

MACEDONIAN CALL

"Come Over into Macedonia and Help Us."—(Acts 16:9.)

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., 918 Congress Ave., MAY, 1934

WHY PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED

The Perfection of the Church.—Jesus says, "All power [authority] is given unto me, in heaven and in earth." Peter says that "all things that pertain to life and godliness" have been given. The New Testament Church did all kinds of missionary work, aid work, orphan work, Bible teaching work, that Christians need to do religiously, and they had no organization but the Church. Paul says, "Unto God be glory in the church." John says, "If any man shall add unto these things, God will add unto him the plagues written in this book." Therefore, any human organization established by Christians to do work of the church is an addition to God's system and is unscriptural.

Bible Colleges and Orphan Homes.—These organizations have boards, treasuries, presidents, secretaries, etc; and the church has its elders, treasurers, deacons, etc. The colleges and homes are bodies. A David Lipscomb College Bulletin says, "The school was incorporated." The Latin word for body is corpus, from which we get "incorporated," hence they are human bodies established to do work of the Church. The Bible says there is "one Body" in the divine system for glorifying God, while the advocates of these human organizations say there are many bodies.

A "David Lipscomb College Bulletin" for June, 1921, says of their school, "Its supreme purpose, as set forth in the charter, SHALL BE TO TEACH THE BIBLE AS THE REVEALED WILL OF GOD to man and as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice, and TO TRAIN THOSE WHO ATTEND IN A PURE BIBLE CHRISTIANITY."

Now, "the Bible as the revealed will of God" is the same thing as "the truth" of God. The human organization of David Lipscomb College, then, is a pillar and ground of "the truth", while Paul says, "the Church of the Living God is the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15).

A "pure Bible Christianity" is the same as "the manifold wisdom of God." Thus is made known by the human organization of David Lipscomb College the manifold wisdom of God, but Paul says that "to the intent . . . might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:10).

After giving the quotation above from David Lipscomb College Bulletin, a Harding College Bulletin of October, 1928, says, "Among these schools that are fashioned after this type . . . is Harding College, at Morrilton, Arkansas." They are all alike.

In an Abilene Christian College Bulletin for May, 1933, is found this as the first statement, "Abilene Christian College exists for the teaching of the Bible." Now, to teach the Bible is to glorify the God of the Bible. Hence this simply means: Unto God be glory in Abilene

Christian College, while Paul says, "Unto God be glory in the Church." Which shall we follow?

The Church Treasury.—The "Rough Draft" was a so-called unity proposition, put out by the publishers of the Apostolic Review in June, 1932, but it has caused ten times more confusion and division than unity. It evidently was given not only to bring the Bible college people and anti-college people together, but even to unify us with the Christian Church people. One of the terms of unity was "Retain the church funds strictly for church purposes, and we'll have a glorious reunion" with the Bible college people and the Christian Church on the society question.

There are two ways in which we might touch the "church funds". We might take directly out of the church treasury after it has been given, or we might withhold what ought to have gone into it. We are commanded to give as we have been prospered. If we do that, we shall not have money to put into a human organization to do part of the work of the Church.

In the Harding College Bulletin before me, they speak of "this six hundred thousand dollar plant." David Lipscomb College has as big a plant or bigger. And Abilene Christian College Bulletin gives a picture of a fine school building, saying, "One of the seven modern newly-equipped buildings on the campus." Probably their plant is worth a million dollars, or more. All this money has been withheld from the church treasury. So all this talk about leaving the church treasury alone simply because no money is taken from it directly (though all the colleges have been receiving money directly from the church treasury) is meaningless. And this argument has been made by the Review against these colleges for a quarter of a century.

Even though the colleges and homes do not touch the church funds directly, still they are just as unscriptural. They are human organizations established by Christians to do work of the Church, when Paul tells us to give glory to God "in the Church."

God's Way of Protecting the Church from False Teachers from Without.—If heretics are within a church, after the first and second admonition, brethren are to reject. But this point in the R. D. does not touch our handling the college advocates. They come from other churches—college churches. After you have let them in, and they cause division over their human organization, you may try to send them away, but the harm has been done. You might even send charges to one's home church, but it will say he teaches what they believe. And so according to the R. D. he can go from place to place confusing and dividing the true Church of God.

The word "transgress" means "to go beyond", and "the doctrine of Christ" is what is taught in his Word. The doctrine of Christ in his Word says, "Unto God be glory in the Church," but Bible college people say, "Unto God be glory

in the Church" and in the Bible colleges and orphan homes, and thus they "transgress and abide not in the doctrine of Christ" (2 John 9).

Next verse in 2 John says, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him NOT." The Rough Draft and its supporters say, "Receive him." John says further, "Neither bid him Godspeed," and the R. D. and its advocates say, "And bid him Godspeed." John continues, "For he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds," while this R. D. and its helpers say, "Is not partaker of his evil deeds." Thus do the supporters of the Rough Draft flatly contradict the Word of God on the Lord's plan of protecting his Church from false teachers from without.

America has a law to keep out anarchists, bolsheviks and communists from Europe, which is identical in purpose to this law of God in 2 John 10 to keep out false teachers, which says, "Receive them not." If the framers of the Rough Draft and its supporter were running America, they would say, "Receive them," and America would soon be in a revolution and a confusion, as Russia has been.

What's all this noise about some preaching Christ of envy and strife, and Paul's rejoicing in it, and therefore we ought to fellowship men who are advocating "rival institutions" to the Church? If the reasoners (?) can show that Paul and the disciples fellowshipped those people while they were preaching Christ of envy and strife, then there would be some point to their remarks. The same argument could be used of the Christian Church. They preach Christ and some more, and so do the college people, and we should fellowship them, too, in the same way.

Other Evils Which Come In.—To receive college advocates opens the way for the worldliness of the colleges with their theatricals and match games with other colleges, etc. It opens the way for organized Sunday-schools with their literature. It opens the way for the all-time preaching system, which is practically the same as the pastor system of the denominations, and one of the greatest evils in Christianity today. That is exactly the way the Christian Church pastor system originated. But the R. D. endorses this alltime preaching system in a church with elders, by a man brought in for that purpose, though the Bible commands elders to "feed the church," and brethren to edify one another, and shows in 1 Cor. 14 that different brethren took part, "when the whole church was gathered together." In the Review of March 27, A. T. Harris, Dallas, Texas, speaks of preachers for two churches there, thus: "Bros. Pullias and Wilber White (of Sunset Church) will exchange pulpits next Lord's day." Go on, brethren—you'll soon be in Babylon!

Headed Toward the Christian Church.—Here is a response to a letter to W. G. Roberts:

"You ask if Allen didn't write and ask

MACEDONIAN CALL

Published Monthly by
D. A. SOMMER,
918 Congress Avenue,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Subscription Price, \$1.00 a Year

me if I would be willing to worship with the Christian church if they would do away with the instrument, or if he wrote some one else to that effect. In a letter to me dated January 31, 1933, Allen said this: 'Wouldn't we still be worshipping with Missionary Society advocates [note the word—Ed.] if they had left out the instrumental music, and risked their support of the Society as individuals?'

"In a letter to Bro. A. T. Kerr, Brookport, Ill., dated Oct. 16, 1933, I believe it is on the envelope. All the date the letter has is the postmark at Indianapolis, Allen says this: 'If they omit instruments, wouldn't their worship be as pure as yours? If not, then the instruments didn't divide us in the first place.'

"Then Bro. Daniel Sommer said in the Review of June 6, 1933, this: 'S. W. Traum advises in the Restoration Herald, Let us follow after the things which make for peace. His fight seems to be with the Missionary Society. We can also prove it unscripturalness. But why doesn't Bro. Traum drop his unauthorized instrumental music in worship, for in doing so, he'd make peace with a million or more of us who really hold to the apostolic worship.'

The statements in these letters show a lamentable amount of ignorance on the part of the young generation, proposing this divisive Unity Plan, and a regrettable amount of forgetfulness on the part of the older generation. At Sand Creek Church, Shelby Co., Ill., Aug. 17, 1889, there was delivered what is known as the "Sand Creek Declaration and Address." Many members from different churches of Christ gathered there to draw the line on the digressive movement and try to save a remnant. Daniel Sommer was the chief speaker on the occasion. From that time especially churches began to keep out the digressive preachers, and the movement made a definite division. One of the chief things mentioned against these digressives was their worldliness. The Declaration said, "We feel that the time has fully come when something of a more definite line ought to be known and recognized between the Church and the world. . . . 'Be not conformed to this world. . . . If they will not turn away from such, that we can not and will not regard them as brethren.'" So worldliness forty-five years ago was cause for disfellowship by faithful brethren just as much as instrumental music in worship and societies in work of the Church. The Christian Church might leave the church funds intact and do away with instrumental music, but they still have the pastor system (which is a root of much of the rest), choirs which keep the members largely from praising God in song, shows and festivals to make

money, abandonment of discipline, and other worldly and unscriptural practices which nullify the good. It is optimism gone to seed to imagine that the Christian Church would give up these practices, yet the supporters of the R. D. would reason us into such an entanglement. But praise God, many brethren have rebelled against such compromise!

Fruit of the Rough Draft.—Carl Ketcherside was booked to hold a meeting in North Indianapolis the last of February. Before the holidays, C. W. wrote Carl not to let the Rough Draft interfere with the meeting. After the Kansas City Mass Meeting which protested against the Rough Draft, Carl wrote this to C. W. January 9, 1934, concerning the R. D. and his proposed meeting: "I consider it my duty to oppose it as a humanly devised instrument for regulating the Body of Christ. Consistency and my conscience demand that I warn the brethren against it at Indianapolis as well as elsewhere. . . . If you still desire me to assist you in light of the above, I am willing to come and do my utmost in preaching the WORD." After waiting about three weeks and till eleven days till time for the proposed meeting, and receiving no invitation to come, he wrote C. W. and told him he was making arrangements to go elsewhere. J. M. Horney, who has done much to boost the Review with its compromise Rough Draft, started the meeting about the middle of March. Thus the publisher of the Review, who was an elder of the church at the time, turned down a faithful gospel preacher who teaches just what the Review used to teach, and accepted one who upholds the Review with its changed doctrine.

About twelve years ago a group of brethren worshipping with the North Indianapolis Church withdrew and started a church on the east side of the city. The leader of this group was a Bible college man. Most of the people connected with it are Bible college people, many having come to the city from the South. They have the literature in their Bible classes, take "special contributions" for an orphan home (which would allow the same for a college), and have only college preachers. Hardeman, of the Freed-Hardeman College, has held a meeting there. Foy Wallace, editor of the Gospel Advocate, the chief Bible college journal, held a meeting there last year. Their present regular preacher obtained his education, part of it at least, in a Bible college.

I am reliably informed that an elder of the North Indianapolis church sent an invitation to the east side to announce Horney's meeting. This preacher for the college people attended Bro. Horney's meeting, and was called on by Horney several times to take public part. That is the first time in the history of the North Indianapolis Church that a Bible college man has stood in that pulpit. It has fought to keep them out. Under the influence of the Rough Draft, the eldership is trying to change the church's principles on such matters, just as the Review is trying to change the principle of the Church of Christ in general on the same. Many who could not see where the R. D. would land them, can now see by its fruit.

A brother in Bedford, Ind., says in the Review, March 13: "Since the 'rough draft' was written there has been no college preacher who preached at North

Indianapolis. I am sure there will never be under the present eldership. Does this look as if they had changed?" Brother, didn't you speak about ten days too soon? The man did the next thing to preaching there. You were looking at the bud, not the fruit. And the harvest of this compromise fruit has only begun to ripen.

Don't Be Confused.—This argument that we tolerate lodge-members, therefore should be willing to tolerate college advocates, does not touch the point under discussion at all. I know of no church that rejects a church member because of these colleges unless they are advocating them. The question is concerning public teachers and preachers who uphold and advocate these "rival institutions", as the Rough Draft calls colleges. If a preacher belongs to a lodge and advocates them, publicly and privately, I do not know of a church that would not reject him. And when a preacher obtained his education in a Bible college and goes along with those who uphold them, he will talk such colleges if opportunity presents itself, and will thus cause confusion and division. The inspired John says, "Receive him NOT;" but the authors and supporters of the Rough Draft say, Receive him.

A Most Vital Question.—The protection of any group of people from outside evils is one of the greatest principles for good there is. We quarantine those with contagious diseases and keep them out of society in general. Every foreign immigrant goes through a rigid physical examination to keep out diseases from our land. Even shrubs and all other vegetation which comes into this country go through the same examination. We tried to keep the saloon-keeper with his poison out of society. We are supposed to have censors to keep evils out of the movies. We have strict laws against communists, anarchists and bolsheviks coming into this country. We try to keep out of our schools those who teach evil or live evil lives. God forbade his people marrying with foreign nations lest their idolatry creep into their religion. All denominations have laws which keep out those who would teach another doctrine. And the Bible says that if any come and bring not the true doctrine, Receive them not. The authors and supporters of the Rough Draft are the only ones that I know of who would break down this great principle of protection, and would say of teachers of "rival institutions" (as the R. D. calls the colleges), Receive them.

Brethren, there are many important, concise truths in this article. Read it carefully again, and loan it to brethren who should read it. Or, what is better, send for as many copies as you can use. We hope the critics, instead of railing at this article, will point out the mis-statements and illogical reasoning in that "nice" spirit they talked about in the R. D. but which they have forgotten all about.

WHAT IS A CONVENTION?

Since the authors of the "Rough Draft" are using the word "convention" in a way to poison the minds of some against the Kansas City meeting which was held the latter part of December, I wish to correct their mistake.

The Dictionary says a convention is "The act of coming together or assem-

bling; the state of being assembled". No one objects to a religious assembly, for Paul said for us not to "forsake the assembling of ourselves together" (Heb. 10:25), so we have Biblical authority for a convention or assembly. It is what they do at a Convention that makes it wrong. The Church has a convention every Lord's day, for they assemble, as the Bible says they should.

At the K. C. meeting there was nothing done to make that assembly (convention) wrong, for we were there OPPOSING what was done at a small convention held about one year and six months before that at 904 Udell St., Indianapolis, where they DID something that made THAT convention wrong. They wrote a HUMAN CREED as a BASIS for Unity, which is absolutely wrong and we were there to oppose that wrong. That is, that was ONE reason of our assembly.

The Holy Spirit wrote a "creed" as a basis for Unity and if all will not unite on that it is absolutely useless for men to try to do something the Holy Spirit failed to do. We oppose all religious creeds except the Bible.

I wish to mention this, too: They are telling that we can not oppose their creed (R. D.) without opposing the Lord's Supper and discipline, for they are in the creed written at that Convention at Indianapolis, which they named a "Rough Draft." True, but their reasoning would make us accept the M. E. Discipline, for it, too, has both in it. Many good things in the Methodist Discipline, but there are enough bad things in it to make us oppose it, so we say we are opposed to the "Rough Draft" just as we say we are opposed to the M. E. Discipline. One grain of strychnine might poison a good glass of water. Those who would drink the water would die. We would oppose persons drinking that water, though a very small amount of poison had been placed in it.—W. G. Roberts, 2708 DeWitt Ave., Mattoon, Illinois.

"A NEW AND ENLARGED FELLOWSHIP"

The Review rejoices in this though it consists of many it formerly ejected or prohibited from its columns. Notice some of them:

1. D. C. J. formerly reported in it, but was rejected when he linked himself with collegites and with Boleites with their hobby on the future kingdom, making division. But now he reports again.

2. Bible college churches were not permitted to report. The paper tried to help a few brethren start another church in or near, Washington, D. C., because that church was considered unfaithful, but now their preacher reports. A. T. H. reports often from Dallas, Texas, and in his report in People's Bible Advocate he says of that church, "\$791 to orphans, home, charity and missions." They don't leave the church funds alone, either, and they probably do the same with colleges, yet readers would think they are faithful. Thirty-ninth and Flora Church in Kansas City, Mo., also reports, though a Bible college church. Others report.

3. T. S. H. was thrown out of the Review as unsafe. He apologized for colleges, worked with college advocates, received many columns of condemnation from the Review, yet now comes back without a word.

4. J. A. S. went to the Christian Church, argued for instrumental music and societies, stayed ten years, came back to a church doubtful of its loyalty and made a "blanket" apology, not mentioning in such apology his stand on things mentioned, went back to his home and worshipped with the Christian Church for six months or more, then moved away, and is now pastor of a "Church of Christ" in Long Beach. He

stands and we have never heard of his stating it elsewhere; yet he reports in the Review.

5. Many readers have drawn the idea that Timothy Tarwater is a faithful brother in the Church of Christ, yet H. C. Towles writes this: "I wrote the postmaster where Timothy Tarwater writes from. He tells me that isn't his name. And that he is a Christian Church preacher. If you would like to have the preacher's name I will gladly give it to you."

6. E. B. wrote a tract in favor of voting in the church. Was contributing editor of an orphan home journal (which touches church funds whenever possible), was a page editor of Gospel Advocate, a college journal (with his picture every week), caused a division in his church at L. B., was thrown off the editorial staff of the Advocate, is still a college man—yet reports in the Review. A few years ago, the paper said, "Come back, Ernest, come back." Ernest did not "come back," but they went to Ernest.

7. F. S. is the "Canadian preacher" referred to, was once office editor of the Review, developed very broad ideas of fellowship, even including the unimersed. At that time I engaged in two written discussions with him on those principles, in the Review, AT THE REQUEST OF THE THEN MANAGERS OF THE PAPER. He was finally thrown out of the paper, went to the Christian Leader (a college journal), but became too broad for that; preached for the Christian Church in Canada and wrote for one of its papers, wrote to the Ohio Christian Missionary Society for a job of working with that, but was rejected (so an ex-officer of the Society told D. A. S. personally), and now seems to be the chief writer for the Review, yet there is no evidence that his broad ideas of fellowship have changed.

All this is saddening to the faithful old soldiers of the cross.—E. M. Zerr, 141 Redding Drive, New Castle, Ind.

REPORTS OF BRETHREN

We are sorry that we have been compelled to cut down reports, but there are other things, too, we thought ought to be said now.

Missouri.—Enclosed find \$1. Hope the time will soon be when you can put it out once a month.—Mrs. J. P. Palmer.

Illinois.—Find enclosed \$1. We like the paper fine, and hope it continues loyal to the Cause. We see many writers for the M. C. that we know are loyal.—Roy Lawrence.

Iowa.—I am sending \$1. I read the M. C. over and it was good.—J. E. Criner.

Missouri.—We enjoy the paper very much. Enclosed is \$1. You are to receive a few more from the congregation soon, if you have not already.—Mr. and Mrs. Roy Clark.

Kansas City, Mo.—Church at 55th and Cleveland is doing very well. Our attendance is larger than a year ago, and contributions much better. I think it was about the first of December we had 100 additions, two from Christian Church, one by baptism, one by membership. It is disgusting the way the Review keeps pushing their idea of unity when one can see the trouble it will cause and is causing. They say it was only a "rough draft", but nearly two years have passed since it was first published; and they haven't hinted that a "smooth" draft is to take its place.—Wilber C. Davis.

St. Louis.—Here are a few names with money. All that attended the K. C. meeting and have since read what Allen said about it, certainly can understand what has caused a lot of this trouble—how he could misrepresent the things that were said there, and paint the glowing picture in his report of how he met all opposition to the R. D., and yet know what a miserable out he made—is more than I can figure out. . . . Church here having good attendance. Brother Ballenger was with us fourth Lord's day and two were added by baptism. Will try to send some more subs soon.—Robert Morrow.

Illinois.—Enclosed is \$1. Glad to know the M. C. is growing. Wish you success in your effort. We still meet with the church at Hartford and think we are doing mighty well. Brother Zerr will hold us a meeting in October.—Chas. and Edna Maynard.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa, R. 3.—John W. Rhodes, LaGrande, Ia., and I just closed a two weeks' Bible reading in Center Point, Ia. We are expected to be with those brethren again in September. The interest taken was very fine. Everyone seems to be studying their Bibles a little more thoroughly than before. We had no evident results of this meeting. . . . Brethren say the crowds were the best since the horse and buggy days. We are open to any meetings the brethren should call us to.—Bruce Pryor.

Kansas City, Mo.—I received the M. C. and like it fine. May the Lord bless you in your work of faith and labor of love. I was with the church in St. Louis over first Lord's day in March and two were baptized. I preached a week at Hartford, Ill., and baptized two there. From there I went to Jerseyville, spent a week and had good meetings. My next will be at Gallatin, Mo. Only a few days there and they are having a hard fight paying hall rent, etc. Am sending names and money.—W. E. Ballenger.

Missouri.—May the good Lord help you in contending for just what the Word of God teaches. Find enclosed one dollar. Will help more.—J. W. Johnson. (Old Bro. Johnson attended two or more Bible readings by Brother Morris, and sees no reason in changing now from the things we used to teach.—Ed.)

Mountain Home, Ark.—I was called to Carthage, Mo., to speak at funeral of Bro. Rob Statts. He will be greatly missed. I go tomorrow to Danet, Mo. Hope to be in some missions soon.—W. C. Rice.

Missouri.—Enclosed is \$1 for M. C. I am 84 years young. I think the M. C. is the paper for the brethren to take.—Brother and Sister Sims.

Iberia, Mo.—Have been meeting with home brethren a few Lord's days, helping what I can to strengthen the work. Have no meetings promised for this spring and summer, except a few mission efforts near home. Brethren say they have not the money to finance a meeting at home or to conduct a mission meeting. Let us pray, watch, work and study the Word, laboring toward greater Unity in the Brotherhood.—Wm. Freeman Jones.

Rockville, Mo.—A faithful member of the church of Christ who is qualified to teach English and history in a first class high school in Missouri, and who wishes a job might do well to write to A. R. Dix, Rockville, Mo.

Kemp, Ill.—The Lyons Bible reading is now history. I only missed two sessions. A profitable ten weeks indeed. Brother Zerr is a competent teacher and stands firm for the Bible alone. Lyons is blessed with a loyal congregation. They believe in showing their faith by their works. I preached there seven times during the reading, had the pleasure of baptizing a young man and an old lady about seventy years old while there. I enjoyed their hospitality and cooperation very much during my stay there. We are starting a mid-week Bible study here, started last Wednesday night with good interest. Hope to do much good. I am working with the following congregations this year: Union Center, Mattoon, Neal and Casey. Some loyal brethren at each place who are satisfied with the Lord's plan for unity. I go to Casey the fourth Lord's day. Am looking forward with interest to my next trip to Union Center and Neal, as I haven't been there this year yet. I have some time for meetings this year. If you want a plain man with a plain gospel message I shall be glad to assist you.—C. R. Turner.

Colorado.—We have been receiving the M. C. for some time, and now wish to help what we can to spread its good news to others. We miss the A. R. and had lived in hope of a change to former conditions, so we could work together. But alas! So I am sending you some subs. You may keep balance as you see best. With best wishes for the success of the M. C.—E. O. Huffman.

Illinois.—Enclosed is \$1 to keep the M. C. coming, and my prayer is that it will always stand firm for truth and righteousness as taught by Christ and his apostles. . . . If the publishers of the R. D. had only used some judgment. . . . The slurring and belittling that some have received because they differed from the author of the R. D. . . . An exaggeration is one way of lying, so is misrepresentation another way and shows our dishonesty. [The name "Timothy Tarwater" is fictitious, and the writer is a Christian Church preacher.—Ed.] "Christ and Religious Racketeers," running in the A. R., has many good things in it, but in my estimation the good has been far overbalanced by one untrue statement that has appeared in the same different times, that "all denominations have millions of Christians in them," . . . though many denominations do not practice immersion at all. Paul says we are "baptized into Christ." (Rom. 6: 3.) . . . I think that one statement will do more harm than the whole series of articles will do good. Why do publishers allow

such false statements to be printed?—Noah Smith. (Bro. Smith is an elder.—Ed.)

Akron, Colo.—I am enclosing the Roady-Johns letter . . . You see it is not addressed to me personally. (on the inside), and it was sent from the Review office—at least it is postmarked Indianapolis, and I think its addressed in Allen's handwriting.—Roy Loney. (Letter follows).

"Dear Brother:—Inasmuch as the statements are being made that the Review has become untrue to the teaching of the Bible, and that it is compromising principles and endorsing things that are wrong, we are anxious to get before the readers of the paper the facts of the case, and prove by some of the writers that such is not the case. And, in order that we might be able to do that, we are asking you to help us in this undertaking. We have decided to make one issue of the paper cover those very questions. We are asking several of the preachers and writers to write short articles to be used in that issue of the paper. We would like for you to help us in this matter, and I am sure that all that you can do will be appreciated by all who are interested in the paper.

"Now, we would like for this short article to cover three things: The College question, the Mutual Edification question, and the amount of preaching each congregation is to have. We would also like to have it shown that the Review is not in sympathy with the idea of using Lesson-leaves in our Bible study.

"Now we are not asking those who are the new friends of the Review to write these articles, but we are asking those who have stood by the paper through the years past and gone; and we are sure that you are in that class, and for that reason we are coming to you with this request. We would like for this issue of the paper to be one that we would not be afraid or ashamed to hand to any man or woman, let them be either friends or enemies of the paper. For that reason we are just wanting the principles explained, and not to make personal statements against any one. (Signed) J. S. Johns, Mentone, Ind.; J. C. Roady, Sullivan, Ind."

New Castle, Ind.—It has been charged that I publicly attacked the Rough Draft and conduct of the Review without having first seen the publishers personally. This charge is false. I am prepared to furnish proof of my statement to any who desires it.—E. M. Zerr.

Mattoon, Ill.—This issue of the M. C. is simply "jammed full" of good reports and good reading. It is just fine and I wish it much success. I am with you in the fight for truth and righteousness.—W. G. Roberts.

Nevada, Mo.—I have just returned from the Lead Belt where I held a two weeks' meeting for Flat River. In most respects it is the best meeting I have ever held there. Crowds were too great to be comfortably taken care of, despite inclement weather. Twelve were baptized, six made acknowledgement of wrongs (a necessity for which we emphasized during our meeting). The church is getting ready to do a clean-up job that will eliminate those whose de-

sires are carnal instead of spiritual. [Worthy of imitation.—Pub.] Had wonderful co-operation from Bonne Terre, St. Louis, Festus and Min-la-motte. This last issue of M. C. will do much to batter down prejudice. I hope to be in position to forward some subs soon.—Carl Ketcherside.

St. Louis.—My wife and I have only been in the faith a short time, and are certainly enthused in the works of the Church of Christ. I also wish to commend the Macedonian Call. It certainly is a wonderful messenger, and may the Lord see fit for its fast growth.—Earl Freiner.

California.—Bro. Walter Weekly is very anxious and willing to forge ahead, and is no respecter of persons when it comes to preaching and teaching. He has helped me and will help others. . . . I am looking forward to the next issue of your little paper filled with good news from all over.—H. M. Hettick.

Topeka, Kans.—Glad to see in the M. C. so many favoring the move to preserve peace and unity of the Church by calling to arms all true disciples to stand firm against present digressions. But the brethren should "SAY IT WITH DOLLARS," as the M. C. is not a self-supporting business. I wonder that you have held out so long in your efforts without assurance of help.—Wm. Ketcherside. (Brethren, I lack one-third enough money to pay for this issue. I have given many weeks of my time FREE, with much persecution, to help you save yourselves from the present apostasy. What are you willing to sacrifice?—D. A. S.)

Sorry.—Yes, I am sorry I can't put in all the articles I have on hand, but space forbids. This number is a tract which the reader should circular where needed. We must counteract poison that is going out every two weeks. Send us reports of good being done or planned. This applies to sisters as well as brethren. You may have a few words of encouragement on home life, family worship, prayer, that will help to greater spirituality. Let's fill the next M. C. with such.

Miscellaneous.—In May the publisher goes into northern Missouri. Churches there that would like me to stop a few days, let me know soon. . . . Protracted Meeting Song Book has more than 100 songs that every one knows, yet sells for only 15 cents. If you need books, send now, and help us out. . . . Don't worry; we are not going to follow the abusive spirit of the authors of the present compromises. But we do intend to show in a straight-forward way just what is going on and where dangers lie.

Let us keep constantly before us the fact that we are in an ONWARD MOVEMENT.

Let us develop all the talent that is fit. Let us put every one to work.

Let us build self-supporting, self-edifying churches.

Then we can do real missionary work. And the "Macedonian Call" will be doing what it planned.