

ZION'S ADVOCATE

"And blessed are they who shall seek to bring forth my Zion at that day, for they shall have the gift and power of the Holy Ghost."—1 Nephi 8:187.

Published Semi Monthly by the Church of Christ

Entered as Second-Class Matter May 14, 1929, at the Post Office at Independence, Mo. under the Act of March 3, 1879"

VOLUME 7

INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI, OCTOBER 15, 1930

NUMBER 16

WE ARE MOVING TOWARD ARMED CONFLICT

By B. L. McKIM

SANGUINARY conflict as the result of the feelings engendered by the Eighteenth Amendment seems probable as one studies the situation both as to origin and tendency.

Few persons could believe that the World War could ensue from the tiny match struck in the Balkans.

Even prior to our own Civil War there seemed little likelihood of bloodshed. In "Causes of the Civil War," French E. Chadwick, the author, says that "scarcely any of the statesmen and practically none of the people of everyday life" thought war a possibility.

The elements of disagreement and intense feeling are growing stronger daily, and apparently have gained momentum which may carry them over into the field of strife so far that nothing short of rebellion can ensue. Has the foundation for this been laid? We shall see.

When we go back to the days prior to the World War we find a period in which the United States reached what in the future may be revealed as its highest peak in civilization. The now prevalent wave of irreligion had not then swept through the land. The general disregard for law and order, with its accompanying crime wave, had not grown to its present proportions.

From then till now a momentous change has taken place in thought and ideals—a change noted and discussed by almost every writer on social conditions.

Standards Are Changing

Our manner of living and our viewpoints have changed materially, as may be witnessed everywhere. And some believe there has been a lowering of our standards and of our ideals, resulting in crime and immorality, foreshadowing weakness and decay of our civilization.

It is well to remember that the greatness we have achieved as a nation is the result of the ideals we have set before us as a Christian nation, with the standard of morals which has been our guide since the nation's birth.

We are a Protestant nation, developing our social and educational systems from ideals essentially Protestant. Not only are those ideals the foundation upon which the Constitution of the

United States was built, but they are also the fountain-head from which sprang the laws enacted from time to time since then, to maintain and protect our institutions.

An eminent Catholic admits this. In the *Outlook* of August 17, 1927, Judge Pierre Crabites says that when there was written into the Constitution by Jefferson and his friends the clause, "that no law should be passed respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," the Protestant bodies were thinking of themselves and "these men never thought of Catholics and Jews when they carried out their give-and-take program."

If our ideas of government, education, etc., are the result of belief in a Protestant religion, which may well be true, then to sweep away those religious beliefs as seemingly is being done today, may well be the stroke which destroys the foundation upon which our social institutions are built.

Protestantism Losing Force

That Protestantism is in large measure losing its virility and on the downward trend is plainly manifest on every hand. And because of this many are alarmed.

One writer says that if it were possible to restore faith in the laity again it would only "postpone an inevitable debacle," and he sees in America soon a Roman Catholic country.

Another churchman says we will require a Christian revival in order to preserve our civilization. And we are told by a prominent minister that unless Protestantism changes from trying to save itself by "clutching at the straws of ritual, liturgy and symbolism" that in the end there will be a need of a "reformation to save Protestantism from dry rot."

Another writer says all this activity among Protestant ministers in issuing "missionary programs and study classes to the multitude" is "an unconscious effort to cover a fundamental sickness which is depleting the church of spiritual power."

In his "Preface to *Morals*," Walter Lippmann takes it for granted that there are a large number

(Continued on page 160)

ZION'S ADVOCATE

Official Publication of the Church of Christ.

Headquarters on the Temple Lot at Independence, Missouri.

BOARD OF PUBLICATION

A. O. Frisby, Louise P. Sheldon, Arch Nace, Granvil Hedrick,
Angela Wheaton

Editor: Elmer E. Long, 424 East Walnut
Independence, Mo.

Assistant: A. M. Smith, Box 232, Independence, Mo.

Address all matter for publication to the Editor.

Address all orders and send all monies to A. M. Smith,
Business Manager, Box 232, Independence, Mo.

Subscription Rates: One Year, \$1.50; Six Months, 75 cents.

In bundles of twelve or more for missionary purpose,
\$1.00 per dozen.

Canadian Rates: Same as above.

EDITORIAL

A SPECIAL TEMPLE NUMBER

We feel quite sure our readers will appreciate the forthcoming special number of Zion's Advocate for November 1.

Among the interesting features of this special number is an article on the Return to Zion, showing the remarkable fulfillment of prophecy in the present development on the Temple Lot.

A fine description of the Temple by the architect, Mr. Norman L. Wilkinson, will be read with more than passing interest. This description will be followed by several cuts, with explanatory notes, that will give the saints a good idea of what the Temple will look like when it is finished.

An excellent article from the pen of the late President Joseph Smith of the Reorganized Church, written in the early days of that organization is reproduced entire. This article was for many years circulated in tract form, but it is now out of date with that body, and out of print. It is an eye opener on "The Rejection of the Church," with a telling back-action argument against the departure from the faith by the present leadership.

We feel sure, too, that the saints everywhere will be pleased to know that the work on the Temple is under way. The work will be pushed forward just as fast as the necessary means comes to hand. No debt will be incurred. Let the saints rally to the support of the building committee by sending in their contributions. Remember, this is a work of *sacrifice*. The money spent uselessly for chewing gum, candy, shows, etc., amounts to considerable. The children, if properly tutored, will respond quickly if they are taught to *save the pennies for the Temple*. Let us sacrifice and save that the Lord's House may be built.

The Special Number will be double in size, that is, sixteen pages, and an extra supply will be printed. Doubtless a number will want to send copies to friends, and those who do should send in their orders at once that they may go out as soon as printed. The price will be 25 cents per copy, five copies for \$1.00.

JUST A REMINDER

The poem in another column, the Old-Fashioned Preacher, was written in June, 1918, and published in the Saints' Herald. It was quite severely criticized in a similar poem by a member of the editorial staff of the Herald in a more or less burlesque style.

But from last accounts, that official caught in the "drift-tide" which he failed to observe, has "just about vanished from sight"—and he is not by himself in that.

"BEHIND THE GRAY MIST"

By R. B. Trowbridge

During my long vigil at the Sanitarium in Colorado, during my sickness, one of the best Pals I had was dear old Mt. Cedar, at whose base the sanitarium is located. It is a wonderful old mountain. The base is several miles across, from which it very gracefully rises to a dignified peak. It was such a good pal that it became my custom to go out of my cabin in the morning and give it a solemn salute as one of my first daily duties.

I had never seen a mountain "mist," and one morning as I went out to salute, lo, there was no mountain there at all! The gray mist so completely enveloped it that a stranger would never have known that there had ever been a mountain near. The first sight made me catch my breath and my hand went to my heart. After the shock had passed I got my camera and took a picture of the place where the mountain had been—then I carefully watched developments.

Along about ten o'clock the mist began to rise. At first I could get only glimpses of the mountain through the rifts in the mist. I got my camera again and took another wonderful picture of the mist as it lifted. Along about noon the mist was all gone and old Mt. Cedar stood out again bright and clear and very beautiful in the glory of the noon-day sun.

That afternoon, as I sat there beside my cabin in the quiet, sacred stillness of the camp, my mind recounted the experience of the morning; and as it did so I felt one of the most sweet, holy inspirations come over me like a mantle, and I got my clip board and paper when the following little poem was given to me (it was not made, mark you,) but it just "came to me" out of the wonderful clear, blue sky.

As I looked for Mt. Cedar this morning at dawn,
In the place where it usually stood,
To my sorrow and pain there was nothing to see—
It was shrouded by mist, as a hood.

I knew that the mountain was there, no mistake,
Its form to my mind was quite clear.
But the veil that now hung between it and me
If I hadn't of known would brought fear.

How truly akin to some happenings in life
When trials and temptations come to us,
How soon they obscure God's all-powerful hand,
And our spirits are cast in the dust.

Ah, the lesson let's learn, and remember it well,
As we go, in our life, to and fro.
No matter what comes, behind the gray mist
Stands the giver of life here below.

And as we remember, with courage increased,
Let us lift up our heads and be glad,
That the God who created both mountain and mist
Is still the best friend we e'er had.

And just as I sat by my cabin this morn,
And the sun mounted up in the sky,
The clouds disappeared and the mountain was shown,
So as surely out mists will pass by.

And we'll see once again, as we've oft seen before,
That only our vision was poor;
And we'll find, as I found with Mt. Cedar this morn,
That God's wonderful presence is sure.

Help us make a bigger and better Advocate.

MOVING TOWARD ARMED CONFLICT

of people who have lost faith in the religion of their fathers.

"It is concerned," he says, "with those who are perplexed by the consequences of their own irreligion." Because, as he further says: "The acids of modernity have dissolved" the old "order with many of us."

War Blamed for Decline

We may well be concerned over the decline of the Protestant religion because of the results it may have upon all of us. It is of vital importance to our entire social structure. Even though we might disagree on the causes, none of us can escape the consequences.

According to Will Durant, the war, in large measure, was the cause of this breakdown in religion. He asserts that it destroyed the faith of millions in a benevolent Providence and took from conscience the prop of religious belief.

"Youth found itself," to quote Mr. Durant, "endowed with new liberties, protected by invention from the ancient consequences of amatory adventure," and "sexual instinct escaped from the jail in which Puritanism had imprisoned it and ran amuck in the streets."

He further warns: "We stand between two worlds—one dead, the other hardly born; and our fate is chaos for a generation. We are conscious that the morality of restraint and fear has lost its hold upon men."

A noted scientist and explorer, Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, in an article in *The Forum* of December, 1929, says:

"It is especially urgent to examine the beliefs of this remarkable age in which we are now living, for in spite of the tremendous advances made in science and the constant evidence of the continuing ability of the white race—portents which might be expected to give confidence, buoyancy and hope—one often hears this anxious question: Whither mankind? What is the future of Western civilization?"

His position as to the cause of this condition is that "the thinking world is now in a difficult transitional period. Old established truths are shaken and overthrown, old creeds and dogmas are largely abandoned, and no new ones ready to take their place."

Continuing, he says: "People who discover the fallacy of their old superstitions" are likely to throw away their moral rules with their religion, since the idea of morality has been bound up with their religion. "Thus they lose their mental balance and their moral and social ideals fall prey to the winds." He says "this state of things will inevitably create unrest, uncertainty, confusion, aberrations," and "it paralyzes the hope of a better future."

Religious Decline Related to Crime

The situation as presented by these writers reveals that we are fast approaching a condition of mental anarchy. And mental anarchy is but one step from physical anarchy.

All this leads us to raise the question: Does not the breaking up of our religious beliefs have much to do with the general disregard for law, even to

the extent of a serious crime wave? That such a situation is recognized as a national menace is evidenced by the fact that President Hoover has appointed a group of competent and well-known persons as a commission to make the most serious and exhaustive study of crime and its causes ever attempted.

With many the big question is: What IS moral? For that which was accepted as morally correct yesterday is today either doubted or denied entirely. And in most cases no new standard has been established to take the place of the old, and it is as Will Durant says: "Chaos for a generation."

So what else can be expected, with law and order breaking down, firstly with the home, then spreading into all the law enforcement bodies of the nation?

It is evident that this religious revolution is affecting the viewpoint of many today concerning the use of liquor. Their moral outlook has so changed that even though ten years ago they would not have considered entering a saloon, today they are drinking more or less freely, which may in part explain the increase and growth of the bootlegging business during the past few years.

Standards Affect Prohibition

At least one may observe that with the changing of our standard of morals, the taking of a drink of liquor today does not make one a social outcast any more than the woman who smokes a cigarette. Yet both were taboo by a vast stratum of society when prohibition became a national law.

The wet or dry problem would not be the leading issue before the nation today had the people still retained their belief in the same standard of morals which guided our social life as prevailed ten years ago. Prohibition would be as popular today as when by the Eighteenth Amendment it was written into the Constitution.

The wets are evidently wrong when they assert that prohibition is the cause of the crime situation today. They can not promise with assurance that with the opportunity open to everybody to purchase and drink liquor at will, there will be a cessation of crime, fewer robberies, murders, less corruption, prostitution and other social violations. Will the legalizing of drinking make alcohol a safe beverage to take?

The mere taking or not taking a drink of liquor is not the fundamental cause of the crime situation of today. The cause lies deeper and its effects are being manifest not only in connection with prohibition but in many other ways. It is as James Truslow Adams says: "When a state has ceased to be able to enforce law, when its citizens have ceased to feel any sense of duty to obey law as law . . . it is clear that something more than merely one amendment to the Constitution, however unwise, must be sought as the cause."—*The Forum*, July, 1929.

We are passing through a revolution which is only recognized by the few, and a rebellious spirit has swept over the land under the cloak of "personal liberty." Especially is this manifest in our homes; in the delinquency of our youth who so easily engage in robberies and holdups; and in infidelity, divorce, corruption, and crime.

Prohibition Not Cause of Crime Wave

Because of this alarming situation, President Hoover said: "We are not suffering from an ephemeral crime wave but from a subsidence of our foundations." And, concerning what we are facing today, he avers: "The possibility that respect for law as law is fading from the sensibilities of our people."

In the language of Mr. Durant, we are forced to conclude "that the morality of restraint and fear has lost its hold upon men."

Then will a change of the prohibition situation change the moral condition of our country? Will those who do not respect law as law today reform at once and become law-abiding citizens if the Eighteenth Amendment is taken out of the Constitution? Upon what ground could we expect such a change?

On the assumption that the cause of our moral breakdown is not prohibition or its violation, let us seek deeper for the fundamental causes. The repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment might shift the point of attack, but the disregard of law as law would still continue unabated.

An intense feeling of resentment against laws which enforce belief in a certain standard of morals is one of the fruits borne by the rebellious spirit, often disguised as "personal liberty." Or a change of mind from former traditions the laws upholding such traditions become galling.

As Walter Lippmann puts it, the modern man of today "does not feel himself to be an actor in the great dramatic destiny, but he is subject to the massive powers of our civilization. . . . They compel his body and his senses as ruthlessly as ever did king or priest." He insists that these compulsions are painful and that the modern man does not make his peace with them.

Rebellion Threatens All Law

This rebellion, then, is not only against a part of our social structure, but against all law.

Can anyone guarantee that with a change of existing circumstances, there will not be a flank movement—a change of attack, to include all laws?

Prohibition is now the center of attack as the latest enactment which restricts individual action. It being a more recent crystallization of sentiment and not having the strength of tradition back of it, many forces seemingly are attacking it as a weak point. Suppose they succeed! How many other fundamental laws may be assailed and put into disrepute by the victors?

Which leads us to the conclusion that the causes are sufficiently serious to lead us to armed conflict, and prohibition is the match which is likely to ignite the conflagration.

Arguments as to the merits or demerits of prohibition have not changed either side. The wets are still wet and the drys are still dry.

This question has now reached a point where, as summarized by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, it "involves a fundamental conflict in principle." And with some it has become a religious issue. That is why it becomes so serious.

Since the Protestant churches of America have for years taken a leading part in seeking control and prohibition of the liquor traffic, and succeeded so well that it was written into the Constitution,

it must be considered a Protestant victory.

All Churches Favored Prohibition

Coming as it did at about the time of the termination of the wartime prohibition measure, the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment was in a general way a very popular enactment and not at the time the measure of any church body in particular. Practically all religions were for its adoption, as revealed in the ratification by the legislatures of the forty-six States of the Union.

Undoubtedly various groups supported the measure for varying reasons. With some it was a moral issue, with some it had economic significance, while others proffered other reasons.

And not only are we convinced that the Protestant bodies which had been working toward that end for many years were for the new move, but also a large majority of Catholics, represented as individuals rather than as an institutional policy.

The Reverend John A. Ryan, D. D., expressed what seems to have been the views of many Catholics at that time. Writing in the "Catholic World" for May, 1925, he says: "It is the teaching of the Catholic Church that civil laws have genuinely moral force. . . . Of course there are exceptions, but this is the general doctrine." He further assumes that "public authorities" have the right to choose "national prohibition. In so doing they have not exceeded their lawful authority. . . . The presumption is that they have chosen wisely. If this presumption is to be overthrown as regards the legal policy of prohibition, a vastly greater amount of evidence will have to be brought forward than has thus appeared."

Continuing, Doctor Ryan says:

"National prohibition of the liquor traffic is not an unjust interference with individual liberty since it has approved itself, with presumably good reason, to the public authorities as the only adequate means of dealing with the abuses of strong drink. Therefore the Eighteenth Amendment is not an unjust enactment."

Change of Sentiment

But since 1925, when this was published, there has come a considerable change of sentiment. There is reason to believe that today a large majority of Catholics are opposed to the Amendment.

According to report of the late investigation before the house judiciary committee of Congress, this same Reverend Ryan "opposed the dry millennium in the name of Catholicism."

This change of sentiment on the part of the Catholics can not be attributed to the same causes as the change which has come over the Protestants, for the Catholic structure is not passing through the same sort of a metamorphosis as is Protestantism. A change of standards is not involved in the Catholic consciousness. Their support of the national prohibition laws can not be considered from the moral point of view, but rather as a matter of expediency. In ceasing to support the measure it can not be charged against them as a change of ideals.

This change may have been hastened by the activities of Protestant bodies in politics, but it was sure to come sooner or later after a more ma-

ture consideration and survey, for such enactment is fundamentally in conflict with Catholic doctrine. It is truly a Protestant measure.

Fundamentally, in many respects, there is a big difference in standard of morals of the Catholic and the Protestant. This arises from the difference in belief as to the source of authority of standards.

Catholicism Claims Jurisdiction over Morals

This difference is shown in two splendid articles in *The Atlantic Monthly* for March, 1930. One of these is "The Issue Joined," by Charles C. Marshall, and the other is "The Catholic Position," by Hilaire Belloc. It is admitted by both parties to the discussion that in Catholicism the church "is the only divine authority in matter of faith and morals."

Mr. Marshall points out:

"The decree of the Vatican council makes obedience to the supremacy of the Pope in matters belonging to morals the duty of all Catholics under penalty of damnation."

To this Mr. Belloc, for the Catholics, urges:

"It is indeed inevitable that any corporation claiming to be what the Catholic Church claims to be—to-wit, the only divine authority on earth, in matters of faith and morals—shall by theory claim universal jurisdiction in these."

This "supremacy" the Protestant vociferously denies and apparently this is the focal point of the difference between the Catholic and the Protestant. This is a vital issue which must be met in the solution of the prohibition question.

Prohibition challenges the Catholic Church with an attack on its very foundation. It is a Protestant measure and was placed in the Constitution by a majority vote of all the States as a law binding upon all its citizens. It repudiates the doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope in matters pertaining to the morals and duty of all Catholics. It denies in principle that the Catholic Church is the "only divine authority on earth, in matters of faith and morals."

Law of Church Placed First

This same Reverend Ryan whom we have quoted tells us through the "New Republic" that prohibition is not a Catholic principle, but rather a Protestant measure. He says: "Moreover, the inheritor of the Puritan tradition quite naturally calls upon the state to adopt and enforce his views of conduct and of moral discipline."

And against this Protestant position he says:

"The Catholic also finds a very considerable difference between church prohibitions of action which are forbidden by Christ or by the moral law and a prohibition which is aimed at an entirely lawful action, namely, the consumption of intoxicating liquor."

We can expect the Catholic, in being loyal to his church, to resist the Eighteenth Amendment with all his powers of mind and body, for there is significance in the contention of Mr. Belloc that a Catholic regards heretical (Protestant, of course) and pagan morals as things which do harm, and which society would be well rid of. And he pointedly asserts that "where there is a conflict between the civil law and the moral law of the Catholic Church, members of the Catholic

Church will resist the civil law and obey the law of the church."

He can not admit of a Protestant moral issue, such as prohibition, being right in principle in governing his conduct, for that would be admitting authority outside the Catholic Church and accepting a moral standard upon which the church had not spoken.

So it appears that the Eighteenth Amendment has created a fundamental conflict between the Catholic and the government.

Because of this fundamental difference between the state of non-Catholic culture and the Catholics themselves, the time will come, sooner or later, when nothing can stop a conflict for supremacy.

Conflict with State Predicted

That such a time may be close at hand is intimated by Mr. Belloc, who says that because the modern state claims unquestioned authority in all things, sooner or later "the Catholic Church must inevitably come into conflict" with the state. And "it is inevitable that there should appear in any absolute state . . . laws which no Catholic will obey. . . . When those laws are presented to Catholics there will at once arise the situation which has arisen time and again for nearly two thousand years, the refusal to obey on the part of the Catholics, which refusal in the eyes of the state is rebellion."

"But as the moral distance grows greater between the Catholic and non-Catholic, and as the modern state reverts more and more to that paganism which is the natural end of those who abandon Catholicism, the direct contrast can not fail to pass from the realms of theory to that of practice."

The placing of the Eighteenth Amendment into the Constitution can easily be a law which is referred to. But who will be the aggressors?

After all, the much-maligned Eighteenth Amendment is there and so long as it remains in the Constitution it is subject to enforcement.

Regardless of whether it is one of the compulsions that modern man does not make his peace with, as Mr. Lippmann puts it, or whether it be a Puritan tradition which they have called upon the state to adopt and enforce as a matter of moral discipline, as the Reverend John A. Ryan suggests, it IS STILL THE LAW, and HOW CAN WE CONTINUE AS A NORMAL GOVERNMENT WITHOUT LAW ENFORCEMENT?

Repeal Practically Impossible

And since the Constitution provides that no amendment can be adopted except by a three-fourths majority of the state legislatures, it is admitted by both wets and dries that it is practically impossible, at least for years to come, to remove the Eighteenth Amendment from the Constitution.

"The wets at last admit the fact that repeal is almost impossible," says Mrs. Willebrandt, "because a bare majority of dries in one or other branch of the legislatures of thirteen states can block repeal or alteration."

Clarence Darrow, in speaking of Cory Ford's article in *Vanity Fair*, says:

"The article, however, has one fatal error.

The 18th Amendment can not be repealed.

If the sufficient majority could ever pass the act through Congress and submit it to the states, thirteen states could block it."—*Vanity Fair*, June, 1930.

"We have the amendment. There is no immediate prospect of its repeal."—Calvin Coolidge, as quoted in *Christian Science Monitor*, June 13, 1930.

Accepting, then, this very important fact that any thirteen of our states could block any change in the prohibition law, what can be done? For Congress to submit a referendum on this question to the people of the several states would be useless, as a three-fourths majority of the State Legislatures who favor repeal would not be gained at the present time. This situation would have a tendency to increase the feeling which is already very intense and create a condition whereby the wet states would feel justified in nullifying the Eighteenth Amendment which could easily lead to open revolt.

The manner in which they are working indicates that the wets are not content to wait for the measure to be removed from the Constitution by process of laborious legislation, but reveals that they would feel justified in starting a revolt as the only means of changing the existent law.

Rebellion Frequently Suggested

This idea is supported by the *tone* in which many of the wets are speaking and writing. The terms "rebellion," "revolution," "nullification," etc., occur so frequently as expressions of their own feelings that they must certainly come from minds which think and feel rebellion, revolution and forced nullification.

And to advocate nullification of the Eighteenth Amendment in the manner in which the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments are in fact nullified would be impossible. The amendments were written into the Constitution under vastly different circumstances and deal with different classes of people entirely.

We must deal with a vastly different type of mentality in this issue than was concerned with the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, enacted at the close of the Civil War. Today we must consider such eminent men as F. Scott McBride, Dr. Clarence True Wilson, Bishop James Cannon, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, Henry Ford, Thomas A. Edison and others of similar standing.

We are consistently and persistently warned that to advocate nullification is a dangerous doctrine.

Defying a law is bad, asserts Fabian Franklin, a wet and opposed to the Eighteenth Amendment. Here are his words: "To defy a law, however bad, which has behind it the full authority of the government is a course which may be necessary, but it is inevitably attended with great evils."

And here is another important and typical contribution on the subject of disregard of law: Judge V. I. Drain, in giving his charge to the grand jury of Macon, Missouri, is reported as saying:

"There has been a great deal of unnecessary agitation with regard to some parts of our Constitution. I am not saying the Eighteenth Amendment is any more sacred than any other amendment. If you breed disre-

spect for any one law, however, you inculcate disrespect for all law."

Even though it is conceded that it took a hundred years to write the amendment into the Constitution, another writer pointedly replies: "That is no reason why we should be willing to wait a hundred years to cancel that outrage."

"Change of Government" Threatened

Sinister suggestions are contained in the statements of Pierre S. DuPont, as reported in press dispatches of April 23, 1930:

"Speaking as a leader in the wet cause, DuPont asserted that if Congress denied the people a voice on prohibition, 'it seems likely that they will be driven to the court of last resort named in the Declaration of Independence,' changing their form of government."

It was further reported that it was not the Volstead Act which Mr. DuPont wanted repealed, but the Eighteenth Amendment. Advocating outright repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and characterizing repeal of the Volstead Act as a dishonorable method of bringing back liquor is the way the report reads.

Armed conflict is suggested by still another—no less than Henry H. Curran, president of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment:

"Curran predicted that the prohibition amendment would be repealed and asserted that three out of four persons in the United States, as well as five states were in revolt. He said he hoped there would be no armed revolution against the government as a result of the law.

"Asked by Caraway whether he thought the Eighteenth Amendment justified citizens to take up arms against the government, Curran replied that he hoped there would be no armed revolution.

"I think the rights of mankind as listed in our Constitution and our bill of rights,' he added, 'are so well worth defending that they ought to be defended in every way that may become necessary.'

"And if resort to arms is necessary, you are in favor of it?' asked Caraway.

"We will cross that bridge when we come to it,' Curran said."—*Kansas City Star*, April 16, 1930.

Why the necessity of armed revolution against the government if the amendment is repealed, as Mr. Curran predicts, even though he hopes such will not happen? Or does he mean that if the amendment is not repealed there will be an armed revolution?

These men know that the amendment can not be repealed for years to come, so why do they foster this dangerous propaganda unless it be in desperation? They bandy the words "revolution," "rebellion," and "nullification" about with seeming indifference as to the consequences. Is it the indifference born of desperation concerning a law which they believe to be so unjust as to justify a change in form of government, as suggested by Mr. DuPont?

"Sees Civil War Danger"

The doctrine of nullification has already caused a disastrous war, according to one legislator. In

a radio speech reported in a news dispatch in the *Kansas City Star* of February 13, 1930, under the heading: "Sees Civil War Danger," Representative Williamson, a dry of South Dakota, is quoted as "predicting that if the doctrine of nullification of the Eighteenth Amendment were persisted in it would 'again lead to open conflict.'"

Another statement of his is reported: "The doctrine of nullification led us into one of the most disastrous and bloody wars. Such a doctrine if persisted in to the last extremity, will again lead us to open conflict."

When will there be action? Jay Franklin, in *Vanity Fair*, says that action will come by 1940. "When will we get action? In 1930? No. In 1932? Probably not. In 1936? Perhaps. By 1940? Yes." "And when it comes," he says, "it will not be as simple a thing as a mere friendly repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and the defeat of dry representatives. It will be a political revolution."

His position seems to be that there will be no relief from Congress and he closes his article by saying: "For if Congress refuses to uncork the Constitution, the American people are quite capable of knocking the neck off the bottle instead."

Physical Action Inevitable

These assembled statements of typical wets can spell nothing else than revolt—revolt as quickly as it would seem to lead to results. Feverish activities are manifest everywhere. Polls, discussions, editorials, articles, reach millions constantly and have their effect. Earnestness and enthusiasm are manifest in organizations formed to combat the Eighteenth Amendment. Vast sums of money are being spent. It is one of the liveliest, most salient issues of the day.

Such intensity of feeling can result only in physical action. Human nature can not continue quiescent under the strain to which it is being put in the activities of press and pulpit, of committees and commissions without inevitable action or the question being dropped entirely.

And there seems no indication of the subject being dropped. Neither is there any likelihood of the amendment being removed from the Constitution by any lawful method, for years to come. There is no evidence of any yielding on the part of either the wets or the dries. The Anti-Saloon League is still active in collecting and expending funds to continue the sentiment which prompted the adoption of the amendment.

The wets continue to raise and spend large sums to influence public opinion.

All these suggest strife and conflict. The general unrest and depth of feeling suggest that such a conflict will be sanguinary and disastrous. The time for it will be determined only by the strength developed and the prospects of success apparent to the wets themselves.

Women Combating Prohibition

If it were only the matter of securing a drink of alcoholic beverage, the question would not be so serious. But it is more. With many it is a moral issue. With still other thousands it is a religious issue, and we find not only men but women

forming organizations to combat the prohibition law.

All the indications, only a few of which are presented here, point to inevitable armed conflict, unless unseen forces arise and that soon to check the trend of events, growing out of violence of debate and enormous total of activity centering around the great issue prohibition.

May the God-fearing people of the nation awake to the serious situation that confronts them, lest the conflict come upon them "as a thief in the night."

THE CROW CREEK BRANCH

By C. L. Wheaton

After the expulsion of the saints from Jackson County, Missouri, in the winter of 1833-34, this small "remnant" spoken of by the "prophets," found temporary asylum in Woodford County, Illinois. Associated with them were such venerable and respected Elders as David Judy, Alma Owens, Jedidiah Owen and others, who had been baptized as early as 1831 and received their priesthood directly under the hands of Joseph Smith. Concerning the authority of these noble servants of the Lord and the Church of Christ, we quote the following from the *Saints Herald* for April 24th, 1918.

"All vexed questions of doctrine, baptism, and priesthood were very carefully considered by the best intelligence that the church could assemble at a General Conference, both among the priesthood and the delegates.

"Though arguments might be advanced upon both sides of the question, as is usually the case, THIS ASSEMBLY CONCEDED THAT OUR CHURCH OF CHRIST BROTHERS HAD ESTABLISHED THEIR CLAIMS SO FAR AS THEY MAY BE INVOLVED IN TRACING BAPTISM AND PRIESTHOOD BACK TO VALID ORIGINAL SOURCES. As an organization they have held to the fundamental doctrines of the church and have been guilty of no moral lapse. In fact in the face of adroit efforts to bribe and seduce from their trust they have kept themselves clear from evil forces and designing men. Hence no charge of apostasy from the original faith could be supported were there any among us inclined at this time to make such a charge."

After these men, above referred to, had associated themselves with the scattered members of the church in Woodford County, Illinois, they formed themselves into a local church known as the Crow Creek branch of the Church of Christ. They continued to adhere to the "original faith," as established on the sixth day of April, 1830. It is true that they were not fully set in order, with all the quorums of the church, but the fact is that within its fold were the elements that was in time to bring about that condition.

A revelation was given to this "remnant" in the year 1863, indicating that the way would be opened "in 1867 for them to return" to Jackson County, Missouri, in "fulfillment of the prophets." This they did, and as a result were the first organized group of the early church to do so, holding their first conference in Missouri on March 1, 1867. Following this, they pooled their monies, at great sacrifice, and purchased the "spot," even the "place of the Temple," where the New Jerusalem was to be built by the gathering of the saints.

THE OLD-FASHIONED PREACHER

Say, what has become of the preacher,
The preacher, old-fashioned and plain, (2 Nephi 13: 4)
Who stood with his hands in his pockets?
Yet made the great message so plain?
Whose words of conviction and power, (Acts 7: 54)
Vehicles of knowledge and truth, (Acts 11: 13-15)
Went straight to the hearts of his hearers, (Acts 2: 37)
Converting both aged and youth? (Acts 2: 41)

The man with the scriptures committed, (2 Timothy 3: 15)
Who quoted Isaiah, or Paul, (Mosiah 8: 15-28)
When asked to define his position
Concerning a minister's "call"?
Who knew where to find what he wanted (John 8: 17)
To prove his position was right,
When some one attempted to argue, (Luke 10: 25-29)
Or questioned the source of his light?

Somehow in the present transition,
When changes are wrought overnight,
The preacher who "spoke by the Spirit"
Has just about vanished from sight.
No longer his manner, once welcome
To those who were thirsting for truth,
Is pleasing to popular fancy—
His actions and speech are uncouth.

Today there is almost a riot
As in our mad scramble and haste
We seek some new-fangled creation (Matt. 15: 9)
Approved by the popular taste. (Acts 18: 21)
The world with its many inventions
Our "narrow" pretensions deride, (1 Nephi 2: 75-83)
And we to "improve" (?) our condition
Are drifting along with the tide.

Its drink of psychology freely
By authors of fame, if you'd teach; (2 Nephi 6: 57-60)
And feast upon late homiletics
By other D. D's., if you'd preach.
For surely those men of great learning, (2 Nephi 11: 90, 91)
Who stand at the head of them all,
Are better equipped to instruct us
Than preachers like Nephi and Paul.

But why did the Savior when choosing
His servants for labors so great
Not go to the places of learning
For men with attainments to date?
Why choose men like Matthew and Peter (D. & C. 1: 4)
Whose manners were rude and uncouth? (Acts 4: 13)
Had not the learned men of refinement
Advantage for preaching the truth? (Job 32: 9)

We may with a modern equipment
Our frenzied ambitions enhance;
And meeting the popular favor,
Attract some attention, perchance. (John 15: 18, 19)
But we of the Lord are admonished— (Isaiah 55: 8, 9)
And oft does the Spirit remind— (D. & C. 102: 2)
That weapons of carnal invention (Rom. 8: 5-8)
Approval of God will ne'er find. (1 Cor. 3: 19)

Oh, give me the preacher, old-fashioned,
Whose message, aflame from the start, (John 16: 13)
Enkindled a fire on the altar
Of every unprejudiced heart. (Acts 16: 14)
I care not how awkward his gestures;
His English may not be the best;
But if he is "led by the Spirit" (Luke 21: 15)
He'll stand when it comes to the test. (Acts 6: 10)

THE SPIRIT OF SACRIFICE.

Bemidji, Minnesota, September 25, 1930.

Elder Arthur M. Smith,
Independence, Missouri.

Dear Brother:

Tithing\$1.74
Temple Fund 5.00

Inclosed find M. O. to cover the above small amounts for the purposes indicated. Under the stress of the hard times so universally in evidence, we have decided that if we are going to do anything for the Lord's work it will have to be by the "mickles" as we gather them, in the hope that with the many who are doing likewise we may all together make a "muckle" that will be of use in helping to move the Lord's work, and in building the Lord's house.

The children are contributing their share by tedious work in peeling the No. 2 and No. 3 potatoes for home use that we may sell the larger ones; and by using No. 2 and No. 3 pumpkins and squashes for home consumption that the best may be sold. There are many ways, if we look about us, in which savings can be made, and in which ALL CAN HELP.

May we add that we are thankful for the opportunity to contribute where we feel assured none of it will be used for the upkeep of worldly "fraternalism," nor for paying tribute to the usurer.

Yours very truly,

Leon A. Gould.

Elder A. M. Smith

Independence, Mo.

Dear Brother:

We are much interested in the building of the temple, and not being greatly blessed of this world's good, we will try and remember that the Messenger said: "This house shall be built by sacrifice and not by promise." So we are sending P. O. order for \$25.00. We don't feel we should stand back and let the other fellow do it all. With a wish and a prayer that God will put it in the hearts of each one to do what they can that the building of the Temple will not be a failure, we are your Brother and Sister in the true Church of Christ.

David D. Smith and Wife.

EUROPEAN MISSION

Owing to lack of sufficient funds for the European mission, Elder Samuel Wood will labor in America until the General Conference next April.

The Temple must be built.

He that is tithed shall not be burned.