bear unpleasantly upon me. I certainly then supposed that you did so from a sentiment of generosity, and I shall always acknowledge it.

Notwithstanding all this, I have, dear sir, something against you. There are few men living, whom I have regarded with more partial favor than yourself. But some of your reasoning, and some of your conduct, in relation to temperance questions, do, in my judgment, merit examination; and if I publish, I shall submit them to a scrutiny, which, whether severe or not, will violate I hope, neither truth nor charity.

These are no toy questions. There is a right and wrong about them. On a pursuit of the right, depend, as you and I are agreed, the possibility of free institutions among men; the domestic happiness of uncounted millions; the spread of the gospel: and, therefore, there exists no higher question—excepting only Christianity itself. But we differ as to principles.

Will you, sir, take Mr. Smith's place, and continue the discussion with me? I ask you to do so on the following grounds;

1. As an act of justice to myself; that I may have—

An honorable and fair antagonist:

A man who understands how to reason:

A man who will point out to me my own errors.

2. As an act of justice to *yourself*; that you may have a full opportunity to place yourself right before the public, in those points of which I shall complain. One of these is, the publication of Doctor Washington's letter, my review of which was refused a place in the *Intelligencer*; which review, I presume, you saw, as you were at Mr. Delavan's house when he received

it. It will now form one of the papers to be published: and allow me to ask whether in any case you will wish for a copy of it to answer?

3. That we may give, as Mr. Smith and I should have done, an example so much now needed, of a frank and manly, but courteous and liberal discussion, on a controverted question.

4. That when our views are fairly embodied and contrasted, the subject may be left there, and not drawn out into vexatious controversy; the public being satisfied, as they will be, that all that is fitting and just on your part, will have been presented by you, in the best possible shape.

5. But chiefly, because I conceive that the duty of defending the new doctrines, is incumbent on *you personally*. I treat those doctrines as the *perversion*; and the adoption of them as the *ruin* of the temperance cause. And I much think, that without the aid of your distinguished name and character, that perversion and ruin could not have happened.

Why do I thus press this subject, as if I expected reluctance? Because I know you have entered a new field of labor, which may much occupy your time. I greatly fear that the proposed discussion will be inconvenient to you; and regret it, if so. But I must urge it as a matter of high duty, to what you consider, as the best interests of mankind. I observe further:

That I will send you, if desired, the correspondence with Mr. Smith; in which he has not had opportunity to state many distinct grounds. From any he has taken, you can vary, if you wish it; but I presume you will not:

That I have expressly reserved with Mr. Smith, the right of referring to the doings of the Albany committees; and that right I must still reserve. And in exercising it, I shall be very likely to call things by English names. This, when done calmly and upon clear evidence, I hold to be no violation of propriety:

That in the case of its being impossible for you to give attention to the subject, I request you will commit it to some one to whose qualities of heart, head and acquirement, you are willing to commit yourself and the cause, *and whom I can reasonably*

accept; and that you will be so kind as to introduce me to his correspondence :

And finally, that I intend this letter for publication, as part of the series ; also your answer if you do not object to it.

I am, reverend and dear sir, with true respect, &c.,

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.

DOCTOR EDWARDS' ANSWER.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, JULY 27, 1836.

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of the 16th instant came to hand last evening. My numerous and pressing duties will not permit me to comply with your request. Your review I think I have not seen, and I do not know any thing with regard to it, except from the occasional allusions made to it by yourself and others. Whether I was at Mr. ———, at the time he received it, I do not know. I was not aware of that fact, till you mentioned it, or, amidst the pressure of business, it must have escaped my mind. No one, at this moment, occurs to me, like the person whom you describe, to whom I can introduce you. My views on the general subject are very fully expressed in a volume of four hundred and eighty pages, entitled, "PERMANENT TEMPERANCE DOCUMENTS," which I expect in a few days to receive from Boston, and a copy of which I will, if I have opportunity, send you. It contains the prominent principles, reasonings, and facts, which have been employed by our society, during the last ten years. A copy of it we wish to put into the hand of every professional man, and every teacher of youth, in our country and in the world. One gentleman has agreed to furnish a copy to every student in Bangor Seminary ; another, Dartmouth College ; another, Amherst College ; another, William's College ; another, Hamilton College ; another, Lane Seminary ; another, Marietta College ; another, Kenyon ; another, Wabash ; another, Alton ; another, Illinois, and another, the Virginia University, &c., &c. Another has agreed to furnish every theological student, not otherwise supplied, with a copy, in all the theological seminaries of the United States. The Board of Commis-

sioners for Foreign Missions have taken one thousand copies, for their various missionaries in all parts of the world. An abstract of it, has been translated into French and published at Paris, and is to be put into the hand of all the leading men of France. It is to be translated into German, stereotyped and published at Berlin, to be put into the hand of the leading men in Germany. Application has just been received from a distinguished gentleman in Greece, requesting that it may be translated into modern Greek, and put into the hand of the leading men in that country. We hope in the same way to reach influential men in all parts of the world. Information from England, Scotland, and Ireland, Russia, Prussia and Persia, India, Ceylon and China, Africa and the Sandwich Islands, to which portions of it have been sent, has been received of its great and salutary influence; and we are encouraged to hope, that its influence, should its circulation become universal, might be equally salutary throughout the world. Any thing which you can in any way consistently do, to promote the great and benevolent work of causing, by the diffusion of information and the exertion of kind moral influence, drunkenness universally to cease, will give me great joy.

For your kind expressions of esteem and confidence, I feel under new obligations; and earnestly desire that all your efforts may be so guided by heavenly wisdom, as to be eminently instrumental in promoting the good of mankind.

Truly and gratefully, yours, &c.,

J. EDWARDS.

EXTRACT FROM MR. HOPKIN'S REPLY.

The book of Permanent Documents is to embrace the arguments, &c., &c., of the American Society "*for the last ten years.*" I allege, therefore, that it must embrace a great mass of contradictions, *in fundamentals*. On one side, the temperance volume containing your admirable essays: on the other side, the matter—spurious and indefensible as I consider it to be—of our late temperance publications. Now in respect to your benevolent hope that my exertions may encourage the blessed

cause of temperance, I answer, that with all my feeble powers, I shall (unless better taught) support the views of the first six or seven years of yourself and the society; and oppose those of later years.

Clearly do I see, and well do I understand the effect, of the immense array to which you refer, of moral and pecuniary means by which these new doctrines are to be disseminated. But it all comes to this: They are right and true, or false and wrong—for there is right and wrong—truth and falsehood involved in this matter; and in the *works*, as well as in the Book of God, and by human observation, there are standards to measure by.

REVIEW OF DOCTOR WASHINGTON'S LETTER.

Whether the smallest quantities of fermented liquors will produce moral perversion—Whether the code of Mohammed is “more salutary” than that of Christians.

 The review, of which a part only is here printed, was sent for publication in the *Temperance Intelligencer*, for Dec. 1834, and rejected. This part forms a proper sequel to the last letter to Mr. Smith—as it follows up the question of the effect of vinous liquors nationally considered, to the point of *national morality*. I have deeply to regret that my limits forbid my presenting the whole paper, both on account of the other points embraced in it, and also as an appeal to the public respecting the candor of the *Intelligencer*.

In the history of opinions, the letter of Dr. Washington, is very important; since in it is contained the germ of principles, which have since expanded so successfully. The view he gives of the effect of a single drop of alcohol, without regard to its combination, is plainly, I think, the remote origin of some of the extraordinary resolutions lately passed at Saratoga.

There has been published in different papers, and particularly in the *Temperance Intelligencer* and *Southern Religious Tele-*

graph, a letter of the 15th of April last, [1834,] from Dr. B. Washington of the U. S. Navy, to the Rev. Dr. J. Edwards, on the subject of alcoholic drinks, which, from the manner of its coming before the public, may be considered as embracing the medical, and perhaps also the moral creed, of those who deny the fitness of using fermented liquors. It seems to be plainly intended as a public exposition and defence of principles; and considering the source from which it comes, must possess no small weight, on the ground of mere authority. * * *

My object is, to sift this question in the most dispassionate manner possible. When that is done, my duty will be done; and whether mankind will pursue the path of right reason which may lead to an universal reformation, or the path of delusion which will disgrace and defeat us, is not for me to say.

Dr. W. says: "And here it is my decided opinion, that it is always injurious, without regard to the quantity or mode in which it may be *combined* (meaning alcohol combined in vinous liquors)—that not one drop can be admitted, with propriety, from infancy to the most extreme old age—and *that it has always been the greatest scourge of the world.*" * * *

"The moment a man takes wine, he is prone to become deceitful, and may be viewed as a player wearing a mask. All the fine, noble feeling he may possess, should be justly suspected as forming a part of his new character: they are theatrical. * * If a bottle of wine will produce a degree of intoxication amounting to temporary madness, will not a single glass disorder the senses, in some degree approaching that state of excitement? At what precise point does temperance end, and ebriety commence?" * * *

"In an instant [speaking of those who were reformed and relapse] the wine produces a moral perversion; the veracity is irretrievably gone."

I feel myself bound to deny all these statements in general; and each one of them in particular.

It is not true, that wine has always or ever been "the greatest scourge of the world;" nor (though it has been, and occa-

sionally is abused) has it been, in any fair sense, a scourge at all.

It is not true, that the moment a man takes wine, he is more prone to become deceitful ; nor that the use of wine can be shown to have any effect, to destroy truth and honor among men.

It is not sound reasoning to say, because a large quantity of wine, or any other substance, will produce great disorder in the system, that therefore any small quantity of the same substance will produce disorder in the senses, in any degree approaching that state of excitement. This would not be so, even if I can not tell at what precise point temperance ends, and ebriety commences.

Finally, *it is not accurate* to state this [the relapse of the reformed] as a question of veracity ; it is a question of fidelity to promises, [to resolutions rather.]

And, on the contrary, I reverse all the above propositions ; and I allege that the substantial contrary of each and every one of them, *is true*.

On any one, I might appeal to the knowledge and conscience of every reader, whether the fact alleged has even the color of truth. Take, for example, this, that wine is prone to produce "deceit," and that the man who drinks it, may be viewed "as a player wearing a mask ;" and I ask, with amazement, what rashness could have produced such an assertion ! What ! have not all the great and good men whom our country has produced, been drinkers of wine, cider, or other fermented liquors ? Was all, then, that we have of ancient worth, an affair of deceit ? Have the long line of priests and prophets and holy men of old, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost—have these men left us writings prone to deceive ? Was there not a particular case of one who drank wine, and who could not possibly be wearing a mask, because we know certainly that "in him was no guile ?

But we are met here by an array of argument, which is put forth as if unanswerable. "If a bottle of wine will produce a degree of intoxication amounting to temporary madness, will not

a single glass disorder the senses, in some degree approaching to that degree of excitement?" No, I answer: and what human being in his senses, ever imagined that such would be the case? I presume Dr. Washington never, in his life, ordered a portion of medicine, which did not proceed on exactly the contrary ground; and all the course of human life contradicts his supposition. If an ounce of Peruvian bark will produce strictures in the breast, does it follow that five grains will give any inconvenience whatever? If one hundred drops laudanum will cause watchfulness in a particular patient, does it follow that thirty drops will not relieve his pain, and put him to sleep? Does not Dr. Washington constantly give quinine and narcotine on these principles? I apprehend I may safely appeal to the cooler reflection of Dr. Washington himself, for very different views. I suppose a traveller to return weary and hungry from his journey; a farmer from his distant labor; a lawyer from court, exhausted with mental effort; or a man of business, wearied with care;—in every such case, the physician will admit that there is some exhaustion of vital energy, which ought to be supplied. All these men dine heartily: and many physicians *of late* will say, that in this *debilitated state of the system*, cold water will best aid digestion, and, with rest, will soonest prepare the men for an equal effort next day. All this I deny; but it is not the present question: the question is, whether, if one of these men takes so much wine, cider, or beer, as sooner to raise up the system to its proper standard of vital energy, "it will disorder the senses in some degree approaching to intoxication, or to temporary madness?" Now I say that there is no approach to *madness*, but only to the par of strength. To assert that drinking such a tumbler of cider, is an "approach" to intoxication, is to say that the first mouthful of food is an approach to gluttony. And the question, at what precise period temperance ends and gluttony begins, has no possible bearing upon the subject.

Here, then, a man of science stands before a great and intelligent public, and thinks proper to sign his name to declarations that, "the moment a man takes wine, he is prone to become de-

ceitful, and may be viewed as a player wearing a mask ;” and, in another case, he says, “ *in an instant* the wine produces moral perversion, the veracity is *irretrievably* gone :” and we properly ask, when and where he ever saw all this ?

Amazed at the substance of such declarations, I have but a momentary wonderment to bestow upon the very incautious terms in which they are expressed. *In an instant*—“ the moment ;” then, again, veracity departs—*not for a season*—it is “ *irretrievably gone.*” We learn, hence, that Socrates, Plato and Aristides, Regulus, Cato and Tully, the patriarchs and apostles, the reformers and martyrs and puritans, the Lafayettes and Washingtons, or such of them as ever tasted a glass of wine, were thenceforth prone to become deceitful ; that all the fine, noble feelings they might possess, suffering patriots, saints and martyrs, as most of them outwardly appeared to be, might be justly suspected of forming a part of their new character, and were, in fact, theatrical.

Again : the whole idea, that men beginning to feel the effects of wine, are used to “ wear a mask ” in order to dissemble, is not merely untrue, but the contrary of it is universally true. Wine is never drunk, as spirit often is, in beastly solitude. It is used convivially ; and the party, if the wine is at all felt, are more disposed to *display*, than to conceal, their excitement. But in all general usage it is taken as food is, and no excitement is noticed.

Will an escape from this be sought, by saying that all men have some deception, but wine and cider drinkers have most tendency to it ? Then, I ask, with what other thing does Dr. Washington compare wine, and the effects of wine, in this particular ? His answer must be, that he compares wine drinkers with water drinkers, and that he finds one class false, and the other true men. Now, I ask, who and where, except Mahomedans, are these water drinkers who never deceive ? Is there in this, or any other civilized country, such a body of men, who have drunk water, and water only, so long that they can be compared with the men who drink cider and wine, and thus prove whether one class is more dishonest than the other ? We all know there is no such

thing. To find any great body of water drinkers, we must go to distant nations, who, from peculiar causes, are cut off from fermented drinks.

The Chinese and Hindoos are examples of water drinkers, upon a scale of stupendous magnitude. They constitute nearly half of the human family ; and by universal testimony, are most radically false, base, treacherous and perjured.

But it is among the Mahomedans, that Dr. Washington has at length found that perfect truth and integrity, which is banished from among christian and wine drinking nations. I extract his paragraph on this subject.

“ One of the greatest revolutions ever witnessed, took place twelve hundred years ago, when an individual, feeling a contempt for the people around him called Christians, who had debased themselves by wine and luxurious living, undertook to prescribe a more salutary code for the world, by prohibiting alcohol and living on the plainest fare. The father of this system, which gave health and gladness to all who observed it faithfully, was soon hailed as one inspired with extraordinary wisdom. The followers of Mahomet immediately manifested superior strength and prowess. They overcame all who opposed them in arms ; and by their exalted intelligence, rapidly advanced the arts and sciences. * * * These people are now on the wane ; mainly because they have introduced the use of opium and tobacco. But still from the healthy blood their sober ancestors had so long preserved, those among them who reject the use of wine, never tell a falsehood ; they never steal ; nor will they, under any circumstances, either of prosperity or adversity, fail to offer up, every morning, their grateful prayers.”

I desire the attention of the reader to the views which are *implied*, as well as expressed, in the paragraph, relative to the comparative wisdom of the Mahomedan and Christian institutions. For this purpose, I ask my reader before we go a step further, to look back and read it over a second time. I suppose that done.

There is a great class of men, even sincere men, who are

now quibbling with their bibles, in order to get rid of some of the most manifest and palpable truths, which were ever written on any subject. There are others who, after first going the round of evasions, and being driven from every subterfuge, come back more frankly, and insist that the example of Christ was not so perfect, but that it may be improved upon, by further experience. This is manly—and I like it. Any thing is better than a quibble. For the special edification of such persons, I draw their attention to the very powerful aid which they will derive from the institutions of Mahomet, as set forth in the correspondence of Dr. Washington with that estimable man, the general agent of the American Temperance Society.

It appears from the above extract, that Mahomet was justly regarded, in obvious comparison with Christ, as a man of “extraordinary wisdom;” and that feeling a contempt for the people around him called christians, who had debased themselves by wine and luxurious living, he “*undertook to prescribe a more salutary code for the world.*” Does this mean more salutary than the code of christians? If not, what does it mean? Who that loves and adores the moral character of Him who was made higher than the heavens—who that thus loves and adores Him, will not be surprised to hear it insinuated that He had not the “*extraordinary wisdom*” to foresee, as Mahomet did, the bad effects of wine?

We are left, however, to infer that even the “*extraordinary wisdom*” of the “*more salutary code*” of Mahomet, was not quite perfect; for the Mahomedans “*are now on the wane*, mainly because they have introduced the use of opium and tobacco.” Indeed? *And how came they to introduce the use of opium and tobacco?* How comes it, that living every where mixed with Greeks, who use wine and not opium, the Turks are “*on the wane*,” and the Greeks, who eat no opium, but drink wine, and are on the increase?

On a future occasion I shall have something to say about the use of opium and other drugs, among all nations (out of the tropics) which have not fermented liquors. Then it will ap-

pear that China also is "on the wane," and that the Hindoos have waned as much as they can.

Why is wine-drinking christendom "*not all on the wane?*" "Are there not more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in the philosophy" of the Temperance Intelligencer? May it not possibly be true after all, that the Lord Jesus Christ had as much "*extraordinary wisdom*" as Mahomet; and left as salutary a "code?"

There are other historical statements of Dr. Washington, that deserve examination. But I shall end this number, by advertising to his views of the truth and integrity of the Mahomedans; of which no little boast has been made by a succession of writers, from Voltaire to Lord Byron. "From the healthy blood their ancestors so long preserved, those among them who reject the use of wine, never tell a falsehood; they never steal."

Time does not permit, nor the occasion require me, to go into a discussion of Mahomedan manners, which, besides, are a tissue of contradictions. I admit that, as in all nations, there are honest people among the unambitious peasants; that the rich country *cadi* is honorable and hospitable; that the post-horse Tartars are as remarkable for trust worthiness as the porters of London; and, finally, that those who can always rob, will not often steal: and then I allege, that falsehood, duplicity, corruption and perjury, abound as much in Turkey as in China or Hindostan, or in any country on earth. I allege, that this corruption most deeply infests the religious and judicial orders. And though I cannot exactly prove, that this or that Turk or Persian has not drunk wine, yet I say of them in general, that they, except some men in great power, do not drink it, because it would ruin them. I therefore deny this allegation of Mahomedan veracity; and in support of my denial, I quote a very few authorities.

"The influence both of the Mufti and Ulema, (Grand High Priest and sacerdotal order,) would be far greater than it is, if they could maintain a good character for probity. But the venality of all employments, &c., * * * In no country in the world, are false witnesses so common and so devoid of

shame, as in Turkey." [Malte Brun's Geography, volume 2, page 74.]

"To christians, the evils of corruption are aggravated by a swarm of false witnesses, who continually infest the courts of justice. This infamous profession is openly avowed and even encouraged, as perjury against a christian is considered a very venial offence. These informers obtain a regular livelihood, by instituting vexatious suits, and extorting money, by means of false oaths."

"An Ottoman minister would be capable of betraying the secrets of the empire, for a sable pelisse. An Ottoman of the lower class, would sell his honor and his most sacred duties, for a scarlet caftan."

"The Turk of Bulgaria is rude to ferocity. * * *
The Albanian, murderous, thievish, and insatiable. * * *
The Turk of the commercial towns, is rapacious and perjured.
* * * The Turk of Constantinople, not only to show his disapprobation of government, but also to plunder the houses and shops of individuals, sets them on fire and commits most frightful acts of barbarity." [New Edinburgh Enc., art. Turkey.]

"Should the mollah," (an ecclesiastical and judicial dignitary,) "be an honest man, or what is the same thing, sufficiently rich to render the octroi no object, the trades make up the deficiency"—(that is, if the mollah is too independent to allow the stated price of provisions to be raised by using false weights and measures;) * * * "the confidential officers of the mollah are bribed to inform the trades people, when their master is about to make a visit; when of course, true weights and measures only are exhibited."

"A valuable branch of a mollah's income, may also be found under the head of false justice. If a man have a bad cause, he engages two witnesses, which every where abound in Turkey, at all prices according to the responsibility. He then bribes the mollah, who admits their testimony, without reference to their character which is perfectly well known, and gives judgment accordingly." [Slade's Travels in Turkey.]

These works embrace, I believe, the latest and best information respecting Turkish manners. Capt. Slade's book is the latest I have seen on Turkey; certainly one of the best; and his opportunities for knowing the Turkish character, were extraordinary. He is besides, a scoffer; which in certain quarters will be a recommendation.

So much for the Turks. While I was writing this number, I saw in a New-York paper, a review of Frazer's *Persia*, and from that review, not having read the work, I extract the following sketches of morals in the other great empire of the Mahomedan faith.

“Nothing can be lower than the character of these people; (the lower class of mollahs or priests.) Their hypocrisy, profligacy and want of principle, are the subject of stories, epigrams and proverbs, without end. Take care, says an adage, of the face of a woman, and the heels of a mule: but with a mollah, be on your guard at all points. To bite like a mollah, and cheat like a mollah, are sayings of equal frequency, in the mouth of a Persian.”

“The seyeds, or descendants of the prophet, notwithstanding their origin, deservedly share in this obloquy; and should one of them become a hadji: that is, have made the pilgrimage to Mecca, his reputation as a rogue is fully established. (He then relates an instance of villainy in one of them.) Volney quotes a similar saying: Distrust thy neighbor if he has made a hadji; but if he has made *two*, make haste to leave thy house.” [2 vol. *Travels*, p. 167, Am. ed. It is in chap. XI.]

“When, men possessing stations so highly responsible, (this relates to lawyers and judges,) and in general so well paid by government, are guilty of such mal-practices, what can be expected from the inferior orders, who, in misery and want, are exposed to a thousand temptations, while their very existence depends on a sanctimonious exterior.”

“Demoralized in the earliest stages of their career, is it to be imagined that in their rise to the higher orders of the priesthood, they can avoid becoming hypocrites and profligates? The

very extent of ascetic self-denial which they are obliged to observe, whether congenial to the disposition or otherwise, produces deceit and concealment. * * * It is much to be feared that the conduct, even of the higher classes of the priesthood, has divested them, as a body, of the right of just complaint," (against the reproaches.)

I could greatly multiply these proofs. But it may be sufficient to conclude with the testimony of an American; an American missionary in Mahomedan countries, and a man known to many of my readers.

"So crookedly in fact are their minds formed," (the minds of the Turks,) "that a falsehood will often come out, as the readiest answer to a simple inquiry, when not the shadow of a motive appears for concealing the truth.

Their own method of settling their matters is, to meet cheating with cheating, and lie with lie; and then by furious altercation and wrangling, work themselves to a mutual adjustment. Like as the inequalities of two flints are knocked off by collision; and in the one case, as in the other, the more fire is elicited in the process, the more perfect generally, is the agreement in the end." [Rev. Eli Smith's address on the trials of missionaries, delivered in Park-street church, Boston, October, 1832.]

These are the people, who, according to Dr. Washington, "never tell a falsehood and never steal!" And the reason of their unparalleled morality is, that according to the precepts of their "*more salutary code*," they never drink wine! This is the historical, scientific, and logical accuracy, with which facts are collected, and argument conducted, in some of the temperance publications! The misrepresentations of Voltaire respecting the Mahomedan character, have been contemned and rejected for half a century, by well informed men: and now, forsooth, they come out, new edited, as authentic information to a Christian people!

In the name of an abused public, I ask, who is responsible for these publications? Are we to understand that this letter

was published by that very able and excellent man, Justin Edwards; and as matter of authority too? Why does he not publicly disclaim it? Does he sanction its facts or its reasonings? And in that case, does the American temperance society stand surety for him?

I have withheld myself for months, from this unpleasant discussion. I remonstrated earnestly against the beginning of it. I was overruled, and since that, the public have been flooded with matter often exceedingly unfair; untrue in fact; unsound in argument and inconsistent with itself. I lament exceedingly, the necessity of thus directly questioning the statements of a gentleman whom I have not the honor to know, and respecting whom I regret to make a single unpleasant remark. I seek not controversy, and I mean to have none. But some restraint must be put upon the abuse of fact and of reason: and I distinctly warn our societies and committees, both at Boston and Albany, that such perversions, if continued, shall not, while I have life and strength and the privilege of printing, remain either undetected, or unchastised.

P. S. I repeat my request that the executive committee will explain more fully their views of the beer question, on which they made some remarks in the October Intelligencer, [1834,] so as to state expressly whether beer, and brandy with water, of equal strength, are or are not, "alike in all their tendencies, dangers and effects." If they admit a difference, will they please to state what it is.

NO. XI. OF THE DIFFERENCE IN THE EFFECTS OF FERMENTED AND DISTILLED LIQUORS RE- SPECTIVELY, UPON INDIVIDUALS.

The peculiar ruin of modern intemperance—it is a proper ground for universal associations to exclude spirits—true principles for such associations—points of opposition between the effects of distilled and fermented liquors—proofs.

It is not possible to comprise, in any short definition, a just idea of the peculiar evils of intemperance, such as it has appeared in

the world since ardent spirit came into general use. The facts are every where before us, in all their frightful enormity ; and, until within two or three years past, they were justly stated and pressed upon the attention of this people, in many exceedingly able publications and personal addresses. But I have seen no attempt to classify and distinguish them, so as to deduce from the whole, a generalization of the proper and peculiar effects of either kind of liquor, or even of both jointly. Any such attempt would, indeed, be quite beyond the reach of our temperance editors and lecturers, who have been be-laboring the public for years, about a chemical hypothesis, without any apparent apprehension of the distinct nature of the evils in question.

For myself, I can find no better description than to say, that the free use of ardent spirit leads most generally to the ruin of the man, in every possible respect—moral, physical and social. But this general description results from a great number of particulars, which it will be the object of this paper to collect, state and prove. This I shall do in the way of discriminating between the effects of different kinds of liquor. This is the great point ; and the one which has been hitherto, *of late*, either overlooked from ignorance, or kept out of view by design. The man who does not understand it, whoever he may be, and however eminent, may rest assured that he has never had any intimate perception of the real nature of the evils of intemperance. And let the man who means, finally, not to admit the whole truth as a system, be careful how he begins by the admission of any single proposition.

The ruin of the man, which I state as resulting from ardent spirit, is a *permanent, established ruin*. He is lost at all points : and finally.

The greatest point of it is the *moral ruin*. I mean the perversion of the moral qualities of the man, from all that is commonly called good, into unmingled evil : for after that, his death is not a loss.

This kind of ruin is new in the world within two hundred years ; and chiefly so within fifty or sixty.

To these points I must recur by and by, at the expense of repetition. For the temperance question has been involved in such a mist of delusion, that we must needs approach it again and again, and in different attitudes, before its features, as they are in truth, manifest before all eyes, can be realized by an abused and deluded public.

Know, then, further, that the fact of *mere intoxication or inebriation*, is not of the essence of that ruin of which we speak, and against which temperance societies are, or ought to be formed: no, not if such mere intoxication be ever so extreme, nor if often repeated. Here lies one of the radical errors which has misled our temperance public, and been a chief instrument in the perversion of the cause. Let us understand it.

All intoxication is an evil and a sin; an abuse of the good which a bountiful Providence gives, and an offence against our own moral constitutions. So are all other sensual excesses.

Intoxication, as it was from the time of Noah to about the beginning of the seventeenth century, stood among the excesses to which man, by evil passions, is exposed, but which were not, for that reason, excluded, by any prohibition of the cause of them. The true position of man in the moral universe is, not that of *physical exclusion* from the objects of appetite, but of moral and prudential restraint, in the midst of physical allowance. On this point rests the divine economy, as exhibited alike in revelation and in the history of man; and as it appears in opposition to the "MORE SALUTARY" code of Mohammed and of the temperance societies.

Intoxication, as it was from the time of Noah to about the beginning of the seventeenth century, was not only different from that *total ruin* above referred to, and to be further stated below, and which total ruin we all daily see; but it had nothing of that ruin in it, nor consequent upon it. Let me be met by no quibble here; for, by this total ruin, I mean exactly that, the symptoms, proofs and effects of which, were so powerfully and justly described in our admirable temperance essays during the first seven years of our societies. I mean exactly what Beecher and

Kitteridge meant ; and I understand this matter exactly as it was understood by Dr. J. Edwards, and by ten other very eminent men, (and among them Professor Hitchcock,) whose essays are officially published by the American temperance society, in that excellent collection, the Temperance Volume. Now the difference is this : the total ruin referred to, may exist, and in multiplied cases which we all see, does exist, without any intoxication whatever : and the intoxication does exist, and always, until about two hundred years ago, and chiefly until fifty or sixty years ago, did exist, without the ruin. But there is, often, since the use of spirits, a coincidence between the two. The ruined sot often gets intoxicated, and a majority do so. And the *cause* of the ruin and of the intoxication is, in such case, one and the same thing, that is spirits. Intoxication is the word in use, because the language was formed before the distinction between this and the other besotted ruin was even imperfectly seen ; and also because this last is of an abstract character, requiring habits of generalization not so well fitted to common speech. When the proofs of this distinction are well understood, it will be perceived that this word "intoxication," as lately applied, involves a deep quibble and fraud. That quibble has been a great, perhaps the greatest, cause of our failure. From the first, there have ever been some excess and some intoxication on vinous liquors. But the besotted ruin here intended, was never heard of—nor by any description or allusion, at all referred to—from the beginning of the world until spirits came into use. I say, undoubtedly, that not a case of it ever existed, which, in a fair sense, was produced, except by spirits.* I know that excited men, in the violence of party zeal, may state such cases ; and very cool-minded men will support the statement, until they understand the radical difference between the two things. *But the very fewness of their cases will ruin their argument,*† and an impartial analysis, if attainable, would destroy those few.

* I do not here take *opium* into consideration, nor in any remarks on the nature of the appetite.

† Since this passage was written, it is most remarkably fulfilled by the letters, which see below, received from the correspondents of Dr. J. Edwards, to whom I appealed to *state their facts*. The fewness of the answers received, and of the cases stated in those few ; the lothness of some

It now appears, that I admit some evils to have arisen from the use of vinous liquors. And it is plain, that I must admit the right of individuals to associate on any point of speculation, or moral principle, or practice, and to gain proselytes. The temperance societies are now just such associations. Where, then, is the point of my objection?

I answer: they have a right so to associate; though not by surprise and management to pervert societies formed on other principles. But when they so associate, I have a right to say that their plans are impracticable; and if ever so practicable, wrong. This brings me, by way of necessary explanation, to consider what a temperance society can do, and ought to do; and what it can not do, nor ought, if it could.

A public and voluntary association, except on religious grounds, to use any article, or to do or forbear doing any act, in a moderate or mitigated way, is an absurdity.

No association for such an object can long exist, but for an object perfectly defined and specific—admitting in every case a definitive yea or nay. There are very few such public objects. If, in 1774, the agreement had been to use tea in moderation only, it would have been at once useless and absurd.

The principle, therefore, of such a society, must be that of *utter exclusion*, or it can have no useful nor practical principle at all. If there were any thing in the use of tea, constantly and violently endangering the public liberties, there ought to be a voluntary and universal bond of utter exclusion against it; and laws, also, when they can be obtained. But if the moderate use of tea is salutary, and the excess only would be dangerous to health, morals, or public liberty, then that subject is not within the powers or competence of any voluntary association, but must be left to the teaching of morals, the practice of medicine, or the restraints of law.

Therefore no great or permanent benefit can arise from temperance societies, unless they aim at, and finally accomplish, the

to be brought to plain matter of fact; and the wide discrepancy as to fact, among those who answer, will be matter of curious observation.

point of *universal exclusion*. Of course, they ought to be directed against no objects but such as ought to be universally excluded. And to direct such societies against a given object, *without a reasonable hope of uniting mankind* in a universal voluntary bond of exclusion, is folly, and will lead to certain failure. If there is an article of such vast and paramount destructiveness, that we can hope to form against it a universal league of exclusion, uniting all men of all classes and denominations—christians, infidels, patriots, gambling politicians, men of business, political economists, farmers, mechanics, laboring and professional men—then possibly such an article may be banished from human use. But without a universal and overwhelming sense of danger, brought home to the bosoms of all men, no such exclusion can take place, and it is vain to attempt it. But if not universally and effectually excluded, the article exists among us; if it exists, all can obtain, and most will taste it; tasting forms that inexpressibly insidious and ensnaring appetite, which I allege to be entirely peculiar to spirits; and if that is so, the battle must, through all ages, be fought by contending against *appetites formed and forming*; that is, the battle will be lost. To this point exactly, I think the infatuation of our temperance societies has brought us. Or if there is any hope, I think it must be reserved for another generation.

No finite mind can estimate, no imagination display, the immense amount of good that might have accrued, if any happy effort of human wisdom, benevolence and perseverance, could have fully excluded ardent spirits from this nation. The example might, and probably would, then have extended from nation to nation, and have introduced the “promised age.”

Omitting now all questions whether wine, tea, coffee, tobacco, or animal food, *ought* to be excluded—was it not the part of wisdom, to inquire whether they *could be*? WINE, for example—blessed and signalized in many ways by the spirit of inspiration, and by sacred use: WINE, with the whole current of medical testimony, and of history, and of human experience, in its favor, until two or three years ago; and CIDER and FAMILY

BEER, which all our fathers drank without suspicion of immorality or injury; how could any extreme of delusion indulge the hope, that all mankind *could be* united in common league for their banishment? What a loss was that, when a few misguided men blighted all our glorious prospects of possible good, for the vain ambition of "going farther than others," "taking higher ground," and leading a party! Or if not so, then how lamentable, that the same stupendous loss should be incurred, for the sake of a chemical hypothesis, utterly false and baseless.

But this point of the proper nature and objects of temperance societies, is so vital, that I must recur to it enough to be sure of being fully apprehended. The object, then, of the societies, was to induce a universal change of a universal, public, national usage. That usage related to *an appetite*, and that appetite was strong and dangerous. So far we are agreed. Then I say, that there can be no such general change, except an immense majority will agree to it; and no such majority can be hoped for, except in a case of very great, overwhelming, and manifest public danger. It must, therefore, be some visible, tangible thing—precise and definite, not complex—such as all minds can comprehend, and few will dispute in principle. Such an object was the evil of ardent spirit; and hence the unparalleled success of temperance associations for the first six or seven years. They had an advocate in the conscience of every human being.

But then, I say, that the temperance societies were combined not only against such an evil, but I say further, that this evil was new in the world, perfectly peculiar in kind, generically distinct, and of most overwhelming and destructive power and magnitude. I say that this peculiar evil arose from the use of ardent spirits, and from ardent spirits *only*: that the danger of spirit lies in the appetite for it, and in the effects when the appetite is indulged; both entirely peculiar, and both such, that the only proper means of safety consisted in total exclusion. But why so? Because, as to the appetite, it is fascinating and insidious beyond the example of any other thing. It is the case of a serpent charming a bird—the fascination is irresistible, until the

bird finds itself caught; and when caught, it is too late. No generation of birds learns any thing from the experience of others. There is no way, but to destroy the serpent.

But exclusion is a thing which admits not, in this case, of degrees. A thing is either excluded or not excluded; and if not excluded, it is admitted. If spirit is admitted at all, it is to be tasted; if tasted by few, it will be so by many: those that taste, form the appetite; and those that form the appetite, are ruined: the nation goes on to ruin, and I see not, but that ruin must now continue to extend over a great part of the earth.

I am quite aware here, that I am anticipating the results of facts yet to be stated; and that my opponent, when reading this, says in his heart, that I am arguing against myself, because I do not exclude cider and beer. Let him enjoy the illusion as long as he can. My question just here, is with *prudentials*.

For a vast proportion, (no matter whether a majority or not,) of wise and good men, in this and all countries, will deny that fermented liquors ever produced the destructive evils complained of, and they *will not* unite to exclude them, until convinced that they ought to do it, or compelled without conviction. But if such will not unite to exclude them, they are not excluded.

For a national temperance society to form a party within its own bosom, is suicide. It must be national or nothing.

The peculiar dangers and great destructiveness of ardent spirit, present a fit case for the action of a national society, and for the object of universal exclusion. The use of vinous liquors is a proper subject for moral and prudential regulation only; and this, again, belongs to the department of individual action. It can not be regulated by social pledges.

Let us review our ground thus far. Under the general allegation, that ardent spirit tends to the ruin of man in all his interests and relations, and in his whole character, I have already stated, 1. That this is a permanent, established ruin: 2. That it is new in the world within about two centuries: 3. That the great evil of it is, that it is a *moral ruin*: and, 4. negatively,

That it does not consist in, nor depend on, the mere fact of intoxication, though ever so flagrant; but is wholly different.

But while on this point of intoxication, it seemed necessary to answer the inquiry, Is not intoxication a great evil? Undoubtedly so: but *mere intoxication, which is all that wine ever produces, and that very rarely*, is not such an evil as calls for the institution of national societies; nor at all so dangerous that mankind can possibly be united in societies for that purpose. In a mere prudential point of view, therefore, it was a fatal error to extend the operation of the societies to the exclusion of vinous liquors, even if it were desirable to exclude them.

But it is not desirable to exclude them. Vinous liquors produce none of the *great* evils which spirit produces; and on the other hand, if they were excluded, the evils of intemperance would be inexpressibly aggravated by the use of some other substance, as in Turkey, by opium. This brings us back to the point of the peculiar character of ardent spirit; respecting which some things have been taken for granted, some partially stated, and all remain to be proved. I say, then,

In the 5th place: Among the foundations of all truth on this subject, lies the great fact, that ardent spirit almost universally engenders *a rapidly increasing appetite*, which, if indulged by any customary use, leads on to the destruction of the man. The opposite fact is, that vinous liquors do not cause any such increasing appetite. And not merely so: the farther truth is, that among aged men, who have drunk wine or cider all their lives, the appetite for them more generally *decreases*, as the advance of years brings on a decrease of animal power and exertion, and with that, a decrease of the demand for sustenance.

6. And as regards the young. Those who are accustomed to wine from childhood and youth, never get drunk upon it: those who are accustomed to ardent spirit from childhood and youth, never escape ruin. By the word "never" here, I mean to express as much universality as the word properly and usually imports, when applied to life and manners.

7. This seventh difference which I state between the effects

of these liquors, relates to the *intensity of appetite* which either engenders.

The use of distilled liquors goes on to form an appetite which is, beyond all comparison, the most unquenchable and irresistible of all human appetites. This distinct and peculiar character appears in its usurping the whole control of the man, and leading him, with open eyes and full knowledge, to certain and fearful destruction. It is a *morbid, longing, yearning thirst*, which nothing but spirits will satisfy, and which, as in the case of fire, when spirit is poured on to quench it, burns more fiercely afterwards. Much more I could say; not by drawing my facts from imagination, but from the personal and confidential disclosures of the victims. It is an appetite which tramples under foot, at once, all the strongest affections of our nature, and all moral feeling and principle—the love of honor and reputation and of property—the shame of poverty and beggary—the suffering of actual want—the parental tenderness, which leads us to sacrifice all (all but the love of spirits) for our children; and finally, among those who believe in them, it defies the horrors of final retribution.

There have been drunkards made such on strong wines, and possibly on cider and common wines. There have been men who have habitually loved wine, and drank too much. But such an appetite as this which is now raving in the bosoms of thousands and tens of thousands, from the use of ardent spirits, was never produced by any other substance, since the world began. In every such remark, however, I leave opium out of the question.

8. Ardent spirit is, in a true and fair sense of the word, an intoxicating liquor. Vinous liquors, though they *can* intoxicate, yet they are not usually drunk, nor do mankind usually desire to drink them, in such quantities as to produce intoxication.

It is not here in place to detect the very unworthy quibble which has been successfully played off upon the words "*intoxicating liquors.*" If I have space to write off a list of frauds and sophisms, with detections, it will be done: otherwise omitted.

9. The ninth difference which I mention, relates to health and disease. Our temperance publications used, until of late, to exhibit, in terrific array and with perfect truth, the variety of diseases, both organic and functionary, which are produced by ardent spirit. "Dyspepsia, jaundice, emaciation, corpulency, dropsy, ulcers, rheumatism, gout, tremors, palpitations, hysteria, epilepsy, palsy, lethargy, apoplexy, melancholy, madness, delirium tremens, and premature old age, compose but a small part of the catalogue of diseases produced by ardent spirit." So says Dr. Sewall, in his address published by the American temperance society in **THE TEMPERANCE VOLUME**. But Dr. Sewall, in that very able and comprehensive address, upon "the effects of intemperance on the intellectual, moral and physical powers of man," refers the whole, in terms express, to ardent spirit, and to that only; and gives not the least hint of any evil arising from beer, wine or cider. In the same volume is the essay of Dr. Rush, the patriarch of the temperance reformation, who mentions further, among diseases, diabetes, eruptions, hoarseness, and all the symptoms of a disorganized stomach. But Dr. Rush says that, "fermented liquors have often a friendly influence upon life and health." The Temperance Volume seems now to be discarded, and probably for these offences. The late Dr. Hosack, in his very able temperance address, holds the same opinions; and to the list of diseases adds, fevers, glandular obstructions, and stone. I presume that no other single cause can be pointed out, in the whole history of disease, producing half as many and as terrible particular diseases, as are contained in the above lists.

What are the diseases which have been imputed to vinous liquors by any physicians or moralists, for three thousand years, among, perhaps, twenty nations, which in each age have used them?

Answer 1st. Rich wines, long and voluptuously used, have been supposed to be a great cause of gout. 2d. They have been alleged to produce rheumatism, which is untrue; because that disorder prevails equally among those who do not use such liquors. These liquors are, however, very hurtful to such as

are already rheumatic. 3d. Redness of eyes, and no other bodily illness, is attributed, in the scriptures, to the *undue* use of wine. 4th. To this list, Professor Silliman, as if in derision, has added bleeding at the nose.

One hundred and fifty millions of people, during one hundred generations, would make about fifteen thousand millions of human beings who have inhabited the wine region of the world. It so happens, also, that this is the civilized and literary part of the world: and the only part, until lately, in which there has been much real medical science. We have means, therefore, to know, in substance, what all the real physicians that ever lived, thought of wine; and if among them all, there has been any accredited or reputable opinion that wine produced other bodily disorders than these four, let it be pointed out.*

10. The medical use of wine and spirits respectively, presents a case in near connexion with the last. There are certain classes of cases in which, by the public and all-acknowledged practice of all physicians, previous to the year 1831, wine was used as a specific, and almost the only one. One of these is tetanus or lockjaw; another is, a low, nervous or typhus stage of any fever; and on the same principle, any and every case of great prostration of vital power, unless some opposing indication forbids the use. In some of these, opium is now substituted, and in others there is no known substitute.

It is very plain that this use of wine proceeds upon the ground of its adding *permanently* to the vital energy. But will any good physician use spirits in any case to give permanent strength? Can a case be shown, of the successful treatment of nervous fevers by the use of brandy?

I recur again to the first point, (see page 65,) that is, to the continuing or permanent effect of the habitual use of spirit upon the moral constitution: though like many other features of the

* Since this was written, I have the letter of Dr. Woods, of Andover, which see below, and in which he mentions headache. I think this is true of many constitutions; and I now remember to have heard the same thing of cider.

case, it is of too plain and every day a character, to be seen by our temperance lecturers.

The habitual use of spirit produces a *permanent* moral disease, besides the physical, which has no connexion with mere drunkenness, nor drinking fits. It affects the man as much when the drunken fit is off, as when on : and it affects those who habitually tittle, but are never inebriated, as much as the drunken.

A right perception of this great truth, is fundamental to all sound knowledge of the subject. The special importance of it is, that it cuts up by the roots, the low deceptions about "all intoxicating liquors"—"what matter is it whether a man gets drunk on wine or whiskey"—"alcohol is the same in every combination," &c. &c. As an example, and not as proof, I mention the case of the man now in Auburn prison, who killed his own very fine child of seven years old, by repeated whippings and beatings, and on whose trial I was one of the counsel. For four successive days, the blows of one day were levelled upon the deep, swollen and festering wounds of a previous day. This man was never known to be intoxicated, nor in any way incapacitated, except that liquor made him more hurried and malignant. He always did business correctly, and was a successful and wealthy country merchant. There was proof of his accuracy in business during the very intervals between the inhuman whippings. To the everlasting disgrace of courts, juries and codified laws, he escaped without hanging.

I also recur again to the second point mentioned above, (page 65,) which is in substance this: that the permanent effect just mentioned, is, among other things, a permanent, *utter perversion* and ruin of the moral constitution of the man.

When a man is given up to the habitual use of ardent spirit, every single natural affection and moral quality which we consider as virtuous and commendable, is universally eradicated from his heart. Thenceforth he becomes the victim of every base and malignant passion. He is false, mean, shameless, cowardly, jealous and cruel. The combined effect of cruelty and

cowardice, is seen in his cringing before the strong, and tyrannizing over the weak and defenceless. Hence the beating and butchery of wives and children.

No use of wine or cider merely, that is, by men not previously injured by spirits, ever produced these effects, or any of them, or any approach to them. I challenge all history and observation to produce a single case of this kind.*

The moral ruin of the man, is the great ruin. The subject needs to be unfolded with proofs and illustrations, which would exceed the length of this pamphlet. I have piles of notes before me, in which I have followed out each virtuous moral affection in its change to the opposite vice, with proofs from general and known facts, and many names of victims, which, in the course of my life, I have collected as examples. But such things have too much the character of every day fact, to be now much regarded. They are things which almost every reader understood something of from early life and from tradition. And the temperance appetite now sickens at plain truth, and needs something strange, paradoxical, incredible. This appetite goes on with progressive stimulation, like the drunkard's: rum is not strong enough for the one without pepper, nor can the other be satiated with absurdity, unless the thing asserted be also impossible.

11. The habitual use of ardent spirit most generally creates an unconquerable aversion to business and to all regular occupation, either mental or manual. This, connected with other causes which have been mentioned, leads to the ruin of property; and so the victim becomes a *ragged vagabond and outcast*. Such are the objects which we have almost constantly before our eyes, and from whose history we so frequently learn that they have been men of most respectable callings and property. But as to the waste of property, the fact is not quite so universal as most of the other points of ruin are.

* In every appeal of this kind, I refer to such facts only, as were publicly authenticated during three thousand years or more, previous to 1831. I have seen too much since that time, of individual facts drawn from "our villages," and converted into general propositions.

This concentration of effects bearing upon the man in the relations of business, industry and property, is, I suppose, entirely peculiar to spirit. I have never seen nor heard of such case resulting from the use of wine, and I presume that no recorded example of it can be found.

12. Death is the closing item in all discussions upon intemperance. From our statistics, it may be inferred that the United States lose, by the use of ardent spirit, as many men, in proportion to numbers, as France lost in the field during her revolutionary wars. But *our* loss is unceasing, in peace as well as war.

The habitual drinkers of wine and cider, are as uniformly fine, healthy and long-lived men, as can be found among any class or denomination, in any country of corresponding latitude and climate.

These twelve points of oppositeness between the effects of the liquors in question, are not all, even of those which press upon my mind. But I must proceed to the facts which prove them. Some of these have been occasionally stated as we went on. I now proceed to state, more fully,

THE PROOFS. 1st. About nine or ten of our northern and eastern states are inhabited by about seven millions of people—but say six millions of *country* people—and five millions and three-quarters of them temperate—who, and whose ancestors, have used cider as a common beverage from the time that, in each place, there was fruit enough to produce it. As it has been much and often urged in temperance papers, that the poor have no liquor to drink except spirit, I allege, on the contrary, that this is by far the most abundant cider country that ever existed—that the average price of the article is not much over a dollar a barrel, or a cent by the quart—that through all this district the apple tree is more universal than any other single tree, and a cider-mill the most common of all manufactories.

I call to witness these five and three-fourths millions of people, that they and their ancestors, who drank cider freely and habitually, (not usually drinking distilled liquors,) have ever

been entirely exempt from all the peculiar evils of intemperance as above enumerated. They have not been ruined sots, nor morally perverted; nor has the appetite for cider increased, but usually decreased in age; nor has any bodily disease, more severe than rheumatism, sore eyes, nose bleeding, and headache, been imputed to it; and as to these, very rarely. Cider is, and ever has been, drank without any restraint, except inclination, by all ages and both sexes. That signally bright, moral and christian race of men to whom I refer, have thus drank it, from generation to generation. Governors, judges, councillors, legislators, magistrates, farmers, mechanics and professional men—**ALL OF THEM** thus drank it. Ministers, officers of churches and private christians of all denominations—**ALL OF THEM** thus drank it. And I aver, that regarding those *who adhered to cider or vinous liquor only*, there was no suspicion of moral nor of bodily ills, unless in cases as rare and peculiar as any other evil. And among no people that ever existed, was there a larger proportion of men virtuous, amiable and intelligent; nor in the same latitudes, of greater personal strength and activity; nor of more general health, nor of a finer old age.*

Let it now be remembered, that according to the hypothesis of our present temperance societies, all these people, even from childhood, were drinking that which is exactly equivalent to weak brandy and water! Or perhaps the more favored doctrine at this moment is, that by reason of the tartaric and malic acids, these vinous liquors are somewhat worse than pure spirit and water. Three or four theorists have broached this doctrine, and it is instantly seized and stated as authoritative, by venerated temperance leaders. But what is the doctrine, in plain English? It is, that the acids which we taste in ripe grapes, apples, pears, peaches, strawberries and raspberries, are of so destructive a nature, that it is safer and better to drink pure spirit and water, than the liquors which contain these acids. Thus extremes meet! Thus the tipler on pure whiskey and water is told by the

* See note A. at the end of this Number.

highest temperance authority in our country, that the drink he uses, is safer and better than Judea wine, or the cider which all our fathers drank ; safer and better than that wine which was one peculiar blessing of the promised land, and which is a memorial of the Saviour's blood ! This doctrine, I suppose, is to go forth among the permanent temperance documents, and be put into the hands of all the men of science in all nations. As a mate to it, send along the disclosure made at Buffalo, that chemistry is indebted to American temperance for the discovery that there is alcohol in pure wine ! The pit of absurdity has no bottom.*

PROOF 2D. That the evils of intemperance in our country, such in substance as I have mentioned them, are attributable to ardent spirits, and to ardent spirits only, and that cider or other vinous liquors have no agency in the matter, I now vouch in testimony, all our temperance societies, all our committees, all our published addresses, resolutions and proceedings, previous to the breaking out of the new party about 1831. But as this may seem vague and general, I put it into such a shape, that every honest man may see the proof to be perfectly overwhelming and irresistible—and I bring it to the following point.

The American temperance society have published, under the special direction of their secretary, a book, of which the following is the title-page : "THE TEMPERANCE VOLUME, EMBRACING SEVENTEEN TRACTS OF THE AMERICAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY. *Published by the Society, at No. 150, Nassau-street, New-York. D. Fanshaw, Printer.*" These seventeen tracts, or such of them as bear the names of authors, are written by the following gentlemen respectively, viz : Dr. Rush, Dr. Edwards, J. Kitteridge, A. Dickinson, B. Dickinson, J. Marsh, Prof. Hitchcock, Bp. McIlvaine, Dr. Sewall, Dr. Gridley and Pres. Humphrey. *Every one of these tracts, which at all refers to the cause of intemperance, attributes it, in full, precise terms, to ARDENT SPIRITS, and to no other cause ; it is generally so at-*

* See note B. at the end of this Number.

tributed as to *exclude* any other cause; and in every instance where the cause is referred to, *it is unanswerably clear, that no other cause than ardent spirit was at all in the mind of the writer.* It may show the state of temperance opinion at that time, to repeat my reference to the first page of the book, where Dr. Rush says, that “fermented liquors often have a friendly influence upon life and health.” I also refer to Prof. Hitchcock’s tract, in which, at page 21, are the following very just remarks: “Judea was a wine country. * * In our country, the apple takes place of the grape. * * To use wine in wine countries, is, therefore, the same thing as to use cider in cider countries.” And though Prof. Hitchcock makes some objection to the use of wine in our country, (justly enough, if factitious wine is meant,) yet he attributes no evil whatever to it. And the above reference to cider makes it certain, that he never had then thought of its being injurious. The meaning is, (see the whole passage,) “Judea wine is as harmless as our cider.” The very title of his tract is against ardent spirits; and *ardent spirits, ardent spirits, ardent spirits*, is repeated through every page of his tract, and through every page of every tract in the book, unless, I think, in one or two, which perhaps do not speak of the cause at all.

To the eleven distinguished men just named, I add Dr. Beecher, who was earlier in the field, and not inferior to any in power; and we have twelve men who, presumptively, had seen, examined and reasoned as much about the causes of intemperance, as any twelve men living; they were all brought up in the cider region; several of them knew all about town life, and every one of them knew the worst that wine can do in colleges. They were advanced in life; the case in question is not one where any new facts can, with the least reason, be pretended; for as to cider, they necessarily knew every *general fact* that can be now known; and as to wine, they were learned men, and had access to the history of four thousand years of wine-drinking.

These twelve men fairly represent all that is known or can be known on such a question of general fact. I adduce them

now here as personal witnesses to the proposition, that the essential evils of intemperance in this country, such as they themselves described them, are wholly attributable to ardent spirit, and not to any other cause. That some of these men have now changed their opinions makes no difference : for it is a *question of fact* ; and chiefly of fact upon their personal knowledge. *The facts have not changed* : and I hold them to these recorded declarations, on the state of the fact as it was from the beginning of the world, up to about 1831. Several of these gentlemen have not changed their opinions.

These twelve men also fairly represent the remaining twelve millions of our free people, as they were up to the same epoch.

PROOF 3D. My next proof is from the consideration, negatively, of what cider has not done, among that population of five millions and three-quarters of country temperate people, above supposed, in the cider country. We have said that the whole of these have drunk cider, without restraint, from childhood. Then I call to witness this whole population and the whole temperance statement of the fact, that the child or youth who is accustomed to mixtures of spirits, *never escapes*—never lives to forty—seldom so long—and is *never temperate*. The fact that very few parents ever do allow their children spirits, unless rarely and very sparingly, is proof of a universal public opinion, supporting me. But some mad-men have given their children spirits more freely. The consequences have been detailed in better times, in temperance addresses ; and the tale is one—*death and ruin*. Now therefore, that these five and three-quarters of a million of people do all exist, having *from childhood* formed all the appetite which cider can form, is conclusive proof of a radical difference in kind between the effects of cider and spirits.

PROOF 4TH. As to wine, in modern wine countries, I refer to No. VI.

PROOF 5TH. As to beer, I refer to a short article which I hope to insert below.

PROOF 6TH. I refer negatively, to what does not appear of

the nature, kind, and extent of the evils of intemperance, from any account of, or reference to them, previous to about the reign of Elizabeth in England. And on this head my reference is made, first, in general terms, to the Bible, and to all that we have of history, and of life, morals and manners, from classic sources, and to medical history, and to the state of modern nations up to the period specified. Some reference has been made to these in speaking of the national extent of intemperance. But as all this opens a field infinitely too extensive to be explored in detail, even if I had the learning and ability, I shall next bring the question to a more precise test, after explaining whence that test is derived.

While I was attempting in 1834 to write in the *Temperance Intelligencer*, I was addressed in that paper by a writer under an anonymous signature, and after the exclusion of my numbers, a letter of his, nearly four columns in length, appeared in the December paper of that year, on the subject now in question. A large part of his letter is indeed engrossed in some ado about the misprint of a name, and in carping and quibbling at words and phrases—the whole showing a mind incapable of rising to that style of discussion which the love of truth will always inspire in every manly breast. But he seems to have had industry and learning too—much, beyond my own.

In my second number of one column, and the last that was allowed to appear, (see the November *Temperance Intelligencer* 1834.) I had begun, and I hope in a perfectly unexceptionable way, to state my propositions on the present subject. Among other things I said, “that it does not appear from the Bible nor from any ancient record, that evils beyond the mere fact of intoxication and a quarrel or a law suit, were noticed except in cases exceedingly rare, like that of Clytus. * * From the Bible and from all that is written on ancient morals and manners, intemperance would seem to be among the least evils known when wine was the drink. * * But this must be confined to wine countries.” That there always have been some evils from the

use of wine—and that intoxication is itself a great evil, has been very often admitted by me.

Now the test to which I bring this subject is the aforesaid answer of nearly four columns of "*The cold water man.*" I refer to it not for the purpose of confutation; I take it as it is. I have seen no statement more full or learned.

This writer refers to his authorities, ancient and modern throughout, and his references, scripture included, are forty one in all. They embrace a period of not less than fifteen or sixteen hundred years; among nations of three great descriptions, Greeks, Romans and Hebrews; and of population, for some part of the time, not less than one hundred or one hundred and fifty millions.

In all comparisons of this kind, it is fair to remember, that the ancients wrote, vastly less than ourselves. On the other hand we know certainly that we have all their best writers on morals. We know certainly that we have the Bible; and it is a full code.

Then I say, that from the before mentioned writers, it does not appear that wine intemperance, was ever referred to as producing--

1. Any single evil to the body politic, such as a general or frequent waste of life or of national resources, or pauperism.

2. Any single permanent evil to the moral, social or physical man, such as disease, aversion to business, loss of property, hatred and cruelty to weak relatives, jealousy, cowardice, general malignity, &c.

3. Any peculiar intensity or rapid increase of appetite.

4. Nor in a general way, was any such ruin, sottishness, beggary, or degradation, ever alluded to, as were constantly brought into view by our temperance addresses, until lately.

And I allege, that among that multitude of writers, and severe moralists too, pagan and christian, if such evils existed in the same degree as among us, there was just the same reason why they should allude to them, as that they should be so fully discussed by such writers as Rush, Beecher, Kitteridge, Sewall, and multitudes of others.

And the precise reason why the subject has never been so discussed before, is, that the evils in question have been coming on upon us gradually, and chiefly since the revolutionary war; and that never, until they became fully established, were the eyes of mankind opened to see them in all their enormity.

Merely as an example of the use of ancient records on this subject, I refer to the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans. In that, St. Paul draws up an indictment against the heathen for their vices; a more formal and regular document of its kind, than can elsewhere be found; and intemperance is not named in it all. In others, it is named. But the fair result of all is, that intemperance was not among the most prominent of Jewish vices. But compare the whole account of its effects as taken from sacred and profane history, for fifteen hundred years, with the intemperance of a single county among us in one year, and it will be seen how incalculable is the difference.*

PROOF 7TH. It remains to speak of wines in this country. We import our wines, and therefore, in general, we have strong kinds, which will bear the voyage and the climate. These are not the best for constant and general use; and hence, the test of our actual experience, compared with that of wine-drinking nations generally, is unequally and unfairly against me. I now submit to the inequality, and present the following tests of **THE HABITUAL FAMILY USE OF STRONG BUT PURE WINES.**

I was a resident of the city of New-York from 1794 to 1811, with occasional absences of somewhat over two years. Peculiar circumstances brought me early into an acquaintance with many public men, and with men in private life, who having some fortune, had always lived in a style of some affluence; and I think I may safely say, that my acquaintance was so general, though not universal, among such men, that with the assistance I am about to mention, I can truly state the effects of wine among them.

* See note C, at the end of this Number.

For this purpose, I made out a list of all the families I could recollect, of the following descriptions, namely: including families of distinction or known wealth, who *had always* used wine in the ordinary family way, on the table and at the side-board; and excluding such as, from *sudden* wealth, or *sudden* political elevation, or other causes, then used it, but had not been so brought up. My list amounted to 180. To make it complete in its results, down to the time when made, 1834, I had it revised by two friends who were brought up in the city; one of whom has always lived there, and who knows that order of people well. It will be perceived, therefore, that our list, if honestly made, would bring to a perfect test the effects of *strong* wine upon two generations; that is, the heads of the families as they were thirty or forty years ago; and their descendants now upon the stage of life. And as regards children, I appeal to all who know the habits of former times, for the fact, that children were much oftener urged to taste wine, than restrained from it. Then it will be perceived that my list embraced exactly that selection of 180 families, who, among all the families in this nation, ought to have shown the ravages of intemperance, in their most destructive and unsparing form, if the effects of wines and spirits be not widely diverse in kind. These 180 families, at the usual estimate of $5\frac{1}{2}$ to a family, would make 990 persons; say, 1000.

THE RESULT. Of the 180 heads of the families, there were,
Regular drunkards, or men ruined in estate, character or morals, or who became morose in their families, or showed any other marks of the ruined sot,.....0

Injured by drinking brandy, (drinking less wine than formerly, or none,) and whose lives probably have been, or will be shortened by it, but have lived to a good age,.....5

Living, mostly in very advanced age, none less than 70, and in character highly respectable,.....33

Died, mostly in advanced age and of highly respectable characters, many of them being our most distinguished public men,.....142

And of the remaining 820 members of those families, we could find no more, on the most careful investigation, who are, or have been, habitually intemperate, than	17
Brought down: intemperate heads of families,	5
Intemperate, in all,	22
Temperate, as believed,	978
	<hr/> 1000

The present estimate, (no doubt exaggerated,) is for the United States, 500,000 drunkards and 50,000 deaths annually. Every ten years, therefore, the half million of drunkards are supposed to die off, and a new half million to succeed. Then, 500,000)13,000,000(26; that is, one in every twenty-six is intemperate, and lives such, on an average, ten years: then again, 26)1000($38\frac{1}{2}$; and three times that, (for the three periods of ten years,) makes $114\frac{1}{2}$, which is the number of intemperate persons that our wine drinking families ought to have furnished, according to the alleged national average. The whole result is that those families, so far as we could discover, do not furnish more than one-fifth as many intemperate persons as the *alleged* average of the United States. But I suppose, truly about one-third. To bring this subject more demonstratively home, as it were, to the consciences of readers, I present the following selection of names from my list. The names of public men are so much public property, and so frequently referred to on all questions, that I hope this measure will not be deemed improper.

Selected names of *public* men in the city of *New-York*, deceased, at from about 70 to upwards of 90 years of age, and who are all believed to have used wine from early life, and in general, are known to have used it from 50 to 70 years:

John Jay,	Lewis Morris,	Richard Harrison,
Mathew Clarkson,	John Sloss Hobart,	Nicholas Fish,
Ezbert Benson,	Robert Benson,	Robert Troup,
Edward Dunscomb,	William Denning,	Richard Varick,
Brockholst Livingston,	John Broome,	Samuel Jones,
Edward Livingston,	Aaron Burr,	Marinus Willett,
Samuel Osgood,	James Duane,	Oliver Wolcott,
Gouverneur Morris,	Joshua Sands,	Rufus King.

If I felt at liberty to go among the living, and among unofficial characters, and into the country, and out of the state, it may easily be imagined what numbers of illustrious men the catalogue would include: Washington, J. Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and J. Q. Adams; Chief Justice Marshall, and all the judges; I presume all the heads of departments; Hancock, and probably every man who signed the Declaration of Independence. I never heard of an instance of alleged intemperance among any of these.* Among officers of high rank in the revolution army, there were two instances, I think.

But I think it right to say, under my signature, that the above list and selection of names are fairly made. They contain every name I could think of, coming within the description, except one, which has been omitted upon a mere doubt whether, after a very long life of honor, his habits altered. If any one thinks he can point out public men not here named, and whose families have proved intemperate, I admit the fact; and I add, that in every single instance of that kind which I can recollect, the heads of such families used ardent spirit habitually and freely, as was either known or reported at the time.

To select a single, insulated, perhaps a mistaken fact, in contradiction to all other experience, as the basis for a general rule of action in the world, is the perverted way of reasoning which misleads our temperance public; and of which a melancholy instance comes under my eye as I am finishing this paper. If a single case will prove a universal principle one way, will not an opposite case prove it the contrary way? It is in reference to such reasoning, that I depart for once from the history of millions, and nations, and ages, and of all present observation, to show that I, too, can cite individual cases. I think there can be no indelicacy in referring to the two following names of men now canonized by public respect, though not in civil office.

1st. The late Dr. Timothy Dwight, the theologian, president of Yale College. He had a favorite opinion, that sound old wine

* See note D. at the end of this Number.

was almost a specific against certain illnesses of children; and this opinion I have heard him press upon his friends, who would naturally enough adopt the views of so able and persuasive a man. It happens that my own family connexions by marriage, and his, were, to some extent, the same in New-York; and I personally know that most or all were, in fact, accustomed to offer wine to their young children, and not unfrequently to urge it upon them. I presume I have much oftener urged wine on my own children, than refused it. Dr. Dwight had a family of seven sons, who lived to manhood; and his near or remote connexions, living in the way I have mentioned, would amount to about 25 families, and 140 persons. Among his *family and descendants*, there is not, nor ever has been, one intemperate person. And among those who, from association, would be likely to adopt his ideas on the treatment of children, either absolutely none, or not more than in the proportion of my list of the 180 families.

2d. My next case, is that of Mr. Daniel McCormack, universally known in New-York. Being a bachelor of independent fortune, he kept house at his well-known mansion, upon the principle of having every comfort and no splendor. Strangers from almost every part of the world, generally brought introductions to him. And I believe, that to diversify a life, otherwise lonely, he had, almost every week-day, dinner on the table for a party of not over half a dozen friends, with about three kinds of wine, madeira, port and claret. All was plain, and as good as the earth could afford. Mr. McCormack always drank very temperately, and I believe uniformly; and his friends as much or as little as they pleased. In this way he must have passed more than 70 years, though from some personal knowledge, I can only speak of about 40. He departed this life two or three years since; and the following are extracts from an obituary notice of him, published in a New-York paper:

“Yesterday closed the mortal career of Daniel McCormack, Esq., of this city, at the advanced age of 92. He was a native of Ireland, but emigrated to this country long previous to the revolution. More than seventy years ago he signed a call for

the late venerable Dr. Rogers to take the pastoral charge of the Wall-street church, and was the latest survivor of those who made the call. Up to the last communion he was a regular attendant of that church, of which he was a member, and was distinguished for piety, integrity and benevolence. He was a merchant, and engaged for a long period in active business; but having acquired a handsome fortune, retired many years ago, and spent the residue of his days in Wall-street, near the corner of Pearl, and was, at the time of his death, almost the only householder in it. * * Generation had succeeded to generation, and had left him almost a solitary individual, even on the very spot where he had passed a life, protracted far beyond the period ordinarily allotted to the continuance of human life. His hospitality was proverbial, and one of the last of his habitually benevolent acts, was a donation to a stranger in our land." * *

And now I turn myself to behold madness and folly; and coming directly to the heart and conscience of every man who knows the facts, and has honesty to confess them, I ask, Are these things substantially true, or substantially false? Are the men here referred to, a fair representation of wine-drinkers in every part of our country? Did the early use of wine by these 180 men, form a rapidly increasing, intense, or unconquerably destructive appetite? Did that appetite lead on to moral perversion—to any form of bodily disease, or to social malignity? Are the cider-drinking population of our country, whom I have stated at five and three-fourths millions, a people given up to hopeless ruin in every relation—and are they all cut down by frightful disease in early life, to fill the graves of drunkards?

I also ask, Will you not make out your lists also? Is not spirit a much safer temperance drink than cider or wine? Have you not, therefore, millions of American yeomanry, and hosts of American statesmen, all drinkers of whiskey from childhood, and now in venerable age, enjoying, either the respect of the social circle, or the gratitude and applause of a nation? Let the lists be furnished.

NOTE A, page 79.

If I had here an adversary who understood his case, he ought to ask me why, according to my own principles, cider has not kept this country temperate, as I allege that wine keeps or tends to keep, the wine countries. I will just mention, that the explanation of this turns upon the peculiar and temporary fact, that we are a people *occupying progressively a new country*. Rum formerly, and whiskey now, *get the start of cider* by twenty years, and form the habit of a whole generation. The great and most unfair disadvantage under which I am compelled to write, forbid me to enlarge upon this, as upon many other points.

NOTE B, page 80.

Neither the absurdity nor the national disgrace are the features for benevolence to weep at. The bitter portion is, that on any future attempt to re-establish temperance, we must be met by the recorded arguments of great temperance leaders, in the mouths of whiskey drinkers. "Our pure spirit is the safest liquor ever drank; and on that point we silence you by the authority of your best men. It is in its *moral effect* a better liquor than Judea wine, which we know was blessed both in its ordinary use, and as emblematic of spiritual influences. Whiskey and water would have been the most proper drink for the sacrament!"

"Again—you preach the inexpressibly insidious nature of the appetite, and the irrecoverable fall of him that is seized by it—all perfectly false, as you well know. Here are you statistics showing thousands on thousands of reformed drunkards; and all your last publications are full of the fact. We know better—and you know BETTER. When a man judges the appetite to be too strong, it is but to sign the total pledge, and all will be well. It is not true that there is any serious danger in the habitual use of spirits!"

NOTE C, page 85.

Since this was written, I have received a pamphlet by Mr. Sargent, of Boston, in the appendix of which is an extract from Pliny's natural history, which gives some shocking instances of the effects of hard drinking, and among others, some deaths. There was no doubt a period, when fashion made it a matter of pride, among the

enormously rich Romans to eat and drink excessively, and at incredible expense. It would have thrown more light on the true state of the question, if Mr. Sargent had quoted the abundant facts to show, that extravagant eating was, at the same time, much the greater vice. And it would have been much to his purpose to show that such drinking was the *general effect* of the use of wine in ancient Italy or modern wine countries ; and that it generally has produced, and does produce, essentially the evils described by Dr. Edwards and others in "the Temperance Volume."

As to such statements as Pliny's, how merely declamatory they are, every one may judge from other authors, who, writing in the same strain, select three men, in many respects among the brightest examples of heathen virtue, as specimens of the ill effects of wine—THE TWO CATOS AND SENECA! Again: one man at a sitting, drank just about ten gallons of wine! And again—Nestor's DRINKING CUP was as much as a *strong young man could carry!* Such things are good authority! But as Nestor was a very old and very wise man, it tells well for wine. [See Mr. Sargent's App. F.]

Two years ago, I was in correspondence with a very candid and learned professor of one of our colleges, and who, doubting my principles to all the extent I allege, must I think have made great search in ancient lore, to find some account of intemperance, such as I challenge and have constantly challenged. The extent of his learning and research may be judged of from his hunting up such an author as Epicharmus ; a name, which I suspect, not one well-informed man in a thousand, ever heard of. He gave me this extract—

A sacrifice

Is still the parent of a feast ; a feast
To drinking leads ; drinking tends to revelry ;
And revelry as sure begets a quarrel.
Quarrels engender law suits ; at their heels
Come condemnation, judgment ; and the close
Of this eventful history, is stocks,
A gangrene and a fine !

Is this the worst? Just what we knew from the book of Proverbs before ; and bad enough. Now compare this and all antiquity, sacred and profane, with any one of the seventeen addresses in the Temperance Volume, or with almost any one county in Chipman's Report !

NOTE D, page 88.

It may be asked how I can affirm that all these drank cider or wine? I answer, that respecting about sixteen of the above selected list, I have seen them drink, and many of them very often. That Washington drank, very regularly, half a pint of best Madeira a day, I first learned in youth, from the Geography of Dr. Morse, who had been to Mount Vernon. More than twenty years ago, I saw Mr. Madison, and forty years ago I first saw Chief Justice Marshall drink wine; and I have seen the same of many others of our public men. But among the whole five or six millions of public and private men, did any one formerly refuse fermented liquors?

About forty years ago, also, I heard, or else had related to me, a minute discussion of John Jay, upon the best manner of making cider. But I cannot mention that man, without an expression of admiration for his venerable name. I have long thought that he was the first man, in point of intellect, that our revolution produced; nor was he less remarkable for his inflexible and lofty integrity, his great simplicity of life and manners, his rigid temperance, and his christian piety. Another age will confess, that his single exertions at the treaty of Paris, which secured to us the western country, have as extensively affected the destinies of nations, as any single operation of any human mind. His son has done all that a son ought, and as he ought, in writing the biography of such a father. But this simple effusion of sentiments, which a son could not express, may be permitted to a stranger.

To the Nestors, Catos and Senecas of ancient times, and the far more illustrious constellation of very aged men, which the single city of New-York can boast in a single generation, I now add the name of one less wise, but longer lived, Lewis Cornaro. "When, at the ago of forty, he began his course of temperance, he found that twelve ounces of solid food, and fourteen ounces of wine, or twenty-six ounces in all, was as much as he could consume with safety. And when, as he advanced in age, his friends advised him to increase the quantity a little, he found the addition of only two ounces of solid, and the same proportion of liquid food, occasioned a serious illness, and he was compelled to return to his former allowance." And as Cornaro lived to one hundred and four, it follows that he drank about six glasses of wine a day, for sixty-four years.

Abernethy, in his anatomical lectures, says: "Now, what I propose as a diet is Cornaro's diet, and it is no fanciful system." [Sure Method of improving Health, &c. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea and Carey, 1828, p. 83-4.]

There has been a low attempt in some of the temperance papers, to play off the name of Cornaro, as if it favored the new system. The same of Dr. Franklin; and as to Washington, it has been published that he was a TEMPERANCE man. As he was truly a *temperate* man, the form of expression is intended to give the publisher all the benefit of a falsehood, without the responsibility. If any one doubts whether it has been, among some such editors, a matter of set design to palter with the truth, and yet come short of a literal violation of it, let him look at the last page of the Temperance Recorder for February 1835, where is the "highly important" certificate of three Presidents of the United States. From that certificate it appears, or is necessarily inferred: 1. That those gentlemen have signed no pledge, nor joined any society. 2. That they do not recommend temperance societies to others. 3. That they confine the recommendation of abstinence so much to YOUNG MEN, as to leave some doubt as to others. 4. That what they say is confined wholly to ardent spirits, WITHOUT A WORD AS TO WINE. In this most interesting crisis to our country and the world, those gentlemen will not countenance societies, based on either principle.

Now, this certificate is emblazoned under a TOTAL ABSTINENCE arch and picture, inscribed, "TO TOTAL ABSTINENCE FROM ALL INTOXICATING LIQUORS, WE SOLEMNLY PLEDGE OURSELVES." Who pledge themselves? The intention plainly is, to dodge the lie direct, and yet to give the cursory reader an impression that the three Presidents had not only signed the pledge, but the *total* pledge.

I have recalled this sheet from the printing office, since the text was in type, to add other names, which have occurred to me, of very aged and distinguished men who have drunk wine generally, as I suppose, through their lives. I have seen it drunk by Robert Morris, the great revolutionary financier; by Charles Carroll, of Carolton; by Timothy Pickering, and by the venerable Dr. Rogers, of Wall-street church.

NO. XII. REV. DR. SAMUEL H. COX TO MR. HOPKINS ;
AND REMARKS IN ANSWER.

Did our Saviour, when on earth, usually drink the usual wine of Palestine ?

UTICA, Aug. 26, 1836.

Hon. SAMUEL M. HOPKINS, LL. D.

HONORED AND DEAR SIR: Your late letter found me in this city, busy in reference to the affairs of our Theological Seminary at Auburn ; nor am I now released, or sufficiently at leisure, to give it an answer suitable to my appreciation of its contents, or my respect for its writer.

You refer to some sentiments uttered by me in a temperance lecture, delivered in Geneva about a year since ; and your demand is, in great fairness, and with a delicate regard to correctness, which ought to be more common and more characteristic of Christian disputants or debaters, as to the very sentiments I uttered on that occasion ; that I would myself state them, so as to preclude the danger of misapprehension in the matter in hand, especially on your part, or that of your readers, in case you are brought publicly to treat of it. What I said, had respect to Luke 7.33-35. "*For John the Baptist came, neither eating bread nor drinking wine ; and ye say, he hath a devil. The Son of man is come, eating and drinking ; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners ! But wisdom is justified of all her children.*"

As to the point to which my sentiments, as I then uttered them, referred, I will pledge myself, at present, only for the substance ; since the forms of thought and the phraseology employed, have quite escaped me. If, however, I know my sentiments at present, and [I] can conceive of their having undergone no change for years, on the topic in question, what is now written may be equally satisfactory and equally right.

The point is, that from the words quoted, and from their parallels, in other parts of the New-Testament, it is too common to infer, or it is commonly inferred and affirmed with too much confidence, that our Lord drank wine not only, but habitually drank it, and so as to be matter of notoriety and observation.

My own position is, you will remark, a qualified one ; of the nature of a caveat or warning against any erroneous or hasty inference

in the case. I aver not, that the Saviour did not drink wine; or that, if he did, it was not a common, unconcealed and well-known usage of his life; though could this be proved, or were it conceded and believed, the case of some would not be proved, till they had established also the sentiment, that our modern wine was in substance the exact parallel or identity with that he drank. I believe that it was a beverage of a far different sort; that it was comparatively light in body, saccharine, recent, nutritious, non-inebriating, not fermented, probably; yet palatable, pleasant to the taste, and most probably, good and the best of its kind. The wine he made at Cana of Galilee, was, I judge, most probably of this innocent description; a beverage soothing and balmy, delightful and invigorating, yet harmless even to men who *have well drunk*; and adapted to *manifest forth his glory*, that *his disciples* might *believe on him* not only, but that his Messianic character might be accredited also by others—by an arrested and *sober* assemblage. It should be remembered that *this beginning of miracles did Jesus*, for a purpose as remarkable and unique, as was the conversion of the thief on the cross; it is hence an exception, and not a rule, an isolated instance, and not a specimen of habitual practice. It is an example of the use of wine, of an innocent and peculiar sort, and for ends as originally religious, to say the least, as is the appropriated use of wine in the eucharistical banquet. We should also remember that we have no evidence that Jesus himself tasted the wine he made on that occasion; on the contrary, the presumption is decidedly that he tasted it not.

My position, therefore, is, that, apart from its use for religious and sacramental purposes, we have no positive evidence that our blessed Lord drank wine at all; that no literal passage of scripture affirms it; that his free and ordinary manner of living, of *eating and drinking*, are contradistinguished from the extraordinary and symbolical abstinence of his harbinger, the great missionary of repentance and preparation, John, no more proves that he was a *wine-bibber*, or *gluttonous*, than it proves that *John had a devil*, or that all that the mendacious now say so copiously of the principled servants of God, is therefore authentic and true; that the wine he did drink, if it were proved that thus he did, might have been, essentially too, different from that currently approved in modern use, to sanction the inference that this is right, because sustained by his example; that the idea of his habitually drinking wine, had better be left to his enemies, than

his friends, to affirm ; that the inference that he did it, is not so certain as better evidence makes other things ; and that all the light of other passages, relevant and combined, seems to me to inculcate a different lesson, in this age of recklessness and self-indulgence. If Timothy may be taken as a specimen of usage among Christians, in the apostolic age, we know of that lovely young evangelist, (and may your son and mine be each such an one !) that he was habituated to *drink water* only ; that it required the inspired order of an apostle to bring him to change his practice ; that here he was to *use a little wine*, and I suppose only *a little* ; and that this was wholly and specifically a medicinal use : *for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.*

I should be happier, dear sir, to speak with you on this subject, than thus to write, in a hurry and far from my study, where I have some notes that I ought properly to consult. Very sorry I am that so much want of the urbanity of gentlemen and the courtesy of Christians, is to be found characteristically in the public disputes of our county, even on great moral questions, and I regret that you have to complain of its passive experience, in reference to your sentiments on the wine question. I know what it is, by wholesale, and on more questions than one ! but I find a glad resource in Heb. 12. 3,4, Rom. 15.3, 1 Sam. 8.6,8, and also *passim* in the precious oracles of God. * * * * *

With sincere respect for yourself, I am, dear sir, knowing that you will use aright what I have written freely,

Your friend and brother in the Lord Jesus Christ.

SAMUEL H. COX.

REMARKS IN ANSWER TO DR. COX'S LETTER.

Dr. Cox's letter exhibits, as I respectfully conceive, the same questionable course of reasoning, which has infected the arguments of far inferior men. There must, he alleges, be a caveat against certain conclusions, in the special case of our Saviour : if he usually drank wine, there must be a presumption, a priori, that there was something peculiar about it. We are not to admit the fact without "positive evidence," or a "literal passage of scripture;" and "the idea of his using wine had better be left to his enemies than his friends to affirm."

On the contrary, I put myself upon the candor of the reasoning world; upon the principle of all the sound defences of Christianity; and especially upon the principles of the reformation—when I affirm that,

1. Every single fact and statement in the Bible, is to be investigated upon the same sound, fair and impartial principles of weighing and comparing evidence, that apply to other facts.

2. Neither “positive evidence,” nor a “literal passage of scripture,” are demandable as a ground of action or belief in any matter of history, theology or human conduct. Reasonable evidence is all that we can ask; and in an immense majority of cases, all that we can have; and it is our duty to yield our assent to it, in matters of faith and of speculation, with the same candor which we would actually use on the same questions, if they were matters of interest.

3. In establishing facts regarding our Saviour, (and so in every other possible inquiry for truth,) the question regards not friends or enemies, but simply *truth itself*—facts as they are—and the evidence of facts, according to its real intrinsic weight.

4. If the character of our Saviour and the truth of the Bible will not stand these tests, then, by the common consent of their defenders, and of protestant christendom, they are to be given up. “*Choose ye.*”

Leaving this appeal and these principles to stand on their own basis, or to fall, I now go on to affirm that, by the fair and just interpretation of the passage in Luke vii., our Lord admits that he ate food and drank wine, in the common meaning of the terms, and in the usual manner, and denies that he is therefore to be reproached, as either a glutton or a tippler.

The passage begins with a just rebuke to the Jews, that they started, against teachers sent from God, quibbling objections, first one way and then the other, as suited the occasion. As, when children should say to their play-mates, “Come, dance and we will play for you;” the others would be too serious: “Well, then, let us *play grief*, and cry;” and they would be too joyous. They would not be suited either way. “So John (to meet

your prejudices) came, giving the highest example of an ascetic and self-denying life." "He neither ate bread nor drank wine, and ye say he hath a devil. You cannot, therefore, be won by personal austerities."

The son of man took a different course. He came eating—but *what?* Was it not *bread?* Came drinking—what? "Water," say some. Then, where's the contrast, in that respect, between him and John? Did not John drink water?

"Wine," say I.

Dr. Cox does not exactly deny that it was wine, nor exactly admit that fact. I insist on it, because,

I. Our Saviour says so himself; for words are always to be taken according to their plain, obvious intent, unless otherwise explained by the speaker. That such was the intent, here appears :

1. By the scope and meaning of Christ, in the whole passage which would be otherwise absurd.

2. By the common apprehension of the Christian world, of all sects,* ages, languages, tongues and kindreds, for eighteen hundred years.

3. Because our Lord's affirmation is as precise, and as full to the point, that he drank wine, and vastly more so, than can be found, for many of the most undoubted truths of fact and doctrine.

4. It is as precise and full as either human speech, or history, or moral teaching usually is ; and if in these, we are to wait for "positive proof," or a "literal passage," we should be involved in universal skepticism;

5. But more than all this : our Lord's affirmation that he drank wine, is not merely enough for common understanding, but it is precise enough for technical legal proof in all ordinary cases ; that is :

It is as precise as the language of witnesses in court usually is, and such as a jury ought to receive as sufficient, until more precision is insisted on in cross examination.

* A single sect, the Tationists of the second century, who were publicly tried, formally condemned, and never revived till now, can hardly make an exception. But it may serve as an example of the love of truth, that some of our temperance papers, referring to the substitution of water for wine, have given it out as the practice of "the Christians" of the second century.

If drinking wine were an indictable offence, (unless, perhaps, in the case of life,) and if, on the trial of a person indicted for it, a letter from him were proved, stating the same in effect and corresponding terms, which our Lord states in this passage, that letter alone would authorize the jury to convict him, and such a verdict would be sustained by the court. If a witness, under oath, in court, had denied that he saw a certain person drink wine, and if then a letter from him could be proved, to like effect and in corresponding terms, showing that he saw that person drink, that letter would be a sufficient ground for an indictment for perjury, and for a jury to find him guilty.

The same thing, also, if two living witnesses were produced in this last case, who saw the drinking, and who should swear that the prisoner saw it. The course would be this: these witnesses, telling the story in terms corresponding with the statement of our Lord, would end with saying, "*we saw him both eating and drinking and so did the prisoner.*" Upon this the attorney general would rest the prosecution. The prisoner's counsel, then, entering upon the defence, would be authorised to ask those two witnesses, "*do you mean to be understood that you saw him eating BREAD and drinking WINE.*" That question they could ask, but they would take good care never to do it. They would know the answer too well. And if they were men accustomed to degrade their profession by low quibbling, they would adopt the argument of our temperance papers, which the jury would hear with disgust, and, under a clear charge of the court, convict the prisoner.

II. So much as to what our Saviour himself says. But further: the words of his enemies, as quoted by him, and in the accusatory manner and spirit in which he quotes them, conclusively prove the same thing. I say, that *thus quoted* by the Lord, they prove it, though they are the words of his enemies.

The passage has a triple parallelism to which we must rigorously adhere, to make any sense of it. Moreover, it is a *paral-*

belism of contrast or apposition, in the manner so constantly seen in the poetry of the old testament, and sometimes in the prose of the new. It is thus :

- (1.) Verse 33, Neither eating bread nor drinking wine.
- (2.) “ 34, ——— eating ——— and drinking.
- (3.) “ Ib., ——— gluttonous man ——— wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.

Observe now that any one of these lines taken by itself, stands in opposition to both the other two. It so stands in the sense and meaning of our Lord’s argument. Observe also that each line consists of two members, and all three of the last members have a *parallelism of agreement or correspondence* with the three first; or if not so, the sense fails.

For example : It is not disputed that our Lord means to say that he came eating *bread* ; nor that his enemies on that ground charged him with *gluttony* ; nor that he denies, *by necessary implication*, the charge of *gluttony* to be just. What our Lord means, therefore, is, that he adopts the fact of eating bread, as true, and denies the perversion of that fact ; namely, *gluttony*.

Take now the second member of the third line, and either the same reasoning applies, or the whole is nonsense. His affirmation and denial regarding wine, are parallel with those regarding bread. He admits the use of wine, and denies the excess, as well as the general conclusion that he was the friend of publicans and sinners. He does this in the same manner, as he admits the use of bread and denies the excess in that.

For again : As it would be absurd, if our Lord lived like John and ate no bread, to charge him with *gluttony* ; so it would be absurd to charge him with *wine-bibbing*,* if he never drank wine. And his denial in both cases alike, is not of the *fact*, but of the *false conclusion*.

* I am ashamed to insert in the text, that “ wine-bibber ” is a term of reproach, like *glutton* ; and that as a man may eat bread and not be a *glutton*, so he may drink wine and not be a *wine-bibber*, in the sense of the text. It is most humiliating to be obliged to mention such things. But the quibbling and trickery of the temperance papers on this, and on many other subjects, have perhaps, led some well meaning persons to give up their common sense, respecting them. I need hardly say that no such remark applies in the remotest degree, to the candid mind of Dr. Cox.

I have drawn out this argument in logical connexion, in order to silence every tongue ; (all but the tongue of quibbling, which can never be silenced ;) but after all, the best appeal is to the honest understanding of an impartial mind.

I now further affirm : 1. That our Saviour not only drank wine, but did so *usually*. 2. That it was his common unconcealed public practice. 3. That he must have seen his disciples drink it, and did not prohibit them. And 4. That the wines which he and they drank, were good or bad, as occasion offered. And that all this was done with perfect temperance, results from his character. The following observations apply to these points promiscuously :

He “*came eating and drinking.*” His “*coming*” is, in scripture language, his whole advent ; his whole ministry in the days of his flesh. To come doing a thing, is to do that thing usually, or as occasion may call, during the time which the coming includes. A merchant comes to China, neither preaching the gospel nor exhorting to repentance ; a missionary comes preaching and exhorting : that is, he preaches the gospel and exhorts to repentance, as fit occasions may be found, during all the time of his mission. It is his usage.

That it was *public* and *unconcealed*, results from four considerations. 1. There would be no *visible* contrast between his manner of life and John’s, unless it were so. 2. All concealment, in such a matter, would be wholly unlike his general conduct, and unworthy of his character. 3. By his appeal and reproof of the Jews in this passage, he plainly treats his usage, in this particular, as well known to them. And 4. Their unjust reproach of wine-bibling, proves conclusively, that the fact of his drinking wine was well known.

To every protestant Christian, I especially adduce the following considerations, as proving (besides his own usage) that he must have seen his disciples drink :

1. I mention the vast abundance and general use of wine in all Palestine. There can be no reasonable doubt, but the use of it was much more extensive than that of cider in New-England and New-Jersey.

2. Our Lord often must have taken such meals as he could find among peasants, or have sent his disciples with a few pence to buy something at the villages. But he often also accepted invitations to large dinner (or rather supper) parties, and took his disciples with him. Such parties often consisted, in great part, of worldly people—as especially at the supper at Matthew Levi's. Sometimes he must have been without wine when, from fatigue and exhaustion he needed it—as perhaps at the well of Sychar. Then again, when he drank, it must have been poor or good, according to the condition of his host.

3. At all set parties, wine was certainly on the table, and drunk by the guests in general. This results necessarily from the acknowledged general usage. There is little doubt but it was also on the private table of the peasant.

4. His whole history shows that he frequented society, high and low, with a perfectly exclusive reference to his divine mission. His object was to gain access to men for the purpose of preaching and exhibiting righteousness.

5. Now, at these parties, he either drank wine and saw his disciples drink it, or he did not. If he *did*, it would be no more a subject of remark, than the question whether he and they ate beef or mutton. If he *did* never drink it himself, that fact must have been as much observed and as certainly recorded, as in the case of John. But especially it is not possible that twelve men of his disciples, should all, by common consent, have varied from general usage, without a special command: nor that such special command should be given without its being recorded: for it must have been in such case, a part of his moral system; and we know certainly that every part of that system is recorded, because the gospel contains "all things necessary for life and godliness;" and it does not contain *that*.

I ask every honest reader to consider how this would have been, had our Lord made it a part of his system, that his disciples should abstain from any other usual article of sustenance: for example, from animal food. Could such a thing be possible, and yet not the least mention of it be made? Should not we

protestants, in such case, be compelled to go out of the Bible and rest on tradition, for a part of our religion? When *leaven* was excluded, at certain times, was it done without many very express recorded commands? When in the "more salutary code," Mohammed forbade wine, was it excluded without terrible and reiterated threatenings?

And finally, when the apostles were left to administer the gospel and carry out its doctrines in more detail, we know that they recorded all that was necessary to regulate faith and practice, in all after times. In doing this, they take great pains to denounce all external rites, whether of performance or prohibition, and to exclude them from the pale of religious duty. Nay more: Paul would not suffer the disciples to abstain even from meat offered to idols, except in special cases resting on peculiar grounds; that is, he would not tolerate *abstinence from an indifferent thing*, on the grounds of general prejudice, and as a religious duty. And on the other hand, he would not tolerate the *performance of an indifferent thing* as part of religious duty, on the ground of such prejudice: and against this last, he directed the epistle to the Galatians. But if wine was forbidden *on moral grounds*, or indeed on any grounds, it was a new command, and must necessarily have been mentioned; nay, much inculcated in the teaching of the apostles.*

Such passages as "eating and drinking such things as they give"—and "it pleased the Holy Ghost and us to lay upon you no greater burden than" &c., had not this subject at all in view. And yet, though incidentally, they show the truth, with unanswerable certainty: for they never could have been so expressed, if it had been in mind that apostles in one case, and Gentile converts in the other, were not to drink wine. The *great* argument of Paley, is grounded on the peculiar certainty of inferences, from incidental expressions.

On the miraculous wine of Cana in Gallilee, see *all* the com-

* This brings me very near to the question of *expediency*, and the utter perversion of St. Paul's doctrine as to abstaining from charity. I lament to see that I must omit the remarks I have meditated. But, *nothing is morally right or due by way of example, unless it is morally right or due in itself*. Such cases as Paul states, are his special exceptions to this rule.

mentators ; and the substance of them in the Comprehensive Commentary. They show how new in the christian world, are the new doctrines about wine. For example, good Matthew Henry says, " This wine had a *stronger body* and better flavor than ordinary."

The true consequence of these views is, that it is not possible to affirm with too much confidence, that our Lord drank wine ; that he drank it usually ; that this was his open, avowed and public practice ; that he saw his disciples drink it ; that he and they used it with the most perfect temperance ; and that the wine drank by them, was of any and every kind, which occasion offered.

I state these views in opposition to those of an estimable minister, whom I alike respect for his ardent piety and distinguished talents ; a man whose instructions, exuberant with eloquence and reason, I have frequently heard, and I hope never without profit.

PROSPECTUS OF PART II., AND MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS.

Accident and delays, unavoidable in a village printing office, have now kept these sheets more than two months in going through the press. As a considerable number of letters, remain to be published, and several separate points are yet wholly untouched, I have concluded to send off what has been printed, with the addition of some explanatory remarks and miscellaneous observations, to make them less incomplete, and also with a prospectus of the remaining papers.

REV. MR. BAIRD'S REPORT OF HIS AGENCY IN EUROPE.

At the moment of suspending my printing, as just mentioned, the New-York Observer comes to hand, with this report. The statements it contains are so perfectly confirmatory, as far as they go, of all my views, and so contradictory to those of the present societies, that I am determined to seize, and if I can, to preserve them. They may possibly be omitted in the second volume of

the Permanent Temperance Documents, as a vast proportion, and that the best, of the reasonings and facts of the societies, have been omitted in the first. I beg every reader to procure and keep a copy of this report. It appears in the Observer of November 26, 1836.

Mr. Baird reports his visit to France, Hamburgh, Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, Saxony, Holland and Belgium. In most, or all of these, he had access not only to the highest authorities, but to the lower classes, and especially to temperance societies, where any existed. The following remarks result from it :

1. The words, *wine, cider, beer, or fermented liquors*, or any of them, are not once mentioned in the report.

2. The words "*intoxicating liquors*" are *twice* mentioned, and in connexion with brandy. The connexion there appearing, shows unanswerably, that the writer meant by it other liquors of the nature of brandy, such as gin, &c.

3. There is no expression or allusion, through the whole report, implying that the writer's mind was turned to any other than distilled liquors, as a source of intemperance. And what he *does* mention, is as follows :

AS TO FRANCE: "A minor, but still important consideration, was the hope that such a work, [his history of temperance societies in the United States,] might be the means of awakening France to the evils of the *increasing* use of brandy and other intoxicating liquors, IN ALL THE NORTHERN, and especially, in all the MANUFACTURING CITIES AND VILLAGES of the kingdom." [See above, page 38,] and remark, that these evils are not referred to in the south and middle, where wine is chiefly made, nor even in the distilling districts, where it is equally plenty, nor in *country*, where all the people drink wine "like water." Again: how can there be any "*increasing evils*" from brandy! The French drink nearly a barrell of wine a year for every man, woman and child, which gives nearly as much alcohol as we use. How is brandy worse than wine? How are *rivers* of it worse than the quantity of wine they have *always* used? How can this evil be possibly "*increasing*?"

HAMBURGH: "A large quantity of ARDENT SPIRITS being consumed by the laboring classes." "A species of WHISKEY, made of potatoes."

DENMARK: "A good deal of ARDENT SPIRITS is used by the lower classes in Denmark, and a considerable quantity of whiskey is manufactured, though much less than in some other countries of the north of Europe."

SWEDEN: There is a vast manufacture and consumption of what is there called BRANDY, but what is really nothing but POTATOE WHISKEY. About forty millions of gallons of this whiskey are consumed annually there, by a population of about three millions. [A note mentions that all classes use it.]

PRUSSIA: I found an interesting temperance society at Berlin. * * I failed of obtaining full statistical information with regard to the quantity of ARDENT SPIRIT consumed in Prussia. There are not a few manufactories of brandy, (or WHISKEY made of potatoes.) Some establishments make almost incredible quantities.

SAXONY: He (the prince) told me that a sensible diminution of the quantity of ARDENT SPIRIT used in the kingdom had taken place, * * in consequence of the exactment of laws calculated to repress the sale of intoxicating liquors, and especially that of BRANDY. * * Many and large establishments for manufacturing WHISKEY or BRANDY, as it is called.

HOLLAND: No kind of liquor mentioned.

BELGIUM: Much ARDENT SPIRIT (gin and brandy) is manufactured in Belgium, and much is consumed by the lower classes. * * He (the king) expressed to me his deep conviction of the baneful effects of ARDENT SPIRIT in his kingdom.

Mr. Baird closes his report by an enumeration of five of "the most important objections and obstacles" to the success of temperance in those countries. Among all these, there is not the least allusion to the use of wine by the higher classes, either in its example or direct consequences; nor even in the German countries, to the use of beer, though we all know it is there drank by all classes most profusely; nor the least pretence that any one there supposes all these liquors to be alike in effect.

The foregoing reference to Mr. Baird's report, reminds me to enter a formal protest against all future discoveries of the effects of wine in wine countries.

The reasons of this in substance are, that the experience of mankind on this subject, from the time of Noah, is sufficient; that the evidence of that experience, taken before this question arose, is safer to rely upon, than discoveries made under party excitement: and to my own mind, a more special reason is, that I have seen too many instances of perverted statements of fact, made, not always dishonestly, but often with the best intentions, and under biasses and delusions which discolor the facts.

A few weeks since, I heard Mr. Baird's report quoted in a temperance lecture, in a way, which I will not affirm, was any wise untrue, as to the letter, nor intended to be incorrect in substance; but it left on my mind the impression that Mr. Baird was to fortify the delusion about French intemperance in general.

I see that some letters from other missionaries are published, and more will come to the same purpose, most honestly intended and sincerely written. *One of the greatest dangers which now threaten our public benevolent institutions, is, that on this, and other subjects, they may be brought under the domination of party.* Those missionaries, I fear, will be pressed to furnish evidence about intemperance, "as they understand it." Brought up as many have been, under a long course of unfair and perverted teaching, they will be perfectly sincere in expressing views, which can be turned to make "the worse appear the better side." No answer will appear, because means are found almost wholly to exclude all access to the public; and then the note of triumph will be raised again, because there is no answer! I protest against all new discoveries of *general fact* on this subject.

INTENDED SECTIONS OF PART II.

No. I. Letters to and from the correspondents of Dr. Edwards.

I explain that the correspondents here intended, are those whose letters to Dr. Edwards in answer to his inquiries, have been published in the ninth report of the American Temperance Society. That report is almost wholly occupied with these letters, concerning the effects of fermented liquors on those particular gentlemen, (being mostly dyspeptic,) with scarcely a word regarding the general interests of temperance. But since these letters were plainly considered by all parties, as bearing in some manner, on the *temperance effect* of such liquors; and as the gentlemen were plainly opposed to my views, I determined respectfully to cross-examine them, and *ask for their FACTS*.

At the end of more than three months, I have answers, mostly of great courtesy and candor, from thirteen of the gentlemen; and from twenty, I have no answers; *or none which I am allowed to publish*. Of the thirteen, six only state that they have known cases of the besotted ruin which I have heretofore described, resulting from fermented liquors: and seven who have answered, either admit that they never saw such cases, or will not say that they have seen them. I mention this to apprise all concerned, of the urgent want there is, of **FACTS PERSONALLY KNOWN**, to support certain hypotheses.

The letters, and a summary at the end, will show this subject in a very interesting point of view. One of my questions regarded *unfermented wine*. See below.

No. II. Of the reformation of the alleged five hundred thousand drunkards.

In answer to Mr. Smith's question.

No. III. Of abstinence by way of example.

The doctrine and practice of Paul—the late application of it exactly reverses his meaning, taking the exception for the general rule—whether any thing is morally right or due by way of example, that is not so in itself, except cases within Paul's exception—wheth-

er the Christian system ever allows any possible accommodation in life or doctrine, to prejudices, except as aforesaid.

No. IV. President Humphrey's testimony regarding beer, and its effects in England: and on the Athletæ, ancient and modern.

President Humphrey's published letter—his view of *facts* supported by all the best authorities—his theory.

No. V. The chemical sophism, that alcohol is the same in all combinations.

No. VI. The moral sophism, that *all* use, &c., of alcohol is an immorality *in itself*.

It is an immorality in general, but always dependent on circumstances—inadvertency of Chief Justice Savage on the point of *malum in se*—tribute of respect to him—use of great names—if a proposition in morals or physics is unsound, whether many great names will make it sound.

No. VII. The medical sophism, which supposes that the diet to anticipate or subdue disease, is the proper diet for man under strong exertion of body or mind.

The proper regimen adapted to any constitution, is that which will sustain all the powers in their best exercise—it must be temperate in all things—but sufficient—and invigorating and restorative to the extent required by the exhaustion of vital energy, and the age and constitution of the subject—all ascetic tendencies are as unphilosophical as they are anti-christian—these tendencies now lead to great waste of life and usefulness, especially in the ministry—fermented liquors often very essential to feeble constitutions—few if any ministers would now dare to use them, however essential. Youth little need them, and their unbiassed appetite will, in general, little desire them.

No. VIII. Of moral delinquencies, and of honest delusions and errors in the conduct of the temperance cause.

Selected cases of sophistry—of disingenuousness—of unfaithfulness to trust and to promise—of conscious incorrectness—the use of odium and denunciation—unjust accusation, pressed against those

who were denied all fair means of defence—the power of reproach and contumely in the hands of assumed “friends of God and man”—on “crushing character”—the registry of the adhering clergy at Albany—it was a *preconcerted* plan, *intended* as a measure of compulsion and terror.

No. IX. Of the imposture of unfermented wine.

Its failure—known to the leaders, but kept a secret from the subjects of the delusion—communications of various other facts, made to the writer, in strict confidence and by men of honorable character, who know the delusion, but do nothing to favor it. The article to be passed off for unfermented wine, is a grape molasses—none now to be had—that, or any other molasses, can be made so strong as to *keep*—the object of the deception, is to wrest scripture evidence from its proper bearing. *Vinum defructum.*

No. X. Historical notices of the change in the principles of the temperance societies.

Successive efforts to change the pledge—this done under formal engagements not to attempt any change in it—the change as regards the New-York society, finally effected by surprise—respectful appeal to Dr. Edwards on the sudden change in the language of the American society, as appearing in the eighth report, in Permanent Temperance Documents, page 491, and why it differs from the spirit of the seventh report, as stated *ib.* p. 341, &c., and from previous reports generally—on what induction of facts is it founded?—like appeal on the omission in the Permanent Temperance Documents, of the fundamental facts and reasonings of early advocates, his own included—expostulation on the propositions stated at the beginning of the ninth report—when or where have they (most of them) been proved true, as there stated?—appeal to Dr. Edwards why the ninth report makes no statement of either the progress, or decay of temperance, as the truth may be?—what is the actual state of the temperance effort?—what were the real causes of the breakings up at Saratoga?—position of some distinguished men there, who were new guests at such assemblies—who are meant by “*eleventh hour men*?” also by the men who “*skulk and show two faces*?” as mentioned in a letter to be published. Can Christians hold an exoteric doctrine,

and besides it, an esoteric doctrine?—this point felt, but neither denied nor asserted at the “august” convention at Saratoga.

No. XI. Summary.

Connected view of the principles of these pamphlets, showing the harmony of truth, whether revealed, or apparent to common observation—or derived from the past history of man.

Some of these numbers may become unnecessary: if all, I should be better pleased. Some of them, such as parts of that on *moral delinquencies*, I should print with repugnance. But the hopes of temperance, involve the hopes of the world; and if, as I suppose, that cause under its present management must fail of any great and permanent good, it is proper that mankind should know by what means it was perverted from its original object.

In a former page, I said I should not be surprised, if a drunken Englishman or Russian were now and then seen in Paris. But I admit more than that, though I never saw it. From Mr. Baird’s and other late testimony, I doubt not but spirit is gaining some ground even in wine countries. I never stated that fermented liquors are any *certain and final defence* against the distilled. It is enough that they have *mainly* preserved those countries, and still preserve them, in general, from spirits, and that wine is never there named as an evil. In the letters yet to be published, the idea will often be found, not that fermented liquors are the same as the distilled, *but that the use of the former leads to the latter*. Suppose it so, (which I deny,) and I will end with this point for inquiry: Why the utter and final exclusion of *spirit*, in which object all might co-operate, did not embrace a remedy for all the evils which *that view* of the subject presented.

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.



