

MACEDONIAN CALL

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

Volume 10

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, AUGUST, 1936

Number 8

MACEDONIAN CALL

Devoted to the work of establishing and developing New Testament churches.

Published Monthly by

D. A. SOMMER,

918 Congress Avenue,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Subscription Price, \$1.00 a Year

Entered as second class matter May 1, 1936, at the post office at Indianapolis, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THERE'S A HILL LONE AND GREY

There's a hill lone and grey, in a land far away,
In a country beyond the blue sea,
Where beneath that fair sky went a Man forth to die
For the world and for you and for me.

Behold! faint on the road, 'neath world's heavy load,
Comes a thorn-crowned Man on the way,
With a cross He is bowed, but still on thro' the crowd
He's ascending that hill lone and grey.

Hark! I hear the dull blow of the hammer swung low;
They are nailing my Lord to the tree,
And the cross they upraise while the multitude gaze
On the blest Lamb of dark Calvary.

How they mock Him in death, to His last lab'ring breath,
While His friends sadly weep o'er the way;
But tho' lonely and faint, still no word of complaint
Fell from Him on the hill lone and grey.

Then the darkness came down and the rocks rent around,
And a cry pierced the grief-laden air;
'Twas the voice of our King who received death's dark sting,
All to save us from endless despair.

Let the sun hide its face, let the earth reel apace,
Over men who their Savior have slain;
But behold from the sod, comes the blest Lamb of God,
Who was slain and is risen again.

Oh, it bows down my heart and the tear-drops will start,
When in mem'ry that grey hill I see,
For 'twas there on its side, Jesus suffered and died
To redeem a poor sinner like me.

—R. Carradine.

READ THE BOOK OF ESTHER

By A. R. MOORE

Esther, a Jewish damsel, became wife of a Persian king. Neither the king, or Haman, his deputy, knew her nationality. Mordecai, the Jew, was servant at the king's gate and there was bitter enmity between the deputy and the gate-keeper. Haman's ancestry led back

to Esau who sold his birthright; while Mordecai came from Jacob who purchased the title. Haman sought to destroy all the Jews and prevailed on the king to sign their death warrant.

When Esther discovered the plot which included herself, she appealed to the king for a stay of execution, and while this challenged the genius, the cunning and the courage of an artful woman it broke the spell that bound the captive Jew. Now the law of the Medes and Persians "changes not," hence this death sentence could not be repealed; but another law was issued, arming the Jews and placing salvation in their own hands. Haman was executed and the seed of Abraham was spared.

God's name is not in the Book of Esther, but HE was there. Jehovah had promised to curse the enemies of Abraham and He never forgets. Christ was in the loins of the Jew at that time and the Jew was in the hand of God who was protecting his promise and securing the route by which Christ would enter the world. Hence the Jews were safe. God decreed in the beginning that man by disobedience should die. To be consistent God can not change, knowing what would follow. He did not make a bird and wait to see if it could fly. Through the seed of the woman He has cancelled the effects of the broken law (Rom. 5:19), and placed the means of salvation in reach of all. There is no reason why I ignore my obligations when another provides the gold (2 Cor. 5:21). The Word makes no corrections because no mistakes.

THE IDEAL CHURCH

By D. A. SOMMER

I have a dream, which is not altogether a dream. It is a wish, a hope, a prayer. It is the earnest longing for the ideal church—the church which should be but is not. It is the hope that Christians of this age have learned something from the saddening experiences of the struggles of disciples through nearly two thousand years. It is the desire that we have learned that unless we back our teaching with our lives, our words of righteousness amount to nothing,—that we must let our light shine that others may see our good works and glorify our Father in heaven.

It is the dream that we see that the only remedy for the wretched world is the Word of God, that true disciples become earnest students of such; that they teach it diligently to their children, and that they try to tell others of its beauties and blessedness. It is that each local group of disciples, in addition to the regular meetings will spend seasons of a week, a month, or several months each year, in protracted Bible study, as they do in protracted evangelistic meetings. That in these meetings they develop the public talents of all brethren with any ability, that they choose several qualified elders

from among those developed, who can feed and guard and guide the flock, as Paul commands and who DO it. That those developed who move away will begin at once to work in their new community, and if there is no church will begin to break bread in their home and try to establish one.

That these little groups will be really intelligent on the Word of God and will keep dead and diseased members cut off. That they will not be ashamed to meet in an upper room or private home, as the apostolic disciples did, when the Church was moving grandly on to victory. That they will protect themselves from false teachers by refusing to receive them, as John commands. That they will contend for purity of doctrine before peace, as James teaches, and that they will keep themselves unspotted from the world. Is such a condition your wish, too, and your hope and prayer, backed by an earnest effort?

CONGREGATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

By E. M. ZERR

An examination of the Scriptures will show that the churches as established by the apostles were independent in their government. That is, each congregation was free from all interference as to other congregations. This is why we find the churches when set in order required a plurality of Elders in one congregation instead of one Elder over a plurality of churches as it finally came to be. "And when they had ordained them elders in every church." (Acts 14:23.) "That thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city." (Titus 1:5.) And every glimpse we have into the governmental matters of the early churches agrees with this idea of plurality of Elders in each congregation and further that the authority of these officers did not extend beyond their own congregation. Thus if the safety and efficiency of the Cause required that more than one Elder should have the rule in one congregation how much folly is seen in the practice of having just one Elder over a number of congregations. As long as this congregational independence was maintained the institution of Rome was kept in the distance and the purity of the Lord's body was more assured.

But human ambition will assert itself and already while the apostles were living this began to be manifest. In 3 John 9 we read: "I wrote unto the church but Diotrephes who loveth to have the preeminence among them receiveth us not." And this spirit, which is the germ of the Roman apostasy was in Paul's mind when he wrote this, "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work." (2 Thess. 2:7.) By consulting Mosheim and other standard church historians we learn this spirit of thirst for power increased and expressed itself as rapidly as the situation would permit. At first the spirit of rivalry in rulership showed itself among the local groups until the balance of power finally rested in one member of the local eldership. But even this increase of power did not satisfy the ambition of the self-seekers. They began to vie with like characters in other congregations. This was not at first done by openly opposing each other. But for a while these leading spirits in the various congregations formed alliances in which they "passed" upon the measures considered proper for the regulation of their respective charges and this developed into a further concentration of power. It is easy to see that such a

movement gradually took from the Elders their rulership in the local congregations which in turn deprived the "members" of that access to and participation in the affairs of the congregation that the Lord intended they should exercise under the Eldership.

The above state continued for a while and then these leaders began contending with each other for supremacy in power. Developments finally reached the stage where it was evident that supreme rule would finally rest with one or the other of the bishops in Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Constantinople or Antioch. We do not need to look long to see the advantage which the bishop in the city of Rome had over all his rivals. This was the head city of the political government of Rome and already mankind was trained to look to this city for leadership. About this time the Roman Emperor, Constantine, professed the Christian religion and assured it the support of his empire. This climaxed the situation and gave the bishop of Rome preeminence over all his rivals and also resulted in the union of church and state which further resulted in the great apostasy or "dark ages." In addition to the history given us in the New Testament the reader may consult on above the work of Mosheim 1-2-2-11, 12, 13, 14. 2-2-2-2, 3. 3-2-2-2, 3, 4. 4-2-2-2, 3, 4, 5, 6. In these references the numbers separated by the hyphen refer respectively to Century, Part, Chapter, Paragraph or section. In all this we see the disastrous result of departing from the Lord's plan of government for his people. As long as the completeness and independence of each congregation were recognized and respected, the purity and peace of the brotherhood in general were safeguarded. But when this was infringed upon and broken down the result was the introduction of all sorts and degrees of corruption in the brotherhood. Of course if history repeats itself as to these causes then we may expect a similar repetition in the results.

But while the congregational independence was the divine plan as to authority, this did not mean to prevent cooperation between the various bodies. In fact this very independence invited cooperation which was really one way of recognizing said independence. For instance, in 2 Cor. 8, we read how the various congregations cooperated in the work of sending financial relief to the unfortunate in Jerusalem. Yet in Acts 11:30 we learn they sent this money to the hands of the Elders. Thus here is a distinct case where the church in various localities cooperated with the one in Jerusalem, yet recognized the authority of the church in that city by placing the funds in hands of its Elders. This procedure is the Lord's plan of government for his people and can not be restricted to the financial matters but must prevail in all things that concern the divine work. Were this principle applied today a far better situation would prevail in many places than we now have. But it seems that little or no regard is had for the authority of congregations. If it becomes necessary for a congregation to reject a member for wrong doing all he needs to do for assistance is to flee away to some other group claiming to be a church of Christ and they will receive him with open arms. If they wished to do the right thing, before receiving the outcast they would consult the congregation from which he is fleeing which would be a way of recognizing its independence. When seeking to make just such investigation I was falsely accused of interfering with the government of another congregation, when the very opposite was the case! it was because I DID wish to recognize the

other church. But a man can be guilty of financial crookedness; another of factionism; another of preaching for the faction; another of rebellion against the Elders and yet congregations are letting these men preach in their pulpits. In so doing they are flouting the New Testament plan of congregational independence. Sometimes they excuse themselves by saying "we are only using these men for what they have been to the Church and are not taking any side of their controversy with the church from where they came." But you ARE taking sides. When you receive and use a man who is out of fellowship with his home congregation you are not only taking sides but are taking the side of this man and against the church from where he came. This principle is further taught in Rom. 1:32. As long as congregational independence is ignored, ungodly preachers and others can find support by scampering off to some other and thus the original scheme of the Lord will be broken down. We have seen above the result of departing from this form of government. Today there is little or no respect had for the authority of the congregations. Evil designing men are floating among the various groups and are being received. As a result we are headed for another apostasy that may outstrip that of the "dark ages" in the depths of its moral and religious corruption. Wrong doers can not be brought to repentance by indulgence but only by being required to make their wrongs right in the place where they were committed, and thus not only recognize God's form of church government but perhaps save some souls who will otherwise be lost through encouragement in their wrong doing.

THE OPEN DOOR POLICY

There has been much said by some concerning the "open door policy", some opposing it, while others favoring it in religion. By "policy" we mean a "definite course or principle of procedure or conduct" in religious movements, fellowship, etc.

The question is about this: Shall we be so lenient, relaxing, softening toward the "Christian Church" and "Bible college" people that we will even fellowship them while in what we admit awful errors? I fear this leniency is a drifting from the old paths toward sectarianism. At least such old reliable preachers as Daniel Sommer, Samuel Piety, et al., taught me that lesson when I was a young preacher, and I still believe they were right, for the Book so teaches. I'm glad Brother Piety still believed and taught that to the day of his death. I can't say so much for some others. I'm sorry.

Brethren, these fellows who are so lenient must be watched and kept out of our pulpits until they will fully declare themselves and allow the entire Brotherhood to know just where they stand. That is what those older preachers taught me and asked me to teach the congregations. Were they right? Am I right in accepting their teaching and still believing and teaching it? It is very true that they may preach strong gospel sermons in the pulpit and not say a word about drifting brethren and collegism, etc. But what about their teaching in private and by correspondence with the class leaning toward their ideas? By their strong gospel sermons they win the hearts of many, then later they get in their work. WATCH THEM as Paul in Rom. 16:16, 17, commands us to do.

The time has come when we must all stand and work together as in days of old. We have had apostasies from

the days of Israel under the law to the present and always will have, so we need not be alarmed about that, but may be grieved.

We have some preachers boasting much that they have not changed and still preach as in their earlier days, hence the following letter is given you to convince you that some of them are mistaken:

Nettleton, Missouri, July 25, 1932. " . . . Well, you and I talked of the open door policy of the Long Beach paper, as you will remember. I could not endorse it, and have refused to even report my work through it since my talk with S. W. Settle, and my correspondence with Stephen and Bro. Morris. They seem strong for an open door policy which I never did endorse and can not now endorse it. But I have noted an open door policy advocated by the Review in the issue of June 21st on first page under heading 'Can't we agree on something?', which is beyond anything that I have ever read in the P. B. A. Concerning that article, Earnest Beam in Christian Leader of the 12th inst. has this to say, 'The Apostolic Review sets the example. It comes with one of the most far-reaching proposals ever made in its long and influential career. The publishers submit a platform for unity. Probably its most outstanding change of policy is the attitude toward extra organizations'. I will not try to give all he said as he wrote three columns in the Leader. Perhaps you have seen it. Bro. Goodson asked me yesterday if I had seen the A. R. which came Saturday. From what he said the issue of June 21st is mild as advocating their liberal ideas and the open door policy. Bro. G. said by all means I should get hold of a copy and read it. I have made inquiry and Sister Boutwell is the only one I have learned of who takes the A. R. in this congregation. I am going there tomorrow and will get the paper and read it. Bro. Goodson said that W. E. Ballenger did not approve of this last issue, and the same was true with all he had talked with. C. W. refused to publish my article allowing me to tell where I stand on these questions. I can now see why, for I do not stand on the college question as he advocates in his open door policy. Why should he condemn Bunn or refuse to apologize for what he has said about him through the A. R. C. W. is now advocating Bunn's position exactly as regarding the college issue.

"Well, I am going on with gospel preaching the same as I have always believed and preached it. My convictions are the same as they have always been. I have thought to write a few articles for the A. R. and have one ready to send in but I will just go and preach the gospel and keep my name out of all papers. This open door policy I do not endorse, and a Bro. told me last winter that if I would write for the P. B. A. that brethren would believe me to endorse their policy. If that rule will work with the P. B. A. it will be just as true regarding the A. R. with their open door policy. I am anxious to see this last issue which I have heard so much about from K. C. people and Sister Boutwell also. . . ."—V. M. Gilbert.

You will notice the above letter was written July 25, 1932, just a little over a month after the "Rough Draft" was published. The letter speaks for itself, so I need not comment, but call attention to a few statements I wish you to carefully notice. The "open door policy" which the Review had then and still has, he stoutly opposed. The Review still has that "policy" and he favors it now. So I wish you to keep that in mind.

"Its attitude toward extra organizations" which he THIEN opposed. "I do not stand on the College question as he" (Chester Sommer) "advocates it in his open door policy". Has Chester ever made a confession and asked forgiveness for introducing that "open door policy" and thus dividing the Brotherhood? You opposed it THIEN, but endorse Chester and the papers NOW. Have you changed? "My convictions are the same as they have always been" needs notice. "I will just go and preach the gospel and keep my name out of all papers." Has he done that? "This open door policy I do not endorse". "A brother told me last winter that if I would write for the P. B. A. that brethren would believe me to endorse their policy. If that rule will work with the P. B. A. it will be just as true regarding the A. R. with their open door policy."

I wished to call special attention to these few statements among the several he has made, then leave it with you to do your own judging.—W. G. Roberts, 2708 DeWitt, Mattoon, Illinois.

BUT WHERE DOES "UNITY" STOP?

"Christian unity" is in the air. The denominations talk much about it. It is magnified far above its value, great as that seems to be. Men talk as if a unity of all professed Christian people would usher in the millennium. It didn't do it when there was practically such unity under the pope in the dark ages, nor will it do it now. Forty years ago there was rank sectarianism far greater than today, yet there was far more devotion and real Christianity then. There are things which come before unity. James says, "The wisdom that is from above is **first pure**, then peaceable." And when we put unity before purity we transgress the Word of God, and do far more harm to the Church and the world than divided Christendom does.

Some in the Church of Christ have caught the unity fever, and are willing even to divide churches over it, as ridiculous as that seems. They adopt the same unscriptural and disastrous principles. Listen: "Our chief concern is for the unity of our churches." For this human and false principle, division has been brought into churches of Christ. Analyze it. The word "chief" means "first", and the word "unity" means "peace." So we have this: Our **first** concern is for the **peace** of our churches. This is diametrically opposed to James' statement, "The wisdom that is from above is **first pure, then peaceable**." Such an unapostolic teaching, yea anti-apostolic teaching, certainly should not be found in a supposedly "apostolic" paper, yet it is. But who cares for the Word of God when it stands in our way!

The details of this anti-apostolic principle is that we will fellowship a man in what he does that is right and not fellowship him in what is wrong. No longer shall we endorse systems, or groups, of doctrines, but we shall endorse only individual doctrines. That's like the man who says he does not endorse every law in a nation, so he will follow a few laws in America, a few in Canada and a few in Mexico! We will go along with the college people, though we will not endorse their colleges nor homes.

And they reason that if the Christian Church would throw away their organ we would go along with them, letting them bear their own responsibility before God of establishing rival institutions of missionary societies, etc.

But why let a little thing like the organ stop you? Can't you endorse their reading of the Scriptures, their prayers, their sermons (generally)? Why not, then, simply keep quiet when they play the instrument, and fellowship them in the good that they do, which is the principle you have adopted?

And why stop there? Don't the sects pray and preach and do many things that are scriptural? Most of them will immerse if you demand it, and we don't have to take part in their baby sprinkling or adult pouring, and societies, etc. Can't you fellowship them in these scriptural things?

Catholics are stronger for the inspiration of the Scriptures than Protestants generally and have many good practices—why not fellowship them in these things, and let them answer to God for the other things, as you said about the college people and their colleges?

And these principles would even include the Jews and heathen. There is no reasonable stopping place between the Bible doctrine of Purity First and the human doctrine of Unity First, until you get to heathenism.

Now this is not a matter of mere reasoning, but I give you a real example. The Christian Church used to occupy the same position we do today, but by adopting that "open door" policy of fellowship, they are drifting into heathenism. They can't logically stop. Read this:

"San Antonio, Tex., October 15, 1935.—Denominationalism was described as the most disturbing influence to Christianity by D. W. Morehouse, president of the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ at the opening session here today.

"Speaking to a congregation representing many of the nations of the world, the president of Drake University, who also is a noted astronomer, likened Christianity unto the solar system with its perturbing orbits.

"**We can not go preaching our message to the world and refuse to recognize Methodists and Baptists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians, young people's associations, the Salvation Army, Catholics, Jews and others,**" the college president said."

Who are the "others" mentioned here? They can mean no others than Mohammedans, Hindus, etc. Think of it. Here is the president of Drake University, a Christian Church college in Des Moines, Ia., belonging to a people who once believed in apostolic simplicity as the true Church of Christ, actually advocating fellowship with the heathen. And it all started with the "open door" policy, of recognizing and fellowshiping the "good" in denominations and letting the other fellow answer to God for the evil in it.

Brethren, are we fools and slow of heart to learn nothing from the saddening experiences of the past?

President Moorehouse is simply carrying to its legitimate end the doctrine that "our chief concern is for the unity of our churches."

But James still says, "The wisdom that is from above is **first pure**, then peaceable."

Churches of Christ are at the parting of the ways. Which road will you take? The one to Jerusalem or the one to Rome and Babylon? Speak out.—D. A. Sommer.

"LET THE TRUTH BE KNOWN"

Again I say, let the truth be known. Here is a quotation from C. W. Sommer in Review August 4, 1931, in a letter to Bro. Warren in regard to Jas. Scott preaching

at Van Brunt congregation in Kansas City, Mo.: "Suppose there was a church in your town that employed college men, and their leanings, when had any leanings at all, were toward the college folks; and Bro. Scott would come to them and hold them a meeting, and Bro. Morris would stop off there and visit with them instead of your 'loyal' congregation, **what'd you think?**" Emphasis is mine. This is exactly what A. M. Morris did here in May of this year except here in Topeka, Kansas, he went to a faction of the church which formerly worshiped in Highland Park district. They were holding a meeting with the college preacher from the college congregation in Topeka doing the preaching. Bro. Morris not only went to this meeting but preached for them, thus endorsing not only this college preacher but this faction which the Review published in Sept. 29, 1931, because of their unscriptural work. . . .

Bro. Morris has changed. He now fellowships the very things he fought against over 25 years. The same is true of the Review. Here is their inconsistency. If their position is right and scriptural now, they owe the college people an apology for fighting them so long. If the Bible colleges are unscriptural, as they formerly contended, they stand condemned for fellowshipping heresies. Rom. 16:17 says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." The Bible College advocates have caused division in the church and both Bro. Morris and Review editors fought them for over twenty-five years as teaching heresy and dividing churches but now they say "fellowship them." Paul says "Avoid them." Choose for yourselves which is right.

John says in II John 9: "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God." The Bible college as an institution in which to teach the Bible is untaught in the Bible. Hence they have not God. The Review says fellowship them.

The Savior said (Matt. 7:15): "Beware of false prophets." The Review taught that Bible college advocates were false prophets, or heretics, but they now in the Rough Draft say, "fellowship them," thus contradicting Christ.

Paul says (Titus 3:10), "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject." The Rough Draft says fellowship college preachers which the Review said in 1932 were heretics.

John says (II John 10), "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." The Rough Draft says, Receive him.

II John 11, "For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." The Rough Draft says fellowship them.

I ask you how we can uphold the Rough Draft and yet stand by the Word of God? It can't be done. I have laid them side by side so you may see what the scripture teaches and what the Rough Draft says.

The putting forth the Rough Draft and the Union of the Review and People's Bible Advocate with the Bible college papers has caused more confusion in the Church of Christ than anything that has happened in 30 years. These brethren are not ignorant but are deliberately going where they are. They have done what Daniel Sommer said as we quoted in the first part of this article. "But when a man overtakes the fault by deliber-

ately going after what he knows is wrong, that man belongs to another class, and should be personally exposed that churches may avoid him." He farther says of such men: 1. "They should be avoided." (See Rom. 16:17.) 2. "They are not disciplinarians." 3. "Under their influence churches will become worldly minded, corrupt and abominable before God." I believe Bro. Sommer's statements are true. These very things are apparent everywhere that the churches are leaning toward the Rough Draft and compromising with the college element. Where and in what church is there any discipline manifested? What discipline does Long Beach, Cal., practice now or any where else where they are compromising? Worldliness is creeping in on every side. I only ask you who are sober-minded to look at the present trend and see if the above statements are not correct.

As a servant of the Lord I have written these words to warn you and if possible help you avoid being carried away in this drifting away from the gospel of Christ. I pray it may be the means of helping many see the truth and that they may remain faithful to Christ. I have much more material that I have no space to print but I have given briefly these quotations that you may see **these men and papers have changed**, and to use their own expression you can see "where they are headed." I have been honest and fair in this article. I bear no one any malice but a sadness comes over me as I write and I think of Paul as he wrote in Phil. 3:18, "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ." May the Lord help us all to see this error, avoid it and those who advocate it, and to contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints, is the prayer of your fellow servant.—J. A. Freed, 2021 East 5th St., Topeka, Kan.

MISTAKES

We have often heard it said that he who doesn't make mistakes doesn't do anything but I believe I will add that he who doesn't do anything makes a greater mistake than any for his whole life is a mistake. But there was a mistake made in 1932 that I now have in mind. Some saw that mistake immediately, but some have been unable to see it to this day, if I may judge by their actions (unless they are terribly dishonest). But that mistake of which I am writing is this day much greater than it seemed when it was made, and I presume it will become more and more conspicuous as the years go by. Of course you have already guessed which mistake I have reference to that was made more than four years ago. That great mistake that was made by the author of the Rough Draft not only in writing the R. D. but by continuing to defend the same regardless of the protest of many devoted Christians.

If I were asked why I though the R. D. was written, I would have to answer, because the editors of the A. R. had become more interested in an earthly enterprise than they were in the Church of the living God, seemingly had forgotten the purpose for which their paper had been started (to build up and strengthen the Church of Christ, that divine institution built upon this earth by our Savior.) And when this drifting is started there is no telling how far it will go. Well, the result of this great mistake is **division**, division. I say and there is no use in denying it, for every one can see it, and every one knows the cause, or can if they want to. Is division in har-

mony with the prayer of our Lord, or the result of the teachings of the inspired apostles? Then there are other mistakes being made by many disciples of Christ, the result of that great mistake by the A. R., and some of them being made by our once faithful preachers of the gospel, by their continuing to endorse and labor for that paper, that is no longer loyal to the Church, and with no sign of repentance on their part. Many factions now exist because of the great mistake of which I am writing and factions they are regardless of what any man may say to the contrary. They turned a deaf ear to the Gospel of Christ by rejecting Heb. 13:17, also Matt. 18:17, 18, and 2 John 10, 11. This doctrine mentioned in 10th verse is that which is mentioned in the 9th verse of same chapter, "the doctrine of Christ" and that doctrine of Christ is to hear Paul in Heb. 13:17 and elsewhere.

But those who are forming factions are not alone in this mistake business, but just as guilty before God are those who are **preaching** for those factions. And that is not all. Those who will fellowship those factions by lending a helping hand in any way, or by using those preachers who are members of those factions, by permitting them to preach for them as many churches are doing, are likewise guilty before their Lord. I can come to only one conclusion, and that is that they are guilty, whether it is through a lack of faith or a lack of knowledge of God's word and ignorance will not excuse us. Read Acts 17:30. Can you not see if we endorse evil, we sin? and if we endorse those who do endorse evil we sin likewise. But the **greatest mistake** of all is not repenting of the mistakes which we make, when we absolutely know that we have made them. There is another word which we might have used instead of "mistake" and that word is sin, because sin it is. So my dear, erring ones, why will you go on in this condition? Better stop now and confess your sins before your God and again have fellowship with both the Father and the Son.

Bro. C. Ketcherside has just finished a two weeks' meeting at Bethany. I had the pleasure of hearing him several times and he still preaches the gospel with power, and is striving so hard to get the brethren to study the Bible and take the gospel of Christ as their basis of unity. We are expecting to have him with us about the middle of October for a two or three weeks' meeting. How sad it is to look about and see conditions as they exist today. Many faithful preachers who have always been faithful who are now idle much of the time because of no place to preach, and at the same time churches employing preachers who are dishonest in their dealings with their fellowmen, will not pay their honest debts, some guilty of causing divisions in the Body of Christ, some representing factions, some preaching for factions and many fellowshipping those who are guilty of divisions, etc. Oh, elders, leaders and all members of the Body of Christ, do you not know you will have to give an account of your actions to your God. Better stop now and employ only those preachers whom you know to be loyal in every respect. Shall I name some of them? Oh, you know them, don't you? Yours for a pure church.—Noah Smith, Sullivan, Ill. (Bro. Smith is an elder.—Pub.)

An Intelligent Onward Movement.—To be accepted of God it must depend on a knowledge of the Word of God. The Simplified New Testament was edited to help

The fourth edition is now off the press. Only one binding now, substantial cloth, \$2. Six for ten dollars. Get up a club and save the difference. Those who have sent money for one, if you do not receive it within a week or ten days, let us know. Many others wish them, and we hope you will order soon. . . . Guide Through Bible History, 126 pages, 35 cents, 30 cents each by the dozen. . . . Foster's Story of the Bible (nearly a million copies sold), \$2. . . . Foster's First Steps for Little Feet, \$1. . . . Eiler's linen wall maps of New Testament, The Exodus, Assyria, Old Testament, Paul's Journeys, Kingdoms of Israel and Judah, \$1.50 each. . . . Holman's Pronouncing Boldblack Type Teacher's Bible, with Dictionary-Concordance which "contains every needed assistance to the Bible student, including dictionary, a concordance, and a subject index of important topics," French morocco leather, \$4.25; same, leather lined, \$5.00; same in Persian morocco, India paper, \$8.00. . . . Great Songs of the Church, round or shape notes, 50c each; limp cloth in shape notes only, 40c. As good a song book as there is. Postage extra. . . . Church of Christ, by D. A. Sommer, 365 pages, \$1.50. Send 25c for samples of tracts. Brethren, let's get busy in the work of the Lord. Send all orders to D. A. Sommer, 918 Congress Ave., Indianapolis, Ind.

REPORTS OF BRETHREN

Vincennes, Ind.—The church is moving along verily nicely.—C. C. Bennett.

Des Moines, Ia.—The meeting by Bro. Ballenger closed July 5. Had a good meeting, and I am sure the church was greatly strengthened by the strong preaching. Two were baptized. The tent was moved to Cedar Rapids and the meeting started there July 7. Eugene Suddeth.

Later—We are expecting you for our all-day meeting August 30 (last Lord's day), and for you to continue through the week following till Friday night inclusive.—E. S. (The subjects will probably be largely our travels through Palestine, Egypt, Greece, Rome, Ephesus, Smyrna, etc. Visitors to Des Moines at that time will thus have an opportunity to hear these, and what we say of the ancient empires so closely interwoven with ancient Israel.—D. A. Sommer.)

Walnut Bottom, Pa.—Will you place in the M. C. a note stating to those brethren who are considering a change in location to consider Shippensburg, Pa. There are several factories employing women here, and it seems they can use some more help again.—C. J. Beidel.

Carrollton, Mo.—Had a good meeting at Bee Creek near Pearl, Ill., not long ago with 16 added. I also visited both congregations in St. Louis and the church at Hartford and Indian Creek.—Ben F. Huddleston.

Missouri.—Yes, some one has been sending us almost every copy of the ———. I say they are getting vicious. The last copy especially ———'s writings are full of venom. Talk about sweet-spiritedness and love, their attitude is far from it. It seems that every scratch of their pens and every word of their mouths is full of hatred and bitterness toward you and the M. C. It doesn't seem that we are doing much to back you up in your fight, but we are indeed thankful that we have a medium through which to answer their infamous attacks. Most of the brethren here like myself complain of being broke all the time, but I am sure we can do more than we are doing. I received a copy of your booklet, "Reading the Bible," and have been loaning it to the brethren both here and at ———. Hope we shall be able to send you an order soon.—Preacher.

(Reports from all over the country indicate that this paper "full of venom . . . and hatred and bitterness toward you and the M. C.," is being sent to hundreds who had stopped it. Well, with the bequestment which they have received, or will receive, of many thousands of dollars, they are able to do this. Fine, brethren, now you can verify every charge we make. Brethren, we must MAKE A STRONG PULL, AND A LONG

PULL AND A PULL ALL TOGETHER to counteract the false statements being circulated. What are you doing?—Publisher.

Colorado.—May the writers of your paper ever teach wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ. (1 Tim. 6:3.)—Anna B. Brown.

Mountain Home, Ark.—Bro. Sommer, you may count on me to send in one sub. or more for the M. C. from each meeting I hold this summer and fall if I have to pay for it myself. I am back from Ozark Co., Mo., where I preached over Lord's day, and promised them a meeting this fall. Johnnie Rhodes had just closed a meeting at Luna school house. From what I could hear they were well pleased with his work.—W. C. Rice.

Spokane, Wash.—Have read the M. C. with interest and benefit. A plain condemnation of sin without the use of slang, the method generally found in the articles I consider is both more productive of results for good and more convincing to readers that the writers are sincerely working to save the church from digression.—* * *

Marion, Ind.—Filled my regular appointment at Logansport, Ind., Lord's day, July 26, and when the invitation was given five boys made the good confession and we took them immediately after services to the water where they were buried with their Lord. These boys will be a great help to the church, as they are interested in the cause of Christ.—Slim Holderbaum.

Lebo, Kans.—All day meeting at "Section" June 28th. Well attended. Six or seven different congregations represented. F. W. Fenton, Wm. Ketcherside and the writer alternated as speakers. All day meeting at South Ottawa July 5 drew large crowd. A splendid spirit of fellowship manifest. Some nine different congregations represented. Many short talks made by different brethren. A very helpful and enjoyable gathering—Roy Loney.

Crystal Springs, Ark.—I visited Lincoln St. congregation, Bloomington, Ind., over Lord's day. My first work there. Enjoyed it very much. Started here last night with good attendance and interest. This is a mission point. We are having our meetings in Bro. A. A. Land's yard. Expect to be here until the 23rd. Crystal Springs is 16 miles west of Hot Springs.—C. R. Turner.

Ottawa, Kans.—The work at Blockton moves along much the same. I visited Bro. W. E. Ballenger's meetings at Des Moines, and was glad to hear him again, as he ably presented the word, and urged people to be subject thereto. I am to preach at Ottawa tonight (July 28th) on my way to Colorado to engage in an indefinite season of labor.—A. C. Warren.

Malta, Ohio—I am to go into West Virginia to begin protracted meeting August 2nd. Then back to Ohio for a meeting at Wolf Creek, August 30. Be steadfast, brethren, even though the compromisers may outnumber us. The Church must be defended. They don't do it.—C. G. Parsons.

E. Liverpool, O.—As Bro. Parsons puts the question, How many who read this are willing to stand for the old paths? Count on me for one, brother. May I always commend and fell thankful to God for such men as this brother and all others who take the stand for the old paths. Let's not be led away from the simplicity that's in Christ by this wave of innovationism that is sweeping over the country. Oh that all the brethren would follow after the things that make for peace and things wherewith one may edify another and not after anything that causes division and discord. As for me and mine may we always be satisfied with what is written in the old Book. "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said We will not walk therein." (Jer. 6:16).—D. H. Howell.

Kemp, Ill.—I filled my regular appointment at New Castle, Indiana, the fourth Lord's day in July. Had a good visit with Bro. D. A. Sommer, talking over the things that are troubling the Church and how SUPPOSED-TO-BE loyal members are turning from the plain teaching of the Bible and following man. May the Lord help us to follow Him and not the documents and creeds of men (doctrines and commandments of men). I had an enjoyable meeting in Arkansas, had the meeting in Bro. A. A. Land's yard. Good attendance and interest, no additions from the world, but nine of the members who had not been meeting on the Lord's day confessed their neglect and all agreed to meet regularly and to do their duty. Others who had been meeting confessed their wrongs and all agreed to work together in love, for which I am very thankful.

May the Lord bless them in their work is my prayer. I go to Holiday, Illinois, August 10th, to begin a meeting.—C. R. Turner.

Ottawa, Kans.—Brethren from eight congregations in this part of the country took part in an all-day meeting with Ottawa brethren Lord's Day, July 5th. Bro. Wilkinson, Ottawa, conducted a Bible drill for the children and Bro. Carl Morton, Ottawa, occupied the remainder of the time in the morning until 11 o'clock. Both of these brethren can do a good job preaching, but have never been sent out. Bro. Wm. Ketcherside delivered a good discourse at 11 o'clock. The afternoon service was given over to short talks by visiting brethren. Bro. Loney brought a good lesson in the afternoon and every one who spoke certainly gave no uncertain sounds. Section brethren also enjoyed a good all-day meeting Lord's Day June 28th. We thank God for brethren who are still satisfied with His divine revelation and take new courage as a result of their fellowship and timely exhortations to press on.—F. W. Fenton.

Mountain Home, Ark.—Was with the brethren at Bonne Terre, Mo., over three Lord's days, also Springfield, Mo., over four Lord's days since reporting. Good loyal brethren at each of these places. At present am with the brethren here near Mountain Home, Ark. Meeting three nights old but conditions look good for a good meeting. This is the home of Brother W. C. Rice. He is held in high esteem by those on the outside as well as those on the inside. Brother Rice has made a great sacrifice for the cause here in Arkansas. Has gone through many hardships of which the average preacher knows nothing. He is worthy of support. From here expect to go to Gama-riel, Ark., then back into Missouri, beginning at Hale, near September 1st. Have some time for some work in November and December. Have some meetings for 1937. Expect to be in Colorado Springs, also Fairbury, Nebraska. If any brethren in those parts wish my services, would be glad for you to write me.—Lloyd Riggins, 1436 S. 10th, Charleston, Ill.

East Liverpool, O.—I am sending you a dollar to help with the M. C., the paper that teaches the truth and cries against all sin. I have found the M. C. not compromising with sins that so easy besets so many professed Christians today. So I hope you collegiates repent of your act of sowing seed of discord contrary to sound doctrine, and stand for the old paths. Let us all join hands with Bro. Parsons for the old paths are the way we should walk in.—C. W. Moore.

Topeka, Kans.—By the time this report goes to press I will be on my way to Pennsylvania and Ohio for work, and Bro. R. O. Webb will be engaged in a tent meeting in Topeka. I have some work in Illinois and will stop a week or ten days in West Virginia before I reach Pennsylvania. I am greatly encouraged with the reports of so many loyal brethren in the M. C. I'm glad to know it will be issued monthly (if we keep it going) from now on, so that our reports will not be so far apart. I am anxious to meet as many elders and preachers in the East as possible, and talk with them of things pertaining to the kingdom. I also have time open for work in late fall and winter months. Brethren, let us work "while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work" (Jno. 9:4). Spent July 12 at Cottonwood Falls, Kans. These brethren are firm in the faith also, but have little public talent. Wish I lived nearer so that I could help them more. It is reported generally that I am a hobby rider and a divider of churches. This report is designed to destroy what little influence I have have for good in the brotherhood. Some faithful churches are reluctant to call me, not being acquainted with me and my work. Churches should be careful whom they call, and should investigate such reports. I'm glad to answer any question relative to the extreme ideas and other evils troubling the Church. While I lived at two different places the church there divided. In each case I was laboring to avert the division and labored several months in effort to effect a scriptural reconciliation. Chillicothe, Mo., was finally reconciled. I have been called as a peacemaker to ten different places where the church was divided and in five of the ten cases I effected a reconciliation. I have been shut out from preaching for two congregations, supposedly faithful, because I exposed the work of two men who are now hired out to the Christian (?) Church. I am not boasting in the foregoing, nor am I pleading for sympathy. I merely state the above facts, brethren, that you might be able to judge the source of the above mentioned false report. Brethren, let us be sober and watch with prayer.—Wm. Ketcherside, 2010 E. 11th St.

TWO DOCUMENTS BY TWO PREACHERS

Reviewed by
W. CARL KETCHERSIDE

THE FIRST is a ten page letter by J. C. Roady, purporting to be a reply to my published challenge for him to defend publicly what he affirmed over his signature. In his reply Bro. Roady uses bitter sarcasm, biting irony and ridicule. He demonstrated that he is another exponent of the "Rough Draft type of brotherly love," by his style of writing. But one thing is very apparent from his letter, and that is, that those of you who had hoped to hear a gentlemanly discussion of those things which are troubling Israel are doomed to disappointment. Bro. Roady is willing to send out over his signature a statement declaring that the Review has not compromised on the "college question" but he is unwilling to defend it.

It brings sorrow to his heart that I should go back and pick up a letter which he wrote three years ago and use that against him, and he severely reprimands me for it, forgetting that this is the first time he has put himself on record on the matter, inasmuch as he usually chooses to express himself by proxy, and let the other individual bear the brunt of the investigation. Has Bro. Roady altered his position since his letter was published? Is he willing to step forward now and declare that the Review IS compromising on things that are wrong? If his position is the same as it was three years ago, why should I not use his letter as setting forth his stand? I thought when I first read his letter that he would some day regret having been led into signing something which he could not erase.

He wants me to appoint a day in which we can get together and go over any personal differences between us, but I have written him that there are issues transcendentally more important than personal disputes confronting this brotherhood. I am not interested in WHAT Bro. Roady is saying about me, I am interested in WHY he is saying it. We evidently do not stand together on matters pertaining to the One Body. If we do, then Bro. Roady is guilty of endeavoring to destroy my influence because of envy or for some other individual reason. If we are not together doctrinally, and by a fair public discussion we can arrive at a just conclusion, the personal matters will automatically be adjusted. I do not propose to leave the Lord's work however, just to enter into a long correspondence wrangle with an individual who cannot see any more to the present conflict than a personal or paper fight. Bro. Roady is almost fifty years old, and he is old enough to know that the Review does not stand today where it stood ten years ago, and if he intends to set himself up as a champion of its principles, he will have to reconcile himself to an investigation of his position occasionally, by your humble servant, nor will such uncharitable letters as he has just written force me to cease fighting compromising and compromisers. Judging from this letter which he sent in reply to my article in the Macedonian Call which I mailed him, the description by Longfellow of John Alden, in "The Courtship of Miles Standish" fairly accurately portrayed the condition of our Bro. John as he read my letter:

"All aghast at his words, surprised, embarrassed, bewildered,

Trying to mask his dismay by treating the subject with lightness,

Trying to smile, and feeling his heart stand still in his bosom

Just as a timepiece stops in a house that is stricken by lightning."

AND NOW shed a few tears for Bro. V. M. Gilbert, who has just circularized the brotherhood with a personal letter asking the question, "Can You Understand What You Read?" Bro. Gilbert certainly answers this question for himself by showing that he cannot. In the last issue of the Macedonian Call I demonstrated the folly of the Review editor's reasoning, by showing it was just a "House That Jack Built" argument. I made a brief reference to Bro. Verna, and when he read it, I suppose he didn't understand it, for he immediately writes a little tract to show how foolish it is to use the kind of argument I had just shown how foolish it was to use. Bro. Gilbert says, "Brother Ketcherside offers some syllogisms . . . let us carry them to a legitimate conclusion and see how they will work." Again he says, "If by his logic" when I was just demonstrating how absurd that type of logic (?) would be. What is the matter, Bro. Verna, "Can't You Understand What You Read?" But someone has to supply a little humor as we go along, I guess. Those of you who haven't seen Bro. Gilbert's tract, write him at Jefferson, Iowa, and request one. Or perhaps the Review office might supply you. In any event it will be interesting for you to see how expertly he answers the question at the head of his article.

But Bro. Gilbert made one fatal error. He tries to justify himself in preaching for the Polk St. "college church" in Topeka, by saying that these people know where he stands on the college question. He leaves the impression on the reader's mind that he informed the church there of his stand, and perhaps condemned that thing before them. He says he had a talk with Bro. Utley (collegeite pastor of Polk St.) and Utley will tell you he is opposed to colleges. My father and I also had a talk with Utley not long ago, and father asked him, "Will you permit Carl, or myself to come into the Polk St. pulpit and preach on this college question as we do among the faithful churches?" He answered emphatically, "We will NOT!" Under what consideration did Gilbert preach for them? Was it on condition that he would not preach against these things? It must have been, because Utley declared in the presence of witnesses that no one could preach there who condemned that evil. God have mercy on the church when its ministers will permit sin to seal their lips, in order to have a place to preach. What would Paul have done in this case?

Miscellaneous.—As the publisher shall be away from home much this fall, please have your articles here by the 20th of the month for the next issue, for they will be sent to me.

When you change your address, please send a card and notify us. Don't leave it for your postman, for there is a delay and it costs us two cents for each one.

We have a large number of a very good tract for free circulation which we will send you for the postage, 25 cents for 100. . . . It does the reader good to know that you are against this "Open Door Policy." It is principles we are fighting for, and we prefer that you leave the name Macedonian Call out of it, though that is a means through which we are making this fight for apostolic simplicity. However, it has been a principle of truth from the beginning that "birds of a feather flock together," and "You can tell a man by the company he keeps."