



DUKE  
UNIVERSITY



LIBRARY

*W. R. R.*

THE SUBSTANCE  
OF AN ADDRESS,  
DELIVERED  
IN VINDICATION  
OF THE ORDER OF THE  
SONS OF TEMPERANCE.

PAVITTVILLE, N. C.,

REV. C. H. PRITCHARD,

March 26th, 1850.

CHURCH OF DOMESTIC DISCIPLINE No. 1.

---

PAVITTVILLE.

WILLIAM W. WELLS, PRINTER.

---

1850.



6

THE SUBSTANCE  
OF  
AN ADDRESS,  
IN VINDICATION  
OF THE ORDER OF THE  
SONS OF TEMPERANCE,

DELIVERED IN

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C.,

BY

REV. C. H. PRITCHARD,

March 26th, 1850.

---

Published by Lafayette Division No. 2.

---

---

FAYETTEVILLE:

WILLIAM H. BAYNE, PRINTER.

---

1850.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

FAYETTEVILLE, APRIL 8th, 1850.

REV. C. H. PRITCHARD,

Respected Brother: At a meeting of Lafayette Division, the undersigned were appointed a Committee for the purpose of soliciting a copy of the Address delivered by you on the 26th of March. In consideration of the success attending the refutation of the various objections urged against the Order, we deem the publication of your Address of superlative importance, and its circulation productive of results beneficial to the Order. Hoping that you will yield to our solicitations,

We remain yours fraternally,  
in L. P. & F.,

JOHN C. THOMSON, }  
JOHN S. RABOTEAU, } *Committee.*  
S. J. HINSDALE, }

---

FAYETTEVILLE, APRIL 15th, 1850.

DEAR BRETHREN: I received your note of the 8th, containing a request, (as a committee of Lafayette Division of the Sons of Temperance, No. 2,) of a copy of the address, delivered on the evening of the 26th. Allow me to tender to you, and through you to the Division, my thanks for the honor conferred on me, in making the request. It is with a great deal of diffidence I comply with the request, not being accustomed to write for the public eye. I cannot promise you that you will find it precisely the same as it was delivered extemporaneously—there will appear some subtractions and additions. I hope, however, that it will meet with your approbation, and though decidedly overrated by you, its publication may, in some measure, contribute to the promotion of the cause, whose interest lies so near your hearts.

Yours, in L. P. and F.

C. H. PRITCHARD.

To J. C. Thomson, J. S. Raboteau,  
and S. J. Hinsdale, Committee.

## ADDRESS.

WORTHY PATRIARCH: In compliance with a request made by Lafayette Division, No. 2, Sons of Temperance, of this place, I appear before you and this large and respectable audience as an advocate of the Temperance cause; and especially of the Order recently established for the promotion of Temperance, of which you and many others present, with myself, have the honor of being members, styled the "SONS OF TEMPERANCE." The present age has been appropriately denominated an age of improvement; many valuable inventions have been made promotive of man's interest. Among them stands prominent the Order we advocate. Being of comparatively recent origin, and but little known to many, there are several questions which naturally and properly arise in the mind respecting it, such as, What are its objects? Are they good? What are its facilities for the accomplishment of these objects? Are they adequate? Are there any objections urged against it? Are they of sufficient validity to render it unworthy of confidence, and deserving reprehension? We therefore propose to arrange the remarks we may make, under these three general divisions, 1st. The objects of the Order—that they are good. 2d. The adaptedness of the Order to the accomplishment of these objects. 3d. The objections commonly urged against it, and their invalidity.

1st. The objects of the Order, and that they are good: The mere statement of the objects will convince any one that they are good. They are declared in the preamble which accompanies our Constitution and By-Laws, which reads thus:

"We whose names are annexed, desirous of forming a Society to shield us from the evils of intemperance, afford mutual assistance in case of sickness, and elevate our characters as men, do pledge ourselves to be governed by the following Constitution and By-Laws."

I do not purpose, at this time, dwelling on all the objects therein expressed, as time will not admit, but chiefly on the one first mentioned, which is the *primary* one: "To shield ourselves against the evils of intemperance." This implies that intemperance exists; that it is productive of evils; that we are, to some extent at least, exposed to its evils. That intemperance does exist, daily observation will prove. That it is productive of evils is equally clear. It may be styled, with as much propriety as is the love of money, "the root of all evil"—a root from which all kinds of evil spring. Intemperance is injurious to man in a *pecu-*

niary sense: It draws heavily upon his purse, in numberless instances exhausts it, to supply him with intoxicating liquors; leads to idleness and prodigality in various ways; both of which tend to poverty; in proof of which, many who were once in good circumstances are now destitute of the necessary comforts of life. It is injurious in a physical sense: it gives rise to numerous diseases—undermines the constitution and renders medical aid inefficient, so that it may be said of many intemperate persons, as it is said of “bloody and deceitful men,” they “shall not live out half their days.” It is injurious in an intellectual sense: It promotes a neglect of intellectual culture; leads to intellectual inertness; renders the mind imbecile, and frequently so impairs it as to render it little else than a wreck. It is injurious in a moral and religious sense: It is the parent of all kinds of vices—proves in many instances an inseparable barrier to his repentance and conversion: and being injurious in this respect, proves to be injurious throughout eternity, for it is one of the works of the flesh, and “they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God”; and if excluded from heaven, must be confined forever in hell, “where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.”

The injurious effects of intemperance are not confined to the intemperate man. Has he a family? his wife and children also suffer. Is he injured in a pecuniary sense? so are they. Frequently are they poor, and destitute of food and raiment convenient for them. Is he injured in a physical sense? so in some instances do his children inherit from him enfeebled constitutions, which give way to diseases, either engendered or to which they are otherwise exposed, and they are hastened to a premature grave. Is he injured in an intellectual sense? so are his children, through want of interest, or means, the cultivation of their minds is neglected, and they grow up in idleness and ignorance, objects of pity, and more frequently of contempt. Is he injured in a moral and religious sense? so likewise are his children, and, frequently, his wife. They walk in his footsteps—acquire a taste for intoxicating liquor in early life. Their moral training is neglected; they grow up slaves to all manner of vices, and meet with the same unhappy results throughout eternity. Not only does his family suffer, but society also, *negatively*, in losing those benefits which would have resulted from his industry, the exercise of his intellectual capacities, and the influence of his wholesome counsel and example. *Positively*, from the influence of his baneful example, exerted directly by himself, and indirectly through his children.

Intemperance is unquestionably a source of many and serious evils. Our preamble presupposes also that we are exposed to these evils. Hence the importance of a shield. That we are exposed to intemperance and its evils, is manifested from the following considerations: Men make, buy, sell, and use intoxicating liquors as a beverage. There are fountains, reservoirs, and streams of intoxicating liquors to which men have access; and there are strong temptations to drink. They are taught that they may drink moderately, with impunity; that they have power to control themselves. They are *entreated* to drink—troubles come upon them—it is an easy way to be merry—to bid dull care be-

gone. A thirst for it is soon induced, and the man forms the habit of drinking to excess, which he finds exceedingly difficult to overcome. He is a slave to the tyrant, and suffers the horrid evils above mentioned. Man being exposed, there is need of a shield, which leads us to notice, as is implied in our preamble,

2d. The adaptedness of the Order as a shield against the evils of intemperance. This it does by shielding us against intemperance, the *cause* of the evils. We argue the adaptedness of the Order, first, from the suitability of the pledge, which is as follows: "No brother shall make, buy, sell, or use as a beverage, any spiritous or malt liquors, wine or cider." This pledge is a comprehensive one; guarding every point through which intemperance may arise. Surely, if a man neither makes, buys, sells, or uses as a beverage, intoxicating liquors, he will be effectually shielded against intemperance and its evils. But the pledge taken must be kept, to answer the purpose. We therefore proceed to show the *probabilities*, not to say the *certainty* of one's keeping it when taken. The solemn and impressive manner in which it is administered, forcibly picturing to the *mind*, not to the *eye*, (as some suppose,) the evils of intemperance. His honor as a man is at stake, having pledged his honor as a man to keep it. The frequency of the meetings—the appropriate manner in which they are conducted—a regular weekly examination into the character of the members, on this subject: Has any brother violated his pledge? is one of the questions asked. It is made the duty of a brother to report a guilty brother, should his guilt be known to him; for the neglect of which he is subject to a fine. At these meetings there are suitable addresses delivered, calculated to keep alive and increase his temperance zeal. If he attends punctually to the meetings, (which he is required to do when it does not interfere with his business or the prior claims of his family,) he will not fail to leave the Division room strengthened in his purpose to be faithful. Besides, he has a pecuniary interest at stake: he has paid his initiation fee, his weekly dues; he is entitled in case of sickness to a weekly benefit of three dollars. In case of his death, a funeral benefit of thirty dollars. In case of the death of his wife, fifteen dollars; all of which he forfeits if his pledge is broken. The benefits he realizes from being sober; his honor as a man; this pecuniary advantage is worth more than a glass of liquor. It is probable that in time of temptation he will resist. Lastly, but not least, prayer is offered to Almighty God for his assistance; a Chaplain is appointed quarterly, whose duty it is to open the meeting with reading the Scriptures and prayer, and close with the benediction. The blessing of God has attended us. The adequacy of our institution has been proven in numerous instances in which the most abandoned drunkards have been reformed, and continue so to the present time; and there is no necessity for their becoming again entangled with the yoke of bondage from which they have been set free. It is said that we are inadequate, because some have fallen. By no means: their shield was all sufficient had they continued to use it. It would have defended them, but they let it fall; the fault was their own, not the Order's. It does not argue the inefficiency of the Church, or the grace of God, when one backslides; these are not at fault, but the individual, who,

through unfaithfulness, renders them ineffectual. Nor should the Order of the Sons of Temperance be deemed inadequate because it is unsuccessful in some instances. We are then well adapted to the accomplishment of the end we have in view.

3d. The objections commonly urged against us, and their invalidity. It is no argument against us that objections are urged, unless it can be shown that they are valid; for who had more objections urged against him than our Saviour? What has been more opposed than Christianity? Yea, an institution is rather to be suspected that is allowed to pass unobjected to. "Wo unto you," said Jesus, "when all men speak well of you." Nor should an institution be discountenanced, even though it were not free from objections, when its ends are laudable, and the good it accomplishes greatly overbalances the evils that might incidentally follow, through the perverseness of human nature or the ignorance of man. Should the use of the steam engine be abandoned because evil results have followed its use? By no means. These evils are not necessary; arising in most instances from carelessness; and the great benefits growing out of its use, outweigh the evils that follow. Nor should the Sons of Temperance be repudiated should there be found objections, though they be real, existing against the Order, if they are not of a *serious* character. We do not claim to be perfect; we claim to be an institution having accomplished, and still accomplishing, great good in the world; and destined, by the blessing of God, if its friends are faithful, to accomplish much more. May it be with us as it was said of the Israelites—"The more they were persecuted, the more they multiplied and grew." The first class of objections urged against us that we shall notice, are those urged against our pledge. As we deem this to be our stronghold—a vital part—the foundation of our glorious fabric—we must guard it as well as we may be able.

1st. It is objected by the *manufacturer* of spirits, that we interfere with his pecuniary interests; he cannot join; what shall he do with his grain and fruit if he does not convert them into spirits? We reply, sell them. But it is so difficult to get them to market. Not so difficult as you suppose. Not as difficult as formerly. Steamboats are plying up and down our rivers; railroads and plank roads are being constructed through our country, which are comparatively cheap and speedy means of transportation; or, if you prefer, raise horses, cattle, hogs, sheep, chickens, ducks, and turkeys for market; they would find ready sale, and be profitable. Why are we dependent upon other sections of the country for many of these, when there is so much grain and fruit in our own? There is no necessity at all, that your productions should be converted into intoxicating liquors, spreading intemperance and its host of evils abroad in our land; a livelihood can be made without it. "Ye brought nothing into this world, it is certain ye can carry nothing out; having food and raiment, let us therewith be content."

"Love of money, the root of all evil," is at the bottom of this objection, and should be enough to render it invalid. You had better live and die poor than be rich at the expense of others; which will be the case if you become rich by making and selling intoxicating liquors.

2d. The *retailer* of spiritous liquors objects to the pledge on the

same ground. He cannot join; he would not have the manufacturing of it stopped; he would not have persons cease to buy or use it; he could not then sell; it would interfere much with his pecuniary interests. He finds it a lucrative business; he is *violently* opposed. He would lose much if this pledge were generally taken and kept? We would reply that there is no necessity for your selling the article; you can make a living in a much more genteel, respectable, and honorable manner; a manner much more agreeable; for surely it cannot be very agreeable to have a parcel of drunkards around you. This you evince by being the first one to turn them out of doors when they get drunk—and much more *conscientiously*; for surely you are not without compunctions of conscience in dealing out to man that which is so pernicious in its effects, both as it respects this world and that which is to come. You had better never have a fortune, than have it at the expense of ruining others. You had better live poor, than bring upon you the curses of broken-hearted widows and orphans, yea, than the curse of God pronounced against him who putteth the bottle to his neighbor's mouth; or the wo pronounced against him of whom the offence cometh. You are indirectly culpable for all the offence committed by the drunkard, when intoxicated through your instrumentality. It would be decidedly to your interest to take this pledge to which you so much object. If you will not, it would be well for you if all others were to ~~cease~~ *compelled* you to cease its traffic. There is no necessity for it; you should abandon it at once.

3d. The *consumer* objects to the pledge. He would drink, and therefore he would not have the making and selling of it to cease. He pleads for its use; and as long as persons use it, there will be found those who love money so much that they will make and sell it, notwithstanding the evils that will follow.

These objectors take high ground; they declare that total abstinence is *unscriptural*. We deny the charge and demand the proof. And what is it? Why the scriptures speak of persons who drank. True; but does that make it *scriptural* to drink? or *unscriptural* to totally abstain? The scriptures speak of drunkards, murderers, adulterers, thieves, and liars; are these things therefore scriptural? No—they speak of these as objectionable; so they do of the use of spirits. It is said, "Look not upon the wine when it is red; when it giveth its color in the cup; when it moveth itself aright; at the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." It is also said, "Wine is a mocker, and strong drink is raging, and he is unwise that is deceived thereby." It was enjoined upon the Priests, in performing their official duties, to abstain from wine. It was enjoined upon the Nazarites, during their separation, to totally abstain from the use of wine. The instruction given to Lemuel was, "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes, strong drink; lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted." It is said by those who plead for the use of spirits, that St. Paul urged Timothy to use no longer water, but wine. True; but mind, it was take a *little* wine, and the reason was for his "*stomach's sake*" and his "*often infirmities*"; in a word, as a medicine, as a tonic; giving no countenance to the use of it as

a beverage. The scriptures speak of those who totally abstained in high terms: the Nazarites—the Rechabites—John the Baptist. To prove that total abstinence is unscriptural, the objectors must show that the scriptures *forbid* total abstinence, and make it *obligatory* upon men to drink intoxicating liquors, which they cannot do.

2d. The objectors urge that there is no necessity for being so stringent; persons might be allowed to indulge in the moderate use of it. We reply that it is necessary to totally abstain, first, because it is the only way to reform the drunkards. If *they* allow themselves to use it at all, they will go to excess. Our object is in part to reform them. Secondly, it is the surest way to keep persons from becoming drunkards. All drunkards have been made so by drinking moderately at first; an insatiate thirst is formed, and they rush headlong into intemperance. But it is urged there is no necessity for it; men can control themselves. Whether there is necessity for it or not, does not alter the case; it is an incontrovertible fact, that men by this means become drunkards; and the very reason urged why there is no necessity for it, is one reason why so many are ensnared. “Men can govern themselves”! they presume, upon their strength, which proves to be perfect weakness. Better, much better, that men felt they were weak, and in danger of being overcome; and that the safe course was total abstinence. All men are more or less in danger who do not totally abstain; there are so many sources of temptation to which they are exposed, which lays them to a greater or less degree liable to be overcome. Persons who drink are not content to drink alone, and use all kinds of stratagems to induce others to join them.

Before we dismiss this objection, as the objector has made an appeal to the scriptures to justify the use of intoxicating liquors, we will offer some additional reasons, deducible from the scriptures, in favor of total abstinence. The scriptures would certainly condemn a steward for wasting his Lord's goods: we are the stewards of the Lord; the money we have, if honestly obtained, is from Him. He requires of us an improvement of this talent. We are certainly wasting it if we spend it for intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage; for no one is so presumptuous as to urge that its use is *necessary* in this respect; nor can it be urged as innocent. If the above be the true state of the case; if the unprofitable servant who hid his Lord's money, was condemned for *not improving it*, how much more culpable is the one that wastes it in spending it for that which, to say the least, is *unnecessary*? We are taught to “abstain from all appearances of evil.” However innocent the use of intoxicating liquors may have appeared in times past, it certainly has the appearance of evil *now*, and very justly so; for the use of it as a beverage tends to excess, the result of which is evil.

The scriptures enjoin harmlessness. Persons who drink spirits as a beverage, do harm by precept. They invariably urge in justification of their course, that there is no harm in it if used in moderation, and entice others to drink with them. Their example is injurious. Others listening to their reasoning and entreaties, and imitating their example, have become intemperate. These so-

called moderate drinkers have been the means of making many immoderate ones. The scriptures also enjoin us to be useful. A man, by totally abstaining, may do a great deal of good in reforming the drunkard, and preventing those that are tending to drunkenness, from becoming drunkards. He will inculcate total abstinence, and his teachings will have some effect; sustained by a corresponding example. It is in vain that you urge total abstinence upon others, when you indulge yourself in the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. The scriptures teach us to deny ourselves even of that which is innocent in itself, if the indulgence will have an injurious effect upon others, in making them offend. "If eating meat," says the Apostle Paul, "maketh my brother to offend, I will eat no more meat while the world standeth." How much more is it our duty to totally abstain from the use of spirits as a beverage, if by its use our fellow creatures are made to offend, of which there is a strong probability, being influenced by our precept and example in using spirits as a beverage; we should, as we have opportunity, do good unto all men. Here is an opportunity of doing good—totally abstain yourself—it will do you no harm; it may do others good—unite with us—you may influence others to do the same; and will you not make a *little sacrifice* in *hope of doing much good?*

2d. It is urged as an objection to us, that we wear a regalia and march in procession. This, to say the most of it, is a very trivial objection; and should have no weight against the Order, even if a good reason could not be assigned for the practice, as the objects of the institution are so laudable. The regalias are not very gaudy or expensive. Custom has made it a law for all societies, nearly, to wear their badges of distinction. In our colleges, there are literary societies which have their badges; our military companies have their appropriate uniforms. Where is the impropriety of this gallant band, united together in waging a war of extermination against intemperance, wearing their badge of distinction? There is also call for this, owing to the privacy of our plan of receiving members: many would not be known as Sons of Temperance, and their influence would be lost to the good cause, if it were not for their appearing on an occasion like this, clothed in their regalia. You have not to ask who is on the side of temperance; look for yourselves and see. True, there are some who are in favor of temperance, that are not with us; but their zeal is not of the right stamp, or they would unite with us, and manfully cooperate in the struggle against intemperance. As to the marching in procession, what objection can there be in this? We have funeral processions—Fourth-of-July processions—May-day processions—military processions—no objection is urged to these; they are proper and expedient. Where then is the impropriety of the Sons, marshalled and equipped with the emblems of their Order, their banners unfurled, with appropriate music, marching from their Division room to the place appointed for the delivery of a temperance address? I can see no validity in the objection urged. The place must be reached in some way; why not in this? It is done decently and in order.

3d. It is urged as an objection, that we are on a par with the Masons and Odd Fellows. The design of this objection is to direct

the prejudices existing in the minds of many against these institutions, against us; and thereby impede our progress. There is a strong presumption against this objection: the *ignorance* of the objector respecting that which he certifies to be the case. How does he know that we are on a footing with them? He is neither a Mason, Odd Fellow, or Son of Temperance. It is an imagining of his own. He is disqualified to draw a comparison between the institutions, or to make such a declaration respecting them, being *ignorant* of them. They are secret institutions. A man to understand them correctly, must be associated with them. Besides, his objection is based upon the presumption that these institutions are really objectionable, which, those who know them best, deny to be the case. Whether they be objectionable or not, we know not; not being connected with either of them. We are not here to advocate or condemn them. It would be unscriptural "to speak evil of those things which we know not." This we know: if we be on a par, they must be very good institutions; much better than many are wont to give them the credit of being. The objector, to give validity to his objections, must *prove*—not merely *assume*—that these institutions are objectionable; also must he *prove*—not simply *assert*—that we are similar; and that the points of similarity are objectionable ones; to do which, it will require a personal initiation into each of them, which should he submit to, judging from the conduct of others, he will not likely do. This we are certain of: he will find a striking dissimilarity between us: that while we, as they, do incorporate charity in our design, we have an additional end in view, viz: the promotion of temperance, which is our primary object, and gives us a decided preference.

4th. It is urged as an objection, that we are a secret society. True, we are; but not in an objectionable sense. The time and place of our meeting is not concealed; if they were, there would be something suspicious. We meet once a week (every Monday evening) on the street leading from the Market to Mumford street. The precise place of meeting may be known by the light of a beautiful lamp suspended near the door of the building. The objects of our society are not concealed; if they were, this would be an additional ground of suspicion; but they are published to the world; our secrets, whatever they are, are not *injurious* either to those who are ignorant of them, or to ourselves who know them. No one has ever, or is likely ever, to sustain any injury from them; they are perfectly harmless. They are not *useless*; we find them of importance, to avoid imposition, as does an army its countersign in time of war. It is necessary that our business be conducted privately, which would be apparent from a moment's reflection. In case of the rejection of an applicant, or in the trial of a delinquent brother, prudence would dictate that these things should be attended to privately. The mere fact that we have secrets, cannot be objectionable, unless it can be shown that evil will follow from them. Every man has his secrets; every family their secrets; every merchant his private mark; churches their secret councils; every government its secret councils. Those that fear the Lord have his secrets, revealed only to them by virtue of their being initiated by repentance and faith into the grace of God. Heaven has its secrets. "It doth not yet appear what we

shall be." It is represented as "glory to be revealed in the people of God." The Apostle Paul "heard unspeakable words, which were not lawful for a man to utter." These secrets are not objectionable; they are both expedient and lawful; so, with the secrets of the Sons of Temperance. Besides our secrets are not *undiscoverable*; we are willing and anxious to reveal them to you, provided there is no bar of immoral conduct to render you unworthy of initiation. "Our gates are only closed to the unworthy." Are you willing to take the pledge? to take stock in our mutual insurance company by paying your initiation fee and weekly dues? apply to some brother to recommend you, and we will admit you to all our secrets; and if you find anything objectionable, you can withdraw. Stress is laid upon our being a *secret society*. This so far from strengthening, weakens the objection, as our secrets are harmless. A society implies two or more persons united. Our society requires not less than nine. A secret, held by a society, approximates towards publicity in proportion to its numerical increase; and if persons would allow us to accomplish our wishes, we would incorporate the world into our society, and thus make our secret universally known, which would be very desirable, as it would make the world temperate. Do not, after this, offer any more complaints that we have secrets. If they remain secret to you, it is your own fault.

It is urged that we are inveighing against the government. There have been secret societies which have done this. All this may be true; but does it follow that this is our object? We deny the charge, and call for proof. There is just none at all forthcoming. It is only an imagining of our enemies which they themselves do not believe. We have direct proof to the contrary: one of our By-Laws forbids the introduction of any subject of a political or sectarian nature before the Division. Have we not as worthy citizens, as good patriots, among us, as are to be found among our opponents? I trow we have. If you have any suspicion of our being dangerous to the peace of the country, it is your duty to come and see for yourself the steps we take to injure the country. And we give you liberty to disclose all such measures that you may find used among us.

5th. It is urged that we are antagonistic to the Church. A grave charge this, which we unhesitatingly deny, and demand the proof; and what is the reason assigned? That we are a human institution, attempting what the Church, a divine institution, should accomplish. We acknowledge that the Church should accomplish more in this regard than she does, but we deny that because we are aiming in part at what the Church aims, (for it is only in part that our objects are the same—the Church aims, and should aim, at the reformation of man from every vice by a sound conversion of heart to God—we aim directly and chiefly at his reformation from intemperance,) that we are antagonistic. Then, steam and wind must be opposed to each other because they are both employed to propel vessels. Then the different Protestant Churches must be opposed to each other, for they are aiming at the evangelization of the world. Then the different companies of a regiment, and the different regiments of an army, must be antagonistic, because they are engaged in opposing a common enemy.

Stress is laid upon our being a *human institution*. We are not a human institution in an objectionable sense of that term; we are not human, antagonistic to God, in the sense that human nature is. We are not opposed to God; our principles tend to Godliness; we are not human in the sense that we are without God; He is on our part; we seek His aid; His blessing has attended us; to Him we owe our unprecedented success. We repeat it, we are not against the Church; we throw no obstacle in the way of the Church's operations. An institution that assists the Church cannot be against the Church; we have and still do afford assistance to the Church. Men who were intemperate, and neglected the preaching of the Gospel, having been made sober through our instrumentality, do not now spend their Sabbaths at the groggery, the gambling table, and the bar-room of some tavern; but are found at the Church of God. If they occasionally attended before, their minds were so under the pernicious influence of spirits, as to unfit them for receiving the truth. Now, their minds are clear. Or if they went free from the effects of spirits, and became impressed seriously upon the subject of religion, they would resort to the inebriating glass to drown their convictions; but now they have no such alternative; and there is a stronger probability that they will be led to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, and to unite with the Church of God. This is not mere imagination: these results have followed in many instances. As we therefore assist the Church—we cannot be against the Church. Again: Wise and worthy members of the Church cannot be against the Church—wise and worthy members are Sons of Temperance, both among the ministry and laity. Have they lost their attachment for the Church? Would they not forsake us if they found that we were opposed to the Church? They remain and are among our most zealous members; we cannot, therefore, be against the Church. The spirit manifested by these objectors, savors a good deal of the spirit exhibited by one of our Saviour's disciples upon a certain occasion: He saw one casting out devils that followed not with them; he informed the Lord that they had forbade him because he followed not them. But Jesus said, "forbid him not, for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me; for he that is not *against us is on our part.*"

It is said if we are not directly and designedly against the Church, we do, nevertheless, indirectly injure her. First, you interfere with the financial interests of the Church; members of the church give to the temperance cause, and withhold their contributions from the Church. If this were really the case, we would be ready to condemn the person's conduct, but not the institution. The tendency of the institution is to make one more liberal; as a general rule, persons do not give enough to charitable purposes; they are able to give more than they do. Many are illiberal because they have not gotten in the way of giving, by giving to the temperance cause; having learned to give more, the probability is that they will become more liberal to the Church. The objection urged, reminds me of a very common one urged by the stewards on some of our Circuits and stations, relating to our missionary collections. They urge, "do not press the missionary cause too much. The people will not contribute enough to support the gospel among themselves." But what is the result? Those appointments which contribute most liberally to the missionary cause, support the gospel the best among themselves. The tendency of the objection is a bad one; it would have us confine our charities to the church, and affords a plea to one who is penurious to withhold his assistance from all benevolent institutions that are disconnected with the Church; yea, even to turn the beggar from his door, because he contributes to the Church, or might not be able to do so if he were to assist him. It is true that no member of the Church is justifiable in curtailing his contributions to the church because he contributes to the Sons of Temperance, nor has a Son of Temperance an excuse for it; he should be the more liberal, because he is assured, when he is sick, of assistance; or in case of his death, or that of his wife, assistance to bury them. The objection has no foundation in fact; but is the result of one's imagination. You might as well say that a man should not insure his property, because he might not give as much to the Church. I would say insure, and he will be the better able to give. The Son of Temperance insures his health, his life, and that of his wife, for an amount sufficient to aid him if sick, and to bury them in case of death. I suppose that the Sons of Temperance will be found as ready to respond to the call of charity now,

as they were before they became Sons; and more so than those who spend a good portion, if not the whole of their income for intoxicating liquors.—*Secondly.* It is objected that we indirectly injure the Church, because there is a danger of persons substituting the Order for the Church. We know not of such an instance; we are sure that no such instruction is given them in the Division. It is possible that some one might do it, but this would be a perversion of the institution. Suppose some should be so silly, is this a reason for abolishing an institution doing, and calculated to do so much good? then might we argue for the abolition of the Church, for in despite of all the preaching to the contrary, there are those found who substitute the Church and its forms, for vital religion; but the Church is doing too much good to be abolished because some will pervert it. Nor should the Order of the Sons of Temperance be abolished, though some might be so unwise as to substitute it for the Church. *Thirdly.* It is objected that we injure the Church, because there are found members of the Church who are more zealous Sons than christians. This may be the case. We can but lament that it is the case; but does it follow that their want of zeal arises from their being Sons? By no means. If the truth were known, these members were never as zealous as they should be; that they are equally as zealous now as before they became Sons. There are such members in all the churches; wanting in zeal, they cannot be induced to pray in their families, or in public; and it is very well that there should be some good field where they will work zealously, and a better one besides the Church could not be found than the Sons of Temperance. Until the objector can show that it is the tendency of the institution to diminish one's religious zeal, and that it actually does it, we contend that the objection is invalid. *Fourthly.* It is urged that we injure the Church by taking the glory from the Church. We reply that the work of merely effecting a Temperance reform does not belong to the Church, her glory is to effect the conversion of the world. A reform alone from intemperance is but a small portion of her work, as great a work as it is. Besides, to take the glory from the Church would imply that the Church had effected the reformation which is not the case. Temperance institutions have been chiefly instrumental in it. This is their appropriate sphere, or it implies that the Church would certainly have accomplished it, if the Temperance societies had not interfered, which is very questionable; for how tardily the work of reformation went on, ere Temperance institutions were formed; yea, how rapidly did intemperance spread and prevail; or it implies that we reject the co-operation of the Church, which is not the case; we are glad to have the members of the different Churches, united with us, and regret much that many of them are so backward in coming up with us to the help of the Lord, against the mighty. Intemperance would not long exist in our country, were the Churches to give us their countenance and hearty co-operation; or it implies that we do not give the Church the credit due her for the assistance she has already rendered. This is not the case. We are happy to state that there are those both in the ministry and laity that have united with us; that have and do still render us invaluable service, and we are always ready to acknowledge our indebtedness to them, and hope that others will imitate their worthy example. If indeed you are jealous for the glory of the Church, leave it not for others to accomplish so good a work; come and unite with us and let the Church at least be a sharer in the glory, or if you please, adopt us, and take all the glory; we care not for that, so the end we have in view is effected: a thorough and permanent Temperance reform.

6th. It is urged as an objection against us, that we are unscriptural.—We are unscriptural it is said, because there is no direct and positive authority for our organization in the scripture. True; nor is there any for the formation of Missionary, Bible and Tract Societies, but are they unscriptural because this is not the case? surely not. There is nothing in the scriptures forbidding or condemning their organization. There is nothing in their organization contrary to the spirit or letter of the scriptures, which must be the case ere they can be with propriety called unscriptural. So with the Order of the Sons of Temperance; they inculcate nothing unscriptural; their organization is not forbidden, they are not therefore unscriptural. Besides, the scriptures speak of total abstinence societies, the Nazarites and Rechabites; these were not condemned, but rather approved. It is urged that we are unscriptural because we promote a union

of the world and the Church. The scriptures enjoin us to come out from the world and be separate. True, but they justify our mingling with the ungodly for their good, which did our Saviour, which the Pharisees objected to on the same ground that you urge. There is nothing transacted in the Division contrary to christianity, or calculated to contaminate one. Love, Purity and Fidelity, is our motto. No profane language or immoral conduct is allowed. Christians may exert a happy influence upon the irreligious, by uniting with us, and there is another good arising from it, which is desirable to be accomplished. The promotion of union between christian denominations. They differ upon doctrinal points which has the effect of producing too great a separation between them; here we can unite on one common platform; here we may become acquainted with each other, and form attachments for each other, that do not otherwise exist. It is urged that we should not do evil, that good may come. This does not apply to us. It is doing good, not evil. Christians should have, and do have a considerable influence with men, and with God, by their prayers. This influence should be actively exerted in behalf of the cause of Temperance. Weigh these words : "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

7th. It is objected to us, that we are unnecessary. It is stated that we are unnecessary, because an individual may form the resolution to totally abstain in his own mind, without joining a society, and signing a pledge.— This has doubtless been the case in some instances; but there are numerous instances in which it has failed; giving publicity to the resolution formed, affords *additional* strength, or leads a man to *exercise* the strength he has. The opinions of others have a powerful effect upon men. The man addicted to intemperance, needs all the aid he can call into requisition; besides, being associated together in a society, strengthens each other's purposes, as the members of the Church afford mutual assistance to each other in working out their salvation. It is vain for a man to contend that he can save his soul as well out of the Church as in it; nor can a man addicted to intemperance resist the temptations to intemperance and live a sober life as well disconnected with a Temperance institution, as if connected with it. Our object is a Temperance reform. Concentrated effort is requisite to effect it. Our foe is too formidable to be overcome without it. Men in war do not meet a foe single handed and alone; but they unite in armies, and by concentrated action they conquer; so must we. Christians could not evangelize the world separately; hence the Church is formed, uniting their efforts, and accumulating strength by accessions from the world of those whom they conquer. They hope to prevail until the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of God and his Christ. It is said that we are unnecessary, or the Lord would have given some directions; or at least intimation of our being expedient. We reply, the Lord has given no direction about Bible, Missionary and Tract Societies, yet the church has found them expedient and necessary to the accomplishment of her ends. Are they unnecessary because not spoken of in the scriptures? and their formation not made obligatory upon the Church? Surely not. Nor are the Sons of Temperance therefore unnecessary. If they were as great an evil as some are disposed to think, why has not the Lord, who knew the end from the beginning, warned us against them. He has warned us of the rise of false prophets, false Christs, and of antichrists; but not a word of the Sons of Temperance, which some seem to think are no better. We have a presumptive at least in our favour.

It is urged that we are unnecessary, because the church covers all the ground we occupy, and much more; being *superior*, there is therefore no necessity for an *inferior* institution. We admit the superiority of the Church; we do not pretend to compare with her, and are only sorry that our opponents institute the comparison, which leads us in defence of ourselves, to speak of them in this sense. We admit that the Churches occupy *higher* ground than we do, and *more ground*; but we deny that they occupy *all the ground* we do; we take the ground that persons should not make, buy, sell, or use as a beverage, intoxicating liquors. Some of them allow the making, buying and selling of spirits; they have no rule to exclude them; all save one, (the Methodist) allow the use of spirits as a beverage; and if total abstinence is requisite to effect a Temperance reform, (which is unquestionably the case) how are the Churches sufficient for this thing? The Church mentioned comes the nearest to being qualified for the work, in forbidding the use of spirituous liquors, unless in cases of necessity; but her discip-

line is not stringently exercised on this point; nor is she explicit enough in reference to the making and selling of spirits. It is contrary to the spirit of her general rules, and those persons who make and sell, are expelled by some of her ministers if they will not desist; but others allow them to remain, because there is no explicit rule upon the subject. There ought to be one. Any one who makes and sells spirituous liquors, is not fit for the Church of Christ. There is not zeal enough in the Church on the subject of Temperance to effect a reform. It is but seldom a subject of discourse from the pulpit. The members of the Churches in some instances by precept and example encourage the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. Can the Church, under these circumstances, effect a Temperance reform? Nay, she must become more stringent in her disciplinary regulations; more zealous and exemplary in her membership on the subject of temperance, ere she can do this work. Besides, even if the Churches were all that they should be in their discipline, and the zeal of their ministry and membership, there would still be need of temperance institutions, because of the very reason urged against us, the *superiority of the Church*. Some of them require, ere they will admit a person to membership, a sound conversion to God; others, at least the exercise of true repentance, a reformation from every vice; and afford no asylum for the intemperate man, until he comes up to these points. In view of the evils of intemperance to which he is subjected, he can be induced to renounce intemperance, while he is unwilling to give his heart to God. The Sons of Temperance open to him their door, and give him a welcome; not as a substitute for the Church, but as a shield against intemperance, which frequently proves to be preparatory to his admission into the Church, and his conversion to God.

8th. It is objected that we are *inefficient*; we cannot accomplish the end we have in view, because it is urged, a man must be converted ere he can be reformed from intemperance. We reply that he must reform ere he can be converted. Man must "confess and forsake his sins if he would have mercy." But he will not remain reformed any length of time, it is said, unless he is converted to God. We grant that conversion would prove a great help to a reformed drunkard, provided he *totally abstained*; and we would earnestly exhort every Son of Temperance to seek to become a *son of God*. Then, if he is faithful to his pledge, he will be steadfast; and if "faithful until death he will receive a crown of life." But it is exceedingly doubtful if a drunkard is converted, that he will be steadfast if he does not *totally abstain*. Many have *presumed* upon the grace of God, and have fallen, through the use of spirits as a beverage—some among the ministry as well as the laity. It is a dangerous position to assume that it is absolutely necessary to the reformation of a drunkard, that he should be *converted*. Is this an adequate mark of a change of heart? Then many that have reformed, may conclude that they are converted, who have not *repented* of their sins. More and stronger marks are requisite to establish a genuine conversion, than this. He must show that he has forsaken every sin; heartily sorrowed before God; sought, and through faith in Jesus, found the peace of God; the witness of the spirit testifying to his adoption, and renewing his heart, which is exhibited by a righteous, sober and Godly life. We admit that a degree of God's grace is requisite to assist the drunkard in his reformation; but that he must be converted, we cannot; as this would argue that all reformed drunkards have been converted, which is not the case. But some of the Sons have fallen: true, but this does not argue the insufficiency of the Order, as we have shown under the head of the adaptedness of the Order to accomplish its ends.

9th. It is objected that there is a want of stability and uniformity in the Temperance reform. Allusion is made to the first Temperance society that was formed, in which the use of wine was allowed; to the Washingtonians, in which the making and selling of spirits were not forbidden.—These have passed away, and now we have the Rechabites, and the Sons of Temperance. We reply that any defects, or want of stability in those that have gone before us, is not chargeable to us; and therefore should not be alleged as an objection against us. The change has been that of improvement. And are we objectionable because we have improved? because there has been a want of uniformity in this respect? Then do we find objection in the vegetation; the grain is sown, then appears the blade; then the ear; the full corn in the ear. Then is man objectionable; he was a babe, then a young man, then he arrived to maturity. Then may we

object to all the improvements in the arts and sciences; to the grace of God in the heart, which is progressive, if not impeded by the unfaithfulness of man; and to God's economy of grace with man. There was the Patriarchal dispensation; the Mosaic; then came the Prophets; then John the Baptist; then the Saviour himself. Is He and his dispensation to be rejected because they were preceded by inferior ones, that have passed away? are we to be rejected because inferior societies preceded us, and have passed away? One must be at a great loss for an objection, that would resort to such an one; yet it has been urged. We think that we have satisfactorily refuted the objections noticed, and that if you have objected, hitherto, you will cease to do so. Though you may not find us entirely free from objection in your estimation, let the laudableness of the enterprise, and its efficiency to accomplish its ends, induce you to co-operate with us. If you will not, take heed how you throw obstacles in our way. Take the counsel of Gamaliel, before the Jewish Council in reference to the Apostles: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this council, or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." May our success continue to prove that we are of God.

Brethren of the Order, be faithful, be punctual in attending your meetings—do all in your power to promote the cause you have espoused—let others see by your example that it is not vain that you are a Son of Temperance; look to God for grace to assist you; shun temptation, and pray for the success of the cause in general. May God bless you, bless all, and speedily banish intemperance from the world.





N.C 975.6 Z99B 1841-59  
nos. 1-25 v. 4 342894

N.C Pamphlets

RBR  
recat

N.C 975.6 Z99B 1841-59  
nos. 1-25 v. 4 342894

**THIS VOLUME DOES NOT CIRCULATE  
OUTSIDE THE LIBRARY BUILDING**

