

The

Reformed Presbyterian
= ADVOCATE =

OCTOBER 1928

Published by the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church
 in the interests of its Principles and Institutions
 A MONTHLY MAGAZINE FOR
 CHRIST'S CROWN AND COVENANT

CONTENTS

P Has No Legal Right to Work for Amendment to Constitu- tion	223
The Smith Acceptance Speech	224
The Candidates' Statements on Prohibition	228
Text of The Paris Treaty	230
An Anti-Bible Society "Without Profit"	232
Letter From Kentucky	233
Ask Something Easy	235
C. E. Topics	240

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY
 REV. R. W. CHESNUT, Ph. D., Editor
 Duaneburgh, N. Y.

- Terms: \$1.00 Per Year in Advance. -

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter
 Acceptance for Mailing at Special rate of Postage provided for in Section 1103.
 Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 12, 1923

ADVOCATE PRINT, Duaneburgh, N. Y.

Reformed Presbyterian ADVOCATE.

Stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.

Published the first of each month by the General Synod of the Reformed
Presbyterian Church at Duaneburgh, N. Y.
Subscription, \$1 Per Year in Advance.

VOL. LXII.

NOVEMBER 1928

NO. 10.

NOTICE: All matter for Publication in the Advocate should be in the Publisher's hands not later than the 15th of the Month. We aim to have the Advocate ready to mail during the first week of each month.

Publisher.

President Has No Legal Right to Work for Amendment to Constitution

Any citizen has an absolute legal right to work for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. Any group of citizens have the unquestionable right to band together and spend money in a union of effort to accomplish that end. It is, however, a matter grave doubt whether it be proper under our Constitution for the President of the United States to become the champion of any one faction for the change of the Constitution. It is significant that when our constitution was drawn, the oath which the president is obliged to take was made different and broader than the oath exacted of other Federal and State officers. The pre-

Reformed Presbyterian ADVOCATE.

Stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.

Published the first of each month by the General Synod of the Reformed
Presbyterian Church at Duaneburgh, N. Y.
Subscription, \$1 Per Year in Advance.

VOL. LXII.

NOVEMBER 1928

NO. 10.

NOTICE: All matter for Publication in the Advocate should be in the Publisher's hands not later than the 15th of the Month. We aim to have the Advocate ready to mail during the first week of each month.

Publisher.

President Has No Legal Right to Work for Amendment to Constitution

Any citizen has an absolute legal right to work for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. Any group of citizens have the unquestionable right to band together and spend money in a union of effort to accomplish that end. It is, however, a matter grave doubt whether it be proper under our Constitution for the President of the United States to become the champion of any one faction for the change of the Constitution. It is significant that when our constitution was drawn, the oath which the president is obliged to take was made different and broader than the oath exacted of other Federal and State officers. The pre-

sident must swear to "preserve, protect and defend" the Constitution. Other officers only swear to "support" the Constitution. "Preserve, protect and defend" are strong words to outline the presidential duty. It would seem that if he chooses to be president of the United States, that oath makes him take the Constitution the way it is when he enters into office. He becomes the champion of that document and all it means. He is to resist any effort to change it by other than constitutional methods. Groups of citizens have a right to work for its change, but the president is like the chairman of a meeting. He is to remain neutral, not the champion and the spokesman of a minority group working for an amendment.

THE SMITH ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

There are at least two features of Governor Smith's plan to modify the prohibition laws, as set forth in his speech of acceptance, which may well alarm all true friends of the prohibition cause throughout the United States.

1. His proposal to destroy the national character of prohibition by an amendment to the Eighteenth Amendment, which will give each several state the right to determine for itself the liquor status within its borders.

2 His approval of the Canadian system of governmental liquor control.

The Governor's reference to state determination is as follows:

"I personally believe in an amendment to the Eighteenth Amendment which would give to each individual state itself, only after approval by referendum popular vote of its people, the right wholly within its borders to import, manufacture or cause to be manufactured and sell alcoholic beverages, the sale to be made only by the state itself and not for consumption in any public place."

The governor's proposition needs elaborate clarification. Does he mean to propose that the Federal Constitution can be so amended as to permit its operation in some states and its inoperation in others, which are left at liberty to choose their own methods of alcoholic determination within the limitations suggested by the Governor?

Does he mean to say that a valid amendment to the Eighteenth Amendment can be written which would make its acceptance by the states optional? At first glance that seems to be

the plain meaning of his proposal. Amendments to the Amendment might be written that would limit and curtail the prohibition now set forth in that instrument. It might be made to read that the sale, manufacture, etc., of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes "containing more than three per cent of alcohol" or "except beer and wine" are prohibited. Such amendments are easily conceivable. But what assurance can the governor give that any constitutional provision would be valid whose prohibitory declaration would be binding upon Maine and Kansas, the Dakotas, Idaho, Colorado, Oregon, Indiana, Ohio, the South and other prohibition Commonwealths and at the same time allow freedom of determination to New York, New Jersey, Maryland and Wisconsin? Before the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted the powers of Congress over the liquor traffic were limited to taxation, to the regulation of interstate commerce and to the determination of its status in the territories and the District of Columbia. Congress possessed no police power and therefore had no power to enact a prohibition law for the nation. Such power had been reserved by the states as their own exclusive power until the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment.

We do not need a provision of the Federal Constitution to give to each individual state that which Governor Smith requests in the quotation given above, for in the absence of the Eighteenth Amendment or similar instrument each state would possess that right. Nor do we need a provision of the Federal Constitution to give to each individual state the right to prohibit the liquor traffic entirely within its borders, for in the absence of the Eighteenth Amendment they all possess that right except insofar as shipments of liquor in interstate commerce are concerned.

Wherein, therefore, does the necessity exist for maintaining any provision in the Federal Constitution prohibiting the manufacture, sale, etc., of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, if the states are to be given freedom of determination on the question? If it be in the Governor's mind that a constitutional provision shall be written fixing a maximum content of alcohol at three or four or some other per cent, he ought to make it plain to the American people. Such a provision, if adopted, would undoubtedly be a valid amendment to the Constitution. Instead, however, of fixing a certain percentage, he asks for a scientific investigation and a determination of what content of alcohol will

render liquor intoxicating within the meaning of the constitutional amendment. This is plainly a suggestion which can never be realized. That which is intoxicating to one individual may not be to another, and both the evidence produced in court and the conclusion of scientists would be so confusing and diverging as to make a fixed percentage impossible that would mark an exact border line. If no standard of alcoholic content be named either in the Constitution or in the law and the prohibition is left to rest wholly upon a question of fact determined by evidence produced in the court, we will get at once into a maze of difficulties which would make prohibition practically impossible of enforcement. This question, however, does not necessarily involve constitutional action but is a matter with which Congress has full power to deal under the powers conferred upon it by the Eighteenth Amendment.

The limitations of this article do not admit of further discussion of the Governor's proposition at this time except to say that he has raised far more questions than he has answered by his proposition. The plain purpose of the Eighteenth Amendment was the adoption of a national policy. The Governor's plan would nullify and destroy it. Practically speaking, whatever the methods used, he seeks to put us back where we were when the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted, except that he adds insult to injury with the suggestion that the state shall become the barkeeper instead of the private owner. And who is the state? The governor, every minister of the Gospel, every school teacher, the mother in the home zealously guarding her brood against evil, every prohibitionist—these are among those whom the Governor would make the sellers of liquor, and the fact that the deed would be performed by corporate action would in no sense lessen the ignominy felt by the several units who are opposed to the liquor traffic.

The Governor makes his plan of state determination rest upon a popular referendum. But when was he ever an advocate of the referendum until after the Eighteenth Amendment had outlawed the liquor traffic? Is he content to rest under the warranted suspicion of favoring the use of the referendum only when it may result in restoring the liquor traffic and opposing its use, as in local option days, when it might have destroyed it?

We make no personal attack upon the Governor, but he, having given to the public the plan upon which his candidacy for the presidency rests, confusing as it is, must now face the pitiless

scrutiny of its meaning.

The Governor's appeal of the Canadian system of governmental liquor control needs careful attention. Whatever may be said in its favor or in condemnation, all authorities are agreed that under the Canadian laws the use of liquor is increasing almost by leaps and bounds. If that suits the Governor's fancy, we will at least know what his objective is in the United States.

The Christian Science Monitor is one of the most responsible daily journals in this country. It sent one of its staff correspondents into Canada for a tour of investigation, whose articles were published in a series that were a revelation of the evils of the Canadian liquor system. The Monitor sums up the conclusions of the investigation as follows:

"The system has steadily increased the volume of legitimate sales of liquor since it was enacted.

"It has greatly encouraged the practice of public drinking among women.

"It has put the government into the saloon business, and made the bartender as much of a public functionary as the postmaster or an army officer.

"It has developed the 'tavern' which presents all the characteristics of the old-time saloon except the bar and the brass rail.

"It encourages bootlegging by supplying the bootlegger with his stock and his market. --

"It furnishes 'hard liquor' in unlimited quantities to anyone who will buy and carry it away.

"It has brought the liquor power back into politics by making the state the only customer for brewers and distillers."

In the last edition of The American Issue we published quotations from Rev. E. I. Hart, of the Quebec League Against Alcoholism, furnished by the correspondent of the New York Telegram, to the effect that "the triple evils of liquors, drugs and prostitution are linked in Montreal," and that in the Province of Quebec "sales of beer increased 5 per cent over the previous year; wine increased 33 per cent; hard liquors 16 to 17 per cent."

Most reports show that the Canadian system is a good thing—for the maker and sellers of liquor. We shall have more to say in subsequent issues about the Canadian system, which the Governor approves.

It is apparent to all now that Governor Smith has set out to be elected president on the liquor issue. Both his record and his recent utterances stamp him as the friend of liquor and as

the foe of prohibition. More than all, his plan is not only hazy but wholly unacceptable to any friend of prohibition.

S. E. Nicholson, in American Issue

THE CANDIDATES' STATEMENTS ON PROHIBITION

MR. HOOVER

"I recently stated my position upon the 18th amendment which I again repeat:

"I do not favor the repeal of the 18th amendment. I stand for the efficient enforcement of the laws enacted thereunder. Whoever is chosen president has under his oath the solemn duty to pursue this course.

"Our country has deliberately undertaken a great social and economic experiment, noble in motive and far-reaching in purpose. It must be worked out constructively.

"Common sense compels us to realize that grave abuses have occurred—abuses which must be remedied. An organized searching investigation of fact and cause can alone determine the wise method of correcting them. Crime and disobedience of law cannot be permitted to break down the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"Modification of the enforcement laws which would permit that which the constitution forbids is nullification. This the American people will not countenance. Change in the constitution can and must be brought about only by the straight-forward methods provided in the Constitution itself. There are those who do not believe in the purposes of several provisions of the Constitution. No one denies their right to seek to amend it. They are not subject to criticism for asserting that right. But the Republican party does deny the right of anyone to seek to destroy the purposes of the Constitution by indirection.

"Whoever is elected president takes an oath not only to faithfully execute the office of the president, but that oath provides still further that he will, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. I should be untrue to these great traditions, untrue to my oath of office, were I to declare otherwise."

MR. SMITH

"The President of the United States has two constitutional duties with respect to prohibition. The first is embodied in his oath of office. If, with one hand on the Bible and the other

hand reaching up to heaven, I promise the people of this country that 'I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States,' you may be sure that I shall live up to that oath to the last degree. I shall to the very limit execute the pledge of our platform "to make an honest endeavor to enforce the eighteenth amendment and all other provisions of the Federal Constitution and all laws enacted pursuant thereto.'

"The second constitutional duty imposed upon the President is 'To recommend to the Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient., ** The platform of my party is silent upon any question of change in the law. I personally believe that there should be a change and I shall advise the congress in accordance with my constitutional duty of whatever change I deem 'necessary or expedient.'

Some immediate relief would come from an amendment to the Volstead law giving a scientific definition of the alcoholic content of an intoxicating beverage. The present definition is admittedly inaccurate and unscientific. Each state would then be allowed to fix its own standard of alcoholic content, subject always to the proviso that the standard could not exceed the maximum fixed by the Congress.

"I believe, moreover, that there should be submitted to the people the question of some change in the provisions of the Eighteenth amendment. ***** I believe in an amendment in the Eighteenth amendment which would give to each individual state itself only after approval by a referendum popular vote of its people the right wholly within its borders to import, manufacture or cause to be manufactured, and sell alcoholic beverages, the sale to be made only by the state itself and not for consumption in any public place."

The above is taken from the acceptance speeches of the two candidates. Mr. Hoover stated his position without argument. Mr. Smith argued for his position at considerable length. His discussion is omitted, and his statements only are printed, as in the case of Mr. Hoover.—Editor.

TEXT OF THE PARIS TREATY**Renouncing War as a Solution of International Controversies.**

The President of the German Reich, the President of the United States of America, his Majesty the King of the Belgians, the President of the French Republic, his Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, his Majesty the King of Italy, his Majesty the Emperor of Japan, the President of the Republic of Poland, the President of the Czecho-Slovak Republic.

Deeply sensible of their solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind;

Persuaded that the time has come when a frank renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy should be made to the end that the peaceful and friendly relations now existing between their peoples may be perpetuated;

Convinced that all changes in their relations with one another should be sought only by pacific means and be the result of a peaceful and orderly process; and that any signatory power which shall hereafter seek to promote its national interests by resort to war should be denied the benefits furnished by this treaty;

Hopful that, encouraged by their example, all the other nations of the world will join in this humane endeavor and by adhering to the present treaty as soon as it comes into force will bring their peoples within the scope of its beneficent provisions, thus uniting the civilized nations of the world in a common renunciation of war as an instrument of their national policy;

Have decided to conclude a treaty, and for that purpose have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the German Reich, Dr. Gustav Stresemann, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

The President of the United States of America, the Hon. Frank P. Kellog, Secretary of State;

His Majesty the King of the Belgians, M. Paul Hymans, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister of State;

The President of the French Republic, M. Aristide Briand, Minister for Foreign Affairs;

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India;

For Great Britain and Northern Ireland and all parts of the

British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations, the Right Hon. Lord Cushendun, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Acting Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

For the Dominion of Canada, the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie-King, Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs.

For the Commonwealth of Australia, the Hon. Alexander John McLachlen, member of the Executive Federal Council.

For the Dominion of New Zealand, the Hon. Sir Christopher James Parr, High Commissioner for New Zealand in Great Britain.

For the Union of South Africa, the Hon. Jacobus Stephanus Smit, High Commissioner for the Union of South Africa in Great Britain.

For the Irish Free State, Mr. William Thomas Cosgrave, President of the Executive Council of the Irish Free State.

For India, the Right Hon. Lord Cushendun, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Acting Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

His Majesty, the King of Italy, Count Gaetano Manzoni, His Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Paris.

His Majesty, the Emperor of Japan, Count Uchida, member of the Privy Council.

The President of the Republic of Poland, Mr. A. Zales, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The President of the Czechoslovak Republic, Dr. Edward Benes, Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE 1.

The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

ARTICLE II.

The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

ARTICLE III.

The present treaty shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties named in the preamble in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements, and shall take effect as between them as soon as all their several instruments of ratification shall have been deposited at Washington.

This treaty shall, when it has come into effect as prescribed in the preceding paragraph, remain open as long as may be necessary for adherence by all the other powers of the world. Every instrument evidencing the adherence of a power shall be deposited at Washington and the treaty shall immediately upon such deposit become effective as between the power thus adhering and the other parties hereto.

It shall be the duty of the Government of the United States of America to furnish each Government named in the preamble and every Government subsequently adhering to this treaty with a certified copy of the treaty and of every instrument of ratification or adherence. It shall also be the duty of the Government of the United States of America telegraphically to notify such Governments immediately upon the deposit with it of each instrument of ratification or adherence.

In faith whereof the plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty in the French and English languages, both texts having equal force, and hereunto affix their seals.

Done at Paris the twenty-seventh day of August in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight.

AN ANTI-BIBLE SOCIETY "WITHOUT PROFIT"

On a recent editorial page of the "Christian Herald," in a prominent position, appeared this ringing statement by its Editor-in-chief, an Honorary Vice-President of the American Bible Society.

A formal application has been made to the Secretary of State in Albany, New York, for the incorporation of the American Anti-Bible Society.

According to the articles of incorporation, the purposes of this organization are to discredit the Bible by publication and speech to promote the repeal of all laws requiring the reading of the Scriptures in schools, and organizing general propaganda against the doctrine that the Bible is the Word of God.

Mr. Charles Recht, who also acts as attorney for the Soviet Government in the United States, filed the application for incorporation. It is stated that the society is to be operated on a nonprofit basis! There is no doubt in my mind but that it will be so operated, if operated at all. Without profit to itself, without profit to the general public, and without profit to any good cause,—this is its destiny. Little wonder that the judge called upon to consider the application turned it back denied.

But, while there is no doubt but that it would have been a society unprofitable and unfit, it is more than possible that its efforts would have contributed, indirectly at least, toward a wider reading of the Book of Books. The fires that were lighted in another time to destroy the sacred volume only carried it on letters of flame to the ends of the earth. Persecution is at last always the friend of a good cause.

Daniel A. Poling.

LETTER FROM KENTUCKY

Houston, Ky.
September 10, 1928

Dear Friends:

Two months of school have passed away before we can realize it. We have been very busy here during the past week.

Misses Elizabeth and Evelyn Turner left early Thursday morning for Oskaloosa, Iowa, where they will attend Penn College this year. We will miss them very much from our group here.

For more than a month now we have been having a spelling match every Friday night. We began with third grade spelling and spelled through the upper grades. Last Friday night we spelled eighth grade words. There are about five boys in our community who left on the 10th to attend High School at Berea, Ky. This last spelling match was turned into

a farewell occasion for them. We played games outside until dark and then came in and played in the house until time to spell.

The school house is nearly completely finished painting. The upstairs advanced room does not have all of its last coat of paint yet. The school house has been improved a great deal in appearance through painting and the children take much pride in its looks. My room also has twenty-four new seats and so we could be proud to have anyone visit us now. Just now we ran out of paint and had to wait till it came. Also Mr. Felix Mc Intosh who has been doing our painting has been taken sick with typhoid fever. He has been sick for several weeks and is still very ill. He is one of our best right hand men and we miss him very much. I am sure you will want to remember him in your prayers.

An accident occurred not far from us a short time ago which saddened our whole community. A crew of men were working blasting out coal when a fifteen foot bank of dirt caved in on them completely covering three men who were standing working in the mine. Ruther and Dan Sebastain were killed probably immediately while Monroe Baker who was between the other two escaped with severe bruises and scratches. Both of the men who were killed leave wives and families. A short time before the accident a neighbor dreamed of it and came and asked the men to quit. They were in a hurry however and thought nothing of the warning until it was too late.

We are sorry to learn that mother Stewart who has been here for so long will have to leave on account of ill health, the latter part of this week. Everyone has learned to know and appreciate Mother Stewart and we will all be sorry to see her go. We do not know who will take her place yet.

Since the last letter we have received \$10. from Miss Annie E. Shone, through Dr. W. J. Nasson, Treasurer of the A. P. Church. We always welcome and appreciate such gifts. We wish to greet each and everyone of our Advocate friends.

Sincerely Yours,

Gladys Benson

ASK SOMETHING EASY

By Georgina S. Townsend

"Him and me done them examples."

Oh, no, this was not the reply of some ignorant foreigner. It was the answer I received to a perfectly innocent question I asked a 16-year-old high school boy of good American parentage. And this is a sample of "English as she is spoke" by many of the rising generation.

What are we going to do about it? What are we going to do about this rising generation, anyway? Ask me something easy.

What other subject bobs up more often in every walk of life than this all-absorbing one of "What is this coming generation coming to?"

It has already "came."

And we have already done it!

Oh, yes we have, we distracted fathers and mothers who are throwing up our hands and bemoaning whatever the world is coming to are the ones who have done it. Nouse kidding ourselves that "the times" are to blame for slovenly English, slovenly attire, slovenly attitude of mind in regard to obligation, responsibility, integrity, morals and honor. The present time has nothing to do with the fact that the young people are so headstrong and willful we can do nothing with them. The time which was to blame for the present was some twenty or twenty-five years ago, when of a sudden we laid aside the good, old, Puritanical ideas that "to spare the rod spoils the child" and "children should be seen and not heard" and "children, obey your parents" and "respect your elders." Then of a sudden, as I say, we began to exploit the baby and we spelled it with a capital B. The Baby must be allowed to grow and develop uncurbed, unbridled. And he did. Oh, how he did! We theoretically preached that the child which grew and developed according to its own desires and inclination would become individual. And he became individual. Very much so. In fact, terribly so. And now we do not know what to do with him.

The indulged Baby became as individual at the profound age of three months. When he wanted his way he yelled lustily, and everyone considered him amazingly smart and clever to know enough to do it. And he was immediately given his

way. By the time he was 4 years old he was all individuality, undirected, uncultivated, undisciplined.

Ever see a tree or bush that was allowed to grow as it pleased for four years? Pretty sight, wasn't it?

A few years later Baby, now Sonny, was ready for school, where he went thoroughly unequipped for any constraint or control. And at school where he should have found training, what did he get? And how long did it take him to find out that, thanks to our revised ideas of moral suasion, of some twenty years ago, that "teacher dassn't lick me." And of a certainty teacher "dassn't."

And all the moral suasion and appealing to a child's intelligence never did one-millionth the good that one sound thrashing has accomplished to drive home with conviction a principle of discipline.

At 12 years old Son is demanding the "right" to drive dad's automobile. And getting it, too.

He demands everything as his "right." And if it is his sister we are considering, she demands silk stockings, even if her dad is dead and her mother supports a family of five on housework at 50 cents an hour.

And that, too, is our fault.

Oh, yes, it is. Face it and acknowledge that we made a mistake when we followed after new gods, yclept individuality.

And next we have them at the adolescent age. They have been indulged—in every desire and whim they have expressed for fourteen or fifteen years. The entire family affairs and fortune have been arranged with the especial idea of catering to the children's pleasure, but not necessarily to their education or discipline. Then, with the surge of life swelling within them, we suddenly expect them to become well behaved, restrained, unselfish, discreet, lawabiding. And instead they are more lawless than ever, and why not? Why should it be any more unlawful for them to do between 14 and 18 what they were allowed to do until they were 14? And if it is all right for Son to slip one over on dad and take the auto out for a wild night, with out permission, why is it so very much worse to slip one over on a perfect stranger! Son does not care a whoop about and appropriate his car? The dividing line between right and wrong

is worn pretty thin by dad's laxity.

And it is every whit as wrong for Son to swipe dad's car as for him to swipe the stranger's car. But Son does not know it. And neither does dad realize it.

And if it is the girls who are worrying us, let us consider. Not the short skirts and the bobbed hair, both are hygienic and sensible, and they are not a "sign of the times," unless they be a sign of good common sense. But it is the fact that these girls have never known what it meant to obey father and mother; they, too, feel they have a "right" to do whatever they please, go when and where they please, responsible to no one, and with no obligations. And whose fault is that? Theirs? Not a bit of it. It is father's and mother's fault for letting them do whatever they wished from the time they were born.

And this is what has come of exploiting the Baby. Such a cute little mite as a baby is, that should have everything done for it, and have the world revolve around it, and stand still for it when it opened its rosebud mouth and squalled. It was a costly fad which took a generation to prove itself impracticable. And now that we have the proof of the pudding, we do not like to taste of it. What are we going to about it?

Well just what?

One thing you fathers can do, but you won't. You can take the car away from Son. How many young fellows are tearing around the country in autos which they themselves earned by hard work? Oh, you laugh, do you? To be sure, it is to laugh. Well, then, who pays for the autos and for their upkeep? Good old dad, eh?

Why, then, isn't dad in control of the situation? Because he hasn't the courage to take control. And Son knows it. He hasn't any respect for dad, who is so easy. Dad may think he should have Son's respect, seeing how he has done every living thing to give the kid a happy life. But that's another of those theories that don't pop as expected. Respect is something Son cannot define. He simply takes all that is done for him as his "right."

I know a family where there is an indulgent father and mother and three grown sons. Each of the boys has a good job.

Dad has one, too, just as good as it was twenty years ago when the babies were coming and one he will have exactly as long as he is able to keep it and not a day longer. Out of his salary the thrifty little mother has saved enough for a home and some investments in good lots, so that they feel they are people of means. And of course, they must have a car. Every family does, whether they have means or not. The price of a car divided by four is not so bad. And the boys helped pay for the car? They did not? Dad bought the car. Why, he had some money in the bank, at least mother had some she had saved, but, of course, it was money dad had earned. And so the car was bought with dad's savings. Then, to be fair and just, dad and mother used the car one Sunday each month and let the boys have it the others. They were very strict about it, too. They never encroached upon the Sundays the car belonged to one of the boys. A lovely arrangement. Perfectly sweet and dear of pa and ma, I call it, especially as pa and ma paid for all the running expenses, not only for themselves, but for the boys, and did all the cleaning and repairing, too. Because, you know, the boys should have a good time when they are young. No, I'm not exaggerating. I can even add to this beautiful picture of ideal family life by telling you that those three husky boys, each one making as much or more than dad, live at home and pay no board, and mother does their washing. When I remonstrated with the thrifty little mother she flew mad and nearly pecked my eyes out and defied me to make her mercenary with her own flesh and blood. And then, too, she showed me a lovely new jewel pin which the boys had given her for her birthday that cost all of what their laundry would have been for a month to convince me.

But I wasn't convinced of something or other, I don't know what.

And speaking of autos, the trouble right today with the rising generation is not the movies or short skirts or bobbed hair or anything half so much as the freedom and license which the autos give the young people. Unrestricted auto drives lead to the lawlessness about us. Take away from the youngsters this means of lawlessness which so often leads to crime and half the grave problem will be solved. But there, again, it depends upon the fathers of the rising generation to do this, and when I think of the helplessness of the average father of today I think

of a lawyer, famous for his brilliancy in argument, a man who can sway juries, can win any case, can even "sass" a judge without fear and take the consequences and yet who gave up trying to manage his 7-year-old son. The child tyrannized his father and mother so completely that they finally placed him in an institution where individuality is administered to with a good stout switch applied to the south end of a rebellious youngster. And the lawyer told the matron "to go to it." And when the kid needed it she "went to it." One good thrashing was all he needed. That was a language he instinctively understood and he immediately became manageable.

But would that brainy little lawyer have thrashed him? No, he didn't have the nerve!

And so with the dads of today. They haven't the nerve to take the autos away from the youngsters. And they haven't the nerve to give up having an auto for the sake of the children's souls.

When we began to do everything for the child we thought we were doing him the greatest kindness in the world, that of making life easier for him and giving him pleasure and happiness, never realizing that the greatest happiness for a child lies in his ability to earn a dime of his own to spend for his pleasure. And why have we indulged our children in this manner to their utter ruin? Because, oh, ye gods, because it gratified our own vanities; we indulged ourselves in pride over our own flesh and blood. And before us is the result and we wail:

"What are we going to do about the rising generation?"

Ask me something easy.

Ask me about relativity.

NOTICE: All matter for Publication in the Advocate should be in the Publisher's hands not later than the 15th of the Month. We aim to have the Advocate ready to mail during the first week of each month.

Publisher.

CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR TOPICS

October 7, 1928

Topic: "Workers Together with God." 1 Cor. 3: 1-9.
(CONSECRATION MEETING)

BIBLE READINGS

Monday—An Invitation to work, Jer. 1: 4-10.
Tuesday—Work at soul-winning, Mark 16: 19-20.
Wednesday—Work at Church- building, Zech. 4: 8-10.
Thursday—A man who struck work, Jonah 1: 1-17.
Friday—Working in church, 1Peter 5: 1-5.
Saturday—Working as missionaries, Matt. 28: 19-20.

COMMENT

If we work with God we must work in His way, according to His laws. Some of our work is quite unlike God, being selfish and ambitious

It is a great thing to be able to link up what we are doing with the powers of the other world, with God Himself. Then we know we cannot fail. One of the joys of Jesus was that He was doing the things that His Father was doing (John 5:19). He always consulted God. He attempted nothing He could not ask God to bless.

We can work with God in everyday affairs, in the carpenter's shop, in the market place, in the office. All the work of the world is God's work in which we share.

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

- 1 In what things do we work with God?
2. When and how do people fail to work with God?
3. How may we get more of God's power in our lives?

October 14, 1928

Topic: "The Christians duty as a Voter." Matt. 22: 15-22.

BIBLE READINGS

Monday—Duty to be honest, Isa. 26: 7-9.
Tuesday—To support authority, Rom. 13: 1-5.
Wednesday—To fulfill all civic duties, Matt. 22: 15-22.
Thursday— To oppose what is false, Acts 5: 1-11.
Friday—To support good men, Heb. 13: 17.
Saturday—To oppose bribery, Ps. 26: 9-12.

COMMENT

If Christians do not vote, evil men will, and the devil will get leave to rule the world.

If we have the right to make just and equitable laws, and do not do it, we are guilty of neglect and responsible for the evil that is caused by unjust laws.

If Christians refuse to vote, or neglect to vote, they will soon have no Sabbath. There are plenty that wish to abolish it.

Had it not been for the Christian vote we should not have had prohibition today. If the world is to be made better it will be by Christian influence.

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

1. Why should Christians interest themselves in politics?
2. How may we help Christian politicians to advance the Kingdom?
3. Is the world growing worse or better? Why?

October 21, 1928

Topic: "How does law increase Freedom?" Rom. 13: 1-8.

BIBLE READINGS

- Monday—Days of anarchy, Judge 21: 25.
 Tuesday—Law gives protection, Acts 21: 27-40.
 Wednesday— Law restrains evil, Isa. 11: 1-5.
 Thursday—Law defines evil, Exod. 20: 1-17.
 Friday— A law of liberty, Lev. 25: 8-17.
 Saturday— Paul saved by law, Acts 26: 21-32.

COMMENT

Freedom is not liberty to do as we please. That would be anarchy, and we should then find that we had no freedom except what stronger persons allowed us.

Man is created with a sense of order. As soon as men begin to live together they set up rules and regulations to govern their actions. This is instinctive and the only practical thing to do.

Law to-day gains its force from the consent of the governed. We agree beforehand that the will of the majority shall prevail. If we did not, life would be impossible.

The great body of the people are law-abiding. Criminals are in the minority, although they make a great noise. Rigorous law alone protects the decent people.

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

1. How do the rules of a game increase freedom?
2. What freedom should we lose if there were no law?
3. How can we create respect for law?

October 28, 1928

Topic: Making the Right Use of Our Talents, Matt. 25: 14-30.

BIBLE READINGS

- Monday— Talent to invent, Gen. 4: 21-22.
 Tuesday— Talent to organize, Num. 1: 1-4; 47-54.
 Wednesday—Talent to speak, Exod. 4: 10-17.
 Thursday—Talent to be friendly, Acts 11: 19-26.
 Friday— Talent to preach, Acts 18: 24-28.
 Saturday—Talent to administer, Acts 6: 1-7.

COMMENT

There is a difference between use and right use. It is possible to waste our gifts, or abuse them to our own and others' hurt.

Gifts or talents are given us first, to use to earn a living; second, to help others; third, to create happiness around us. The first use alone is selfish.

Think of the good a man might do who has the gift of making money if he used it for the Kingdom. Some do this, but most of the big men have other interests.

It is by use that our talents grow. That is one way in which God rewards faithfulness. The reward is not withheld until our journey is finished. It comes, in part, now.

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

1. Why is stewardship larger than mere giving of money?
2. What talent have you that you may use for God?
3. Why should all develop the talent of kindness?

November 4, 1928

Topic: "In what ways do we waste our time?" Eph. 5:16; Ps. 90:12.

CONSECRATION MEETING

BIBLE READINGS

Monday— In gossip, Acts 17: 16-21.

Tuesday—In sleep, Prov. 24: 30-34.

Wednesday—In some pleasures, Eccles. 2: 1-11.

Thursday—In wilful disobedience, Acts 9: 5.

Friday—In sinful living, Luke 15: 11-32.

Saturday—In worldly living, 1 John 2: 15-17.

COMMENT

Oceans of time are wasted in pleasure that should be used in getting knowledge or doing useful work. Pleasure is necessary, but not an overdose of it.

Time is wasted by dawdling at our tasks. The cure is to "do with our might what our hands find to do."

Time is wasted in day-dreaming, picturing our own greatness, building castles in the air, instead of buckling down to realities.

Time is wasted on railroad trains and street cars. Use it for planning the day; or improve the mind by reading worth-while books, or memorizing poetry.

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

1. How may we lay out a plan for our days?
2. What temptations have we to waste time?
3. Can we waste time reading? How



PRINTING OF DISTINCTION

Are you getting such printing? Doubtless you are taking up with poor job work, at exorbitant prices. This is unnecessary. SUPERIOR PRINT produces Distinctive Designs and Quality on every print job, at a reasonable price. How? New and Up-to-date Equipment, Expert Workmanship, and Cash with order enable these Low Prices

Letter Heads	\$4.50 per M.
Envelopes	\$2.25 per M.
Statements 5 1-2 x 8	\$4.50 per M.
Posters 12 x 18	\$2.25 per 25 .02 each over 25
Cards	
Business	\$4.50 per M.
Personal Calling, plain	\$.50 per 100
" " paneled	\$1.00 " "

Note - - - All Prices are Postpaid in U. S. A.

This is a small list of prices and work. Write for complete List.

We are glad to give Estimates on all kinds of Printing -- Nothing too small, nothing too Big!

To Churches, Sunday Schools, C. E. Societies etc., Special Discount. Inquire!

SUPERIOR PRINT

DUANESBURG, N. Y.

Cedarville College, CEDARVILLE, OHIO.

Prepares young people for definite Christian service. Located in the northern part of the beautiful and healthy Miami valley. Co-educational. Character building. Christian school of the highest type. Sound, safe, strong. New science hall. New Gymnasium. Modern preparatory and collegiate departments. Classical. Scientific. Music. Educational. Agricultural and Physical Educational courses.

Degrees A. B., B. S., and B. D. Expenses very low.

1st. Semester opens Sept. 7, 1927 and 2d. Semester opens February 1, 1928. Send for catalogue, etc.

W. R. McChesney, Ph. D., D. D., President

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CEDARVILLE, OHIO.

Our Seminary was established in 1807. It has a full faculty and modern courses. Regular seminary course of three years, leading to a diploma.

Students in the Seminary may take courses in the college under the supervision of the faculty. They have the privilege of the large college library and the college laboratories.

Young men of our own church are asked to consider the Gospel ministry.

Open to students of all churches.

For further particulars write to

Rev. W. R. McChesney, Ph. D., D. D., Dean