

MACEDONIAN CALL

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

Volume 13

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, SEPTEMBER, 1939

Number 9

Why Are Bible Colleges Wrong?

If the apostle taught that Christians should be able to give reason for their hope or for believing a thing to be right, it is certainly necessary to have a reason for saying a thing is wrong. It is not enough to declare against a thing on some general ground, but some specific reason should be given. Thus I am convinced that we should be prepared to show why we oppose these colleges. In the past it has often been the case that members of the church would be "opposed to instrumental music" and yet the only reason given would be that "we just do not believe they, the organs, are right." But this evasion of the issue often drove the wedge of innovation deeper. Likewise, unless we are able and willing to give a fundamental reason for opposing the colleges we might be justly accused of mere prejudice.

And it is not enough to point out various items of practice that are wrong and use them as proof that the institution as such is unlawful. We often see that kind of tactics used in church troubles. Some one will say "there has been wrong done on both sides." When a person puts up such a plea as that where there has been a division over a principle, then we may feel sure that person favors the side in the wrong and is using this cowardly method of dodging the issue. Items of wrong done by various individuals on "both sides" of a controversy have nothing to do with the issue at stake. And so there are many things done by the colleges and orphan homes that are wrong in themselves, perhaps, and yet even if those items were eliminated those institutions would still be wrong.

Just now I think of the most popular point of attack that our brethren resort to in fighting above mentioned institutions. That point is the financial one. Much time and effort have been spent to prove that they really do take money from the church to support their work. But what is gained by this as far as the real issue is concerned? Taking money from the church treasury to support the colleges does not prove them to be unscriptural institutions. If it did then taking money from the treasury to support widows would prove that it is wrong to be a widow. And the attempt to distinguish between money taken from the treasury and that taken from the individual pocket is downright silly. The Rough Draft creed put out by the Review made this overture toward the colleges but any one can see that if it is right for an individual to support a certain religious work then it is right for the church treasury to do so. Besides, when the individual sends his money to the college he keeps it out of the treasury where it should have gone, and thus the church treasury is virtually furnishing the funds for the support.

A question that would naturally come up here is why should any effort be made at all to show the practices of the colleges in drawing money from the churches. The main thing to be accomplished is to show them to be institutions almost without conscience. The fact that they will use urgent methods for obtaining this money,

even threatening the brotherhood with perdition if the support is not forthcoming and yet deny their guilt of using church money—this practice should be exposed to prove them to be the dishonest institutions that they are. And when we can see how unscrupulous they are on matters of fact, we are prepared to expect them to be crooked in their general procedure. But aside from this consideration, the using of church funds in their work, whether direct from the treasury or indirect through the individual, does not prove them to be unscriptural bodies.

Then what is it that makes them wrong? The answer may be learned by considering Eph. 3:10, 21, 1 Tim. 3:15, 1 Peter 2:9, 2 Peter 1:3 and kindred passages. These teach that the Church is the Lord's institution for giving spiritual blessings to the world. It is fully equipped for this work and no institution of man whether secret orders, orphan homes or Bible colleges has any right to offer moral or spiritual benefits to man. When any such institution pretends to offer such to man it is infringing upon the lawful province of the institution for which Christ died. It is a rebel institution and its supporters are in rebellion against the King of Glory. Whether these worldly bodies run with or without any money from the "church treasury" does not affect the principle involved. This is why the George Pepperrine College is to be considered in the same class with other Bible colleges in spite of its claim to be running without funds from the Church. In the speech of dedication made by the founder as published in first number of **GRAFIC** which is the publication of the college this unscriptural purpose is admitted. He says in part: "Therefore, as my contribution to the well-being and happiness of this generation and those to follow I am endowing this institution to help young men and women to prepare themselves for a life of usefulness in this competitive world and help them build a foundation of Christian character and faith which will survive the storms of life." This is the very purpose for which the Church of Christ was founded as shown by the passages cited above. Thus the George Pepperrine College, like all other Bible colleges is a rival institution against the divine one. The Long Beach paper, the one published at Indianapolis as well as the former avowed college papers, all endorse this institution lately founded in Los Angeles. This in spite of the fact that said papers try to make their readers believe their editors are still opposed to Bible Colleges. And since it is seen that all said colleges are rivals of the divine body and since all these aforesaid papers and their endowers are supporting the colleges, we can only conclude that the "disciple brotherhood" represented by said papers are allied with these rivals and thus have departed from the faith.—E. M. Zerr.

Not All Is Gold That Glitters

Sometimes when the devil gets into our congregation and there is trouble, we think we are in a worse condition than any other religious people in the world, and long for what we think is their "peace". But in the words of

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
New names in any number, 50c each.
Old names in clubs of five or more, 75c each

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

our heading, "Not all is gold that glitters". Many of our brethren in the present apostasy have been snared by this propaganda of the devil. They have thought that if they would adopt the "pastor" all their local troubles about eldership and leadership would cease. Some have thought there would be unity if only they would join hands with the Bible college people whom they have fought so long; but those people are having a great war on pre and post millennialism, are having troubles with their pastors, and even now some Bible college presidents are seeing where their colleges are taking them and are trying to call a halt. The past few years one would think that in southern California the "Church of Christ" was taking everything for Christ, but Wm. P. Reedy, publisher of People's Bible Advocate (Bro. Morris' paper) writes almost in despair about conditions there.

H. H. Adamson, pastor in Detroit, shows how pastors are dividing churches. Here are two quotations which enlighten us on this:

"Possibly no other one thing a congregation feels duty bound to do is fraught with more danger than the selection of elders. Within the last decade or so it has become about as dangerous to select a preacher as to select elders. **At one time the people felt that they could give the preacher his walking papers if he did not suit them. Few congregations think that now. They feel that it is either to let him stay or split the church, and he becomes a kind of fixture.**—H. H. Adamson in Gospel Advocate, April 28, 1938.

"As long as brethren of the Church of Christ preach peace and unity and still practice division; as long as preachers seek their own ends, not the things that are Christ's; **as long as deceit and fraud and earthly honor are evidenced in the daily dealings of preachers and members in general; as long as friends (!) and brethren (!) betray one another; as long as we stick so closely to our orthodoxy and at the same time know nothing about the Christian ethics of living—just that long should we hang our heads in shame and confess that we are no better than others. No, there is not peace within our ranks and there is no use of kidding ourselves along and rationalizing that we are the mighty people of the Lord by any illusions of outward form and show of numerical progress or material growth, or by any boastings that we know the Bible and have the truth. Those of us who are close to the inside, know that what I am saying is true, and would confess it if we were all honest. Many may think that they are making a show of success—and**

perhaps they are—but know also that they are only doing so by covering up wrong motives and crooked dealings. To flourish under such circumstances is but to fail. May the Lord have mercy."—Wm. P. Reedy in People's Bible Advocate, July 15, 1939.

Brethren, we have had our troubles, our severe fight the past seven years, and the other fellows were drifting down stream in "peace", but we have saved a remnant and now their real troubles are beginning and will grow worse and worse, for the evil and good are mixed. We may be small in number, and yet there are many thousands who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of popularity with error, and we are just now in good shape for a great onward movement. The apostates have largely gone to their own place, like another character we read about in the Bible. Let us throw ourselves into this constructive work with all our hearts, and in a very few years you will see the true Church moving grandly on. What preparation have you made to develop soldiers of the cross in your local church this winter? Won't you make arrangements NOW to have some preacher interested in development according to 2 Tim. 2:2, come and spend at least a week in Bible study and developing of talent. Your regular "social meetings" will be more interesting the coming year, if the preacher knows his business in putting you to work. Write in our Church News column that you have made such arrangements, and it will encourage others to do the same.—Publisher.

The Debate on the Rough Draft

For the benefit of some of our newer readers we state what this Rough Draft is. It was an article on the title, "Can't We Agree on Something", written by the publishers of the Apostolic Review and printed June 22, 1932. The effort was to try to amalgamate us with the Bible college people as well as to unify the brotherhood on some other points. They said that if the worship is pure, we ought to go along with the college people. The paper completely reversed its policy of several decades of trying to keep false teachers out of the churches and trampled under foot one of the most important doctrines in the Bible, expressed in 2 John, 9-11—"If there come any and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker in his evil deeds."

Following are reports of the debate by the two disputants:

The Allen Sommer-Roberts debate,—closed Thursday night with fine audience. Several states were represented. A. R. S. wrote Bro. E. C. Rose thus in most of his letters: "You must want Roberts exposed", "I'll take care of Roberts", "I'll take care of Roberts' cheap wit", etc. Then at close of the debate A. R. S. arose and said, "I'm no debater, I'm a greenhorn", thus indirectly if not directly admitted defeat—admitted he did not do what he repeatedly told Bro. Rose he would do. He also told the audience his last (6 minutes) speech that if he had known the "Rough Draft" would have been misrepresented and divided the brotherhood as it has, they never would have written it, thus he then admitted their error and sin, but failed to ask forgiveness and promise to call it in, cease advocating it, etc. We now know that he knows it is wrong. Allen R. Sommer is, remember, their champion, too. Poor Allen! He is a weakling, though their best.—W. G. Roberts.

Indianapolis.—That discussion at Decatur, Ill., should produce much good, straight thinking. And that church deserves the brotherhood thanks for providing the opportunity. Through the chairman (Bro. Carl Ketcherside) the last night's audience commissioned me to tender its profound respect and love to the Review's senior editor—a very touching tribute. And I myself received only kindness at Decatur.—A. R. S. in *Apostolic Review*, Aug. 16.

THE MODERATOR WRITES ON THE DEBATE AT DECATUR

This scribe was called by W. G. Roberts to moderate for him in the Decatur, Illinois debate, which he held with Allen Sommer. Upon arrival it was ascertained that though Bro. Sommer had signed an agreement to furnish a moderator for himself, he did not have one present, and clearly indicated he either could not, or would not secure one. Thus by arrangement with the leaders of the church at Decatur, and the two disputants, I took over the job as chairman, both debaters agreeing to abide my decision as to what was competent and relevant matter to introduce.

The first proposition was stated as follows: "The Macedonian Call is scriptural". In his affirmative Bro. Roberts piled up a number of scriptures showing that it was proper to write the gospel, that the apostles wrote both to individuals and churches, that they sent these writings by the hands of others, and that we do the same through the Macedonian Call. He next showed that the paper was scriptural because it advocated the New Testament doctrine, and asked his respondent to put his finger on one thing which was taught as a principle by the M. C. which was contrary to God's word. Thirdly, he showed by the former writings of Daniel Sommer, senior editor of the Review, that the present position of the Macedonian Call was scriptural.

To all of this Bro. Sommer paid not the least heed. His negative speeches were all written out before he left home, as well as his affirmative declarations, and he proceeded to read "and continued to read" to employ his own timeworn expression. Not a thing he read was even remotely connected with the proposition, and many in the audience bored by the long documents apparently thought it was a good opportunity to catch up on some sleep which they had lost in coming a long distance to hear a debate. I personally asked Bro. Sommer how he could write out his replies to Bro. Roberts before he left home, when he didn't even know what the affirmative arguments would be. The consensus of opinion seemed to be that Bro. Sommer did not believe and never did believe that the Macedonian Call was unscriptural. Repeatedly when called upon to set forth its unscripturalness, he ignored what was said, but finally pressed to where he was forced to answer, he said that he was reading all of the personal things attacking Bro. Zerr, Roberts, D. Austen Sommer, et. al., because if he showed what kind of a man Roberts was that would prove the M. C. unscriptural. Brother Roberts demonstrated the childishness of such reasoning, by his statement that if his respondent could show he was as mean as the devil wanted him to be, that would not prove the M. C. was unscriptural.

The last two days, Bro. Sommer affirmed, "The article entitled, 'Can't We Agree on Something?' offered in the

June 21, 1932 issue of the *Apostolic Review* is scriptural as a whole". - The audience had waited rather tensely for the date to arrive when the first speeches would be made on this subject. All seemed to feel that this was the point at issue. Most were disgusted when Brother Sommer completely ignored the Rough Draft, and "continued to read". Our Saint Louis young people who came to take notes and jot down the points made for further examination, came back home without a single note on the last two days of discussion, because Bro. Sommer gave a rather disorganized dissertation on the subject, "Zerr, Roberts and Austen Sommer wrote one time". Though he had affirmed that the Rough Draft was scriptural, Bro. Sommer used little scripture. He said he left his Bible at Indianapolis, and his only testament in his hotel room. Bro. Roberts loaned him his Bible, but the few scriptures Bro. Sommer read were turned against him with terrific pressure.

Bro. Sommer said the Review had changed, and declared "God forbid that we should ever go back to what we once stood for!" Then he went back to 1902 and came this way, showing that Bro. Roberts, Bro. Zerr, et. al., had written things which he interpreted to be in harmony with the Rough Draft. He made the point that the Review stands now where it always stood, yet he had just asked God to forbid that they go back where they always stood. It was a serious mistake for a debater to make. Bro. Roberts replied to the many personal thrusts as made, and then took the Rough Draft, analyzed it, pointed out twelve unscriptural ideas as set forth therein. These arguments were left unnoticed, not being even referred to by Bro. Sommer. The first night of the debate on the Rough Draft question Bro. Roberts handed his respondent seven questions to think over through the night, and answer the following day. Bro. Sommer became incensed, declared Bro. Roberts was "unfair" and said, "They want to take up my time from reading". I told him the questions were on the proposition, and asked him to read something about them. The leaders of the church who sponsored this discussion requested that I try to get Bro. Sommer to come to the issue as the debate was about over, and people had come there to learn wherein the Rough Draft was scriptural. I examined the questions, which Bro. Roberts had read, found them all germane to the proposition and so ruled. I publicly told Bro. Sommer that the audience had a right to some notice of them. He refused to answer them, and I told him that he could proceed, if he desired to leave the audience under the impression they could not be answered. He then proceeded with his part of the speaking.

It should be reported that audiences numbered from 175 to 275, as I would estimate it. Very few of those sympathetic to the Rough Draft attended. Brother Roberts mentioned one afternoon that he believed there were few if any present on Bro. Allen's side of the question, and asked him where they were. It was believed that none were there who favored the Review, but when Bro. Allen arose, he publicly gave recognition to Bro. Dan Mathis from Terre Haute, Indiana. Verna Morgan from Mattoon also came one session, but aside from this I do not recall having met any other preachers who are now reporting through the *Apostolic Review*. A number of preachers old and young who are opposed to the modern apostasy were present. I would like to see the Review put forth a champion who will meet the issue

squarely, so personalities may be eliminated on both sides.—W. Carl Ketcherside.

ANOTHER VIEW OF THE DEBATE

The publisher of the M. C. did not attend the debate, but a week after it and before he had heard anything about it, he sent a circular letter to about twenty-five brethren asking for their opinion of it; hence he has a pretty good cross-section view of it, though no one can tell much really about its real results for a year or more. With one voice these brethren say that all the so-called arguments offered by A. R. S. for the Rough Draft were completely demolished. This was as we fully expected, and if one of the authors of that divisive document can not scripturally defend it, no one can. The debate seemed to turn out very much as we thought so far as personalities were concerned.

We have received some criticism of both speakers in the debate, one brother saying that things were said and done on both sides which ought not to have been done and said, for a debate on Christian subjects. Of course, the main purpose of the discussion for faithful brethren was to get the truth on the Rough Draft before those in favor of it, and in this the discussion was almost a complete failure, for it is said that less than a dozen of the Rough Drafters attended. The publisher of the M. C. told Bro. Roberts that he firmly believed it would be that way, though he did not expect them to desert their champion to such a large extent. A. R. S. said in Review, as quoted elsewhere, that the debate "should produce much good, straight thinking," which might be said pleasingly by Hitler too if he had the privilege of explaining his side of the world's crisis to Britons while Britons had no chance to explain the democracies' side to the Germans.

Several years ago an onslaught was made against Carl Ketcherside and D. A. S., to which they replied in a "Defense" leaflet. This Defense answered many misrepresentations which had been made up to that time and many of which were dragged out at the debate. If you wish a copy send a stamp to the M. C. office.

And yet, indirectly, we have learned some beneficial things. J. C. Roady, who said the Review had not changed and who has gotten more subscribers for it since its apostasy than before, if we are to judge by reports in the paper, was within driving distance of the debate but never showed up at a single session. **Out of the 175 to 275 people who attended the discussion, not more than a dozen were of the Rough Draft persuasion. (Some have put the number at half a dozen.)** This convinces me of one of three things: 1. That they utterly rejected A. R. S. as a man, or as a competent man to defend the document, though he was one of its authors; or, 2. that they did not care any thing about it; or, 3. that there was a combination of these conclusions.

A. R. S. said that if they had known the Rough Draft would have been misrepresented and caused division as it did, they would not have put it out. C. W. S. at 904 Udell St., Indianapolis, on July 1, 1939, said practically the same thing to Walter, John and Geo. A. Williamson. When the document was put out, June 22, 1932, immediately hobbyists, college and Christian Church people gave their hearty assent, some of them saying that was what they advocated many years ago; in fact, the scramble for exaltation became so great that C. W. S. soothed them with the statement that "there was glory enough

for all"! Faithful brethren were so stunned by the complete about-face, much like Russia's and Germany's regarding communism, that they could say nothing; but when they got their breath they started writing against it. This angered the authors of the R. D., and they showed it, and threw many of the criticisms in the waste basket and tried for years to force the brotherhood to accept their apostasy.

There are three conclusions we wish to draw from these statements that if the authors of the Rough Draft had known the division it would cause they would not have introduced it: 1. If the document contains the truth of God, which they say it does, they should contend for it whether it is misrepresented or not, whether it causes division or not. This shows that they do not have real conviction for this child of their confused mind. 2. A few weeks after they put out their Rough Draft, they KNEW that many objected to it, but **for seven years they have persistently and savagely contended for it, causing division**, hence their statement that they would not have contended for it if they had known it would cause division is insincere. 3. A. R. S. at Decatur defended and contended for the divisive document called the Rough Draft and tried to win all to it he could, yet at the conclusion said if they had known it would have caused division, they would not have introduced it. What a contradiction! This shows that since they once introduced it they were too stubborn to withdraw it and acknowledge their sin. "Stubbornness is an iniquity and idolatry." (1 Samuel 16:28.)

But, as we have said before, the Rough Draft was not altogether the cause but was also the occasion of the present apostasy. The people were seeking an easier way, as is true in nearly every generation, and that gave them a boat in which to drift down stream. It has divided families and churches and communities, and those who have introduced it **and also those who have encouraged them**, will have much to answer for at the judgment. "Offenses must come, but woe unto him through whom the offense cometh." "Six things the Lord hates . . . he that soweth discord among brethren." —Publisher.

ON DEBATES IN GENERAL

For the benefit of young preachers especially, I wish to say a few words on this subject. We need men who are able to defend the truth publicly in a way which will win honest people to that truth. The purpose of a religious discussion is to get both sides before the hearers, and to win the honest ones to the truth, but this can not be done if the party spirit is raised high and many personalities are flung by the speakers.

If **only** one side to a discussion can or will attend, it is folly to debate and risk everything when there is nothing to be gained. Some brethren have said, "We ought to be willing to defend our position under any circumstances." I suppose, then, that we ought to debate with any man who arises and asks it though he has not a follower within a hundred miles. Paul says, "Whatsoever you do, do all to the glory of God," and how would God be glorified by giving the devil a chance to shoot down faithful Christians when we did not get an equal chance to shoot down the devil's children? Debating is not supposed to be for the glory of debaters but for the glory of God. When any one talks like that

I think of a little word with four letters which Solomon uses quite often.

There are some opponents who are neither Christians nor gentlemen in their discussions, and we certainly should not debate with them. Alexander Campbell conducted his discussions in a dignified way and accomplished great good, but hundreds of debates since have not been so conducted and have not done much good but oftentimes harm. Sometimes a brother says that he goes down into the dirt and mud-plinging and personalities because the other fellows does. Does the Good Book teach us to be "courteous" only to those who are courteous to us?

Some brethren do harm in a debate because they do not seem to understand human nature. Though they defeat the opponent in argument, they spend so much time belittling him and berating him that outsiders turn their sympathy toward him, just as people do often when they see even a pestilent dog chewed up by another dog. I know churches have been stagnated so far as the world is concerned because they have had a debate there of such a kind.

Don't think that because the rabble laughs and even cheers when you have made some witty remark that cut the other fellow (though there was no argument in it), you have won the debate. Many people go to such a discussion as they would go to a dog fight. The question is: What does the quiet, sincere man and woman think of what has been said and done. These are the people whom we should seek to gain—the unthinking rabble has soon

forgotten and settled down in sins again. Within the past two years a discussion was held in which the opponent of the truth was unscrupulous and the "faithful" debater "came down strong" on him. I recently talked with one of the leaders of that church, and he said that though the members seem to have been strengthened, the non-members say that when "Christians" talk to each other as the two men did, there is not much Christianity to either of them. Forty and fifty years ago non-members were inclined toward religion, but today very few of them seem to be, but seem inclined rather to pick flaws in ALL professed Christians. Hence, such a discussion helps make it harder to convert such men and women. We do not say we have always followed our principle but we have tried to make all discussions in our columns as courteous as we can. About thirty years ago we held a debate with a Christian Church man in Unionville, Mo., with an average attendance each night of about 1200, and one of their preachers reported in the Christian Standard that there was not an unkind word said on either side. When we deviate from the courteous way, we hope our readers will call our attention to it. But, of course, we intend to be MIGHTY plain in our arguments against error.

We dislike to spend so much space this issue to negative work, but now that we all have it off our minds, let us **ALL get down to intensive and prolonged, constructive work. WHAT IS YOUR CONGREGATION DOING TO MAKE EVERY MEMBER A LIVE WORKER FOR THE LORD?**

Church News

Bro. Daniel Sommer is very low at this time, and may any day close his long and eventful life.

Des Moines, Ia.—The congregation here is getting along very good. Everyone willing to take some part and all looking forward to a good meeting with Bro. Carl in October and November.—LeRoy J. Munger.

Marion, Ind.—Meeting at Palmyra, Ind., closed Aug. 27, with two young men being baptized into Christ. The brethren at Palmyra are still satisfied with the New Testament teaching. I am now in meeting with the Brethren at Elwood, Ind. Enclosed seven subs. for M. C. To Him be all praise and glory.—Slim Holderbaum.

St. Joseph, Mo.—I am here at the present for one week of development work and go from here to Shelby for a three weeks meeting and from thence to St. Louis to attend one year of school at the Washington University. We had fine attendance at the all-day meeting at Des Moines yesterday with Bro. Freed doing the preaching.—Arthur Freeman.

Fredericksburg, Ind.—The tract, Christian Liberty, that you sent to me was gladly received and is really helpful, and in return I am sending you a bill that you may send more of them out where you think it will do good.—Chas. Wellbaker.

Belmont, Ohio—Will you please send me five copies each of July and August numbers of M. C. to distribute? May this good work go on and steadily increase, until the glorious Church of Christ will shine forth as a city set on a hill which cannot be hid, in all its ancient purity, and may we never grow weary in well doing, knowing the reward is sure at the end of the race.—Emma Brady.

Neosho, Mo.—The church at Neosho, located corner Grant and Young Streets or 606 Young Street, wants to be understood. Brethren, this is the only church here in Neosho which is fully satisfied with the gospel. We ask all faithful brethren when passing this way to meet with us. Bro. Lloyd Riggins just closed a two weeks meeting here. One was restored. But much was accomplished otherwise. The church at Neosho sends

greetings to all of the Brethren with Christian love and fellowship. Together we will give God the praise through the Church for evermore.—Leonard A. Choate.

If all those who sent us a Club of Names last Summer and Fall will do their best to get the renewal of the names soon at 75c each, we may be able to go back to twelve pages for November. Provided also, that our other active friends continue their activity. We have many good articles. Shall we have the twelve pages of them

Kirk, Colo.—Assisting again here. Enjoyed services at home Lord's Day before coming west. Several Brethren made such good exhortations and Bro. Wilson (our Elder) praised the procedure. Have helped at Waynesville, Cooksville, Guthrie, and Peoria in Illinois since reporting. Sorry I didn't have more time to spend at Decatur debate (heard only two sessions). God bless efforts of all true workers in the saving of souls.—R. O. Webb, Secor, Ill.

We have received a report of mission work in Kansas in a mimeographed circular letter, signed by Wm. Ketcherside, J. A. Freed, E. R. Noel, Glen Ellis. Good work has already been done through the co-operation of these churches, and we hope it continues, and that the Kansas churches often take up a contribution for this advancement of the Kingdom. Mere co-operation is scriptural, but organization different from the One Body, the Church, is not.

Enclosed find one dollar to help keep the M. C. on its feet. I feel benefited by every article I read in it. It is certainly comforting to know there are a few people not afraid to expose the evils of the old world.—Miss E. E.

Mrs. H. B. Land, of Mattoon, Ill., writes an appeal to send money to help the disciples at Crystal Springs, Ark., pay for their meeting house. Send to A. A. Land, Meyers P. O., Ark. He says that W. G. Roberts and C. R. Turner will vouch for the faithfulness of this group. He says that they need a meeting but are too poor to have one. The publisher of the M. C. has not been much in favor of begging money for meeting houses. The Church began and thrived for three hundred years

and never owned any meeting houses. They spent their money for the aid of the poor and for the preaching of the gospel. But modest structures are in harmony with gospel principles. We have thought it best for churches to find the place to meet, but we do take an interest in the preaching of the gospel, and we hope churches which can will help this congregation to hold a meeting. Maybe you who know Brother Roberts or Turner can help them to assist the church.

Unionville, Mo.—Bro. W. E. Ballinger is to hold a meeting for us about October 1, and Bro. Lloyd Riggins will hold another meeting for us in May, 1940. Bro. Riggins has never been here. The Church here at Unionville is getting along very well. We are honestly contending for the One Faith and are at peace among ourselves. We are looking forward to our two meetings with great anticipation.—D. N. Davis.

Dayton, Ohio—The May issue of the Macedonian Call was fine. Those who contribute to the writing of this paper are to be commended for the firm stand which they take "for the old paths." I very much like the way you comment on the Witty-Murch Conclave, or the annual hand shaking party with the Christian Church preachers. But all of those who have in-dorsed this road to apostasy including the editorial staff of the Apostolic Review have never told us what they accomplished through these annual conventions. There is nothing more needed in the brotherhood than a medium of information like the M. C. which will fearlessly and earnestly contend for the old paths, as there are many honest brethren who have been misled by false teachers, and if we can get some of the literature like the M. C. in their hands it would help, as some of those honest souls are for the old paths at heart; but have been misled.—F. V. Minckler.

Cotter, Ark.—Our meeting of ten days (at Gassville) with Bro. Lloyd Riggins of Charleston, Ill., doing the preaching closed Aug. 6, Sunday. Bro. Riggins rendered some real service in the effort. There were no additions but the seed was sown and much good was done and we were very much encouraged at the outlook for the future. Bro. Riggins is a good preacher and our prayers are that he may ever remain faithful and true to the N. T. teachings and we hope to have Bro. Riggins with us again in the near future. My family and I attended the meeting at Liberty, held by Bro. John W. Rhodes. We only missed one sermon and regret missing that. There was good attendance and much good was done there, with eight being baptized, making four complete homes. Bro. Rhodes is a talented preacher and gave some very good lessons which I am sure will bring forth good fruit. We are in hopes of having Bro. Rhodes with us, in our small congregation at Gassville, Ark., in the near future.—Ed. Robinson.

Have you friends who are not Bible Christians whom you would like to enjoy the happiness you experience in the true faith? The last Missionary Number of the M. C. was on that, Happiness, and may do your friends much good IF you will put it into their hands. We had an extra supply printed, for the next Missionary Number will not reach you till the very last of October, as the publisher will conduct a meeting at Nixa, Mo., from September 17 to October 8. Churches—have you a supply at hand, to pass to every non-member who attends your meeting? What is equal to sixteen pages of ordinary book pages for only two cents!—can you get printed Gospel any cheaper? Let's "Fill Jerusalem with our doctrine." Two cents a copy.

Echoes from the New Castle Mass Meeting.—The outstanding thing to me was the interest the young people take in spreading the Gospel.—Mrs. Luella Govero . . . What impressed me most was the warm reception on arrival at New Castle and on general hospitality, which shows that though strangers in the flesh we are all members of one big family.—Mrs. Lena La Rose. . . . What impressed me was the willingness of young and old to respond when called on. The song leaders were good. The sisters were to be commended for supplying material things.—W. J. Williamson. . . . The Brethren made no apologies nor excuses when called upon for a talk, and the lessons presented were inspiring. I thank the Brethren and Sisters at New Castle.—John Williamson.

Bristol, W. Va.—Began meeting with "Ten Mile" congregation Aug. 13. Attendance and interest very good. This is my fourth meeting here. Was in meeting at Anderson, Ind., clos-

ing Aug. 6. Brother Harold Shaasteen of Sullivan, Ill., had charge of song service and did well. He also taught a class of young people each morning from 9:30 to 10:30, and preached in afternoon the last two Sundays. Any congregation wanting a preacher or song leader would make no mistake in getting him. There were no additions, but the brethren were encouraged and strengthened in the faith. My next meeting will be in Pennsylvania.—C. G. Parsons, Malta, Ohio.

IMPORTANT.—The congregation formerly meeting at 55th and Cleveland Sts., in Kansas City, has purchased the property formerly belonging to the Methodist church, at 59th and Kenwood Sts. Possession will be obtained and the first services held in the new location, on September 24, and on that occasion W. Karl Ketcherside will begin a series of meetings to continue approximately one month. The church is desirous of starting with as good showing as possible, and an all-day meeting with basket dinner served at noon will be sponsored on the opening date. All the brethren who can possibly come, are cordially invited to do so, and thus assist in launching the church in this new territory. We will appreciate the attendance of all who can come, and if any reader of the paper knows of someone in the Kansas City territory who has been, or might become interested in the pure Gospel, write us immediately, and Bro. Ketcherside will endeavor to contact them during his stay with us. Address your communications to Buell Boyce, 2415 East 67th Street, Kansas City, Mo. Church of Christ, located 59th and Kenwood Sts., Kansas City, Mo. Elders: B. A. Boyce, W. C. Davis, M. J. Burton.

Bro. Wm. Ketcherside is now located in Phoenix, Ariz., R. 8, Box 491A, where he has gone for his health and where he will do all the gospel work he can. Any church in that great southwest that can use him will find him faithful. Bro. Ketcherside was about the first preacher who encouraged the publisher of the M. C. in warning brethren of a big apostasy coming. This was long before the Rough Draft came out and when a number of other preachers who are now strong for us were knocking us in another paper. Bro. K. has served faithfully with the group in Topeka, and every dollar sent him will be held in the Lord's work. He needs your assistance.—Publisher M. C. . . . Lloyd Riggins also writes: "Here is an opportunity to show your appreciation for what Bro. Will has done. So far as I know Bro. Will has never shown the 'white feather' nor run up the white flag. He does not know I am writing this, but I am sure it will be appreciated by him and his good wife who has shared the burdens that are common to a preacher's wife." Look again at the first line of this note for his address and write it "Wm. Ketcherside" on your check, or money order.

Polo, Mo.—Recently closed a two weeks meeting in Mountain Home, Arkansas, at the Liberty Congregation, where W. C. Rice holds membership and is an Elder. We had a good meeting from the standpoint of attendance and interest and eight were baptized during the meeting. Brethren from Gainesville, Mo., and Cotter, Ark., attended almost regularly and thus encouraged the brethren there. Cooperation and fellowship of sister congregations is one of the best sources of encouragement. With it a congregation feels that even if the world is against them, there are still a few faithful willing to stand with them in the good work. Without this cooperation I have seen some places where the brethren became almost discouraged. I never did advocate nor encourage congregations to dismiss their worship, especially not on Lord's Days, but I do think that after making arrangements for the work to be carried on at home, brethren would do well to help encourage other sister churches with their presence. I am now in a meeting at what is known as the Bethlehem Congregation in Ray County, Mo. This is an old church but though it once was the largest for miles around, it is now among the smallest. Trouble, discord, and other of Satan's weapons have taken their toll here. The interest has been good on the part of those in attendance but our audiences have been small—however, they are fairly regular. We were pleased last Wednesday evening to have five good brethren from the congregation at 55th and Cleveland in Kansas City present with us. I go from here to Illinois, where I am to assist in three consecutive meetings at Hammond, Shelbyville and Decatur, respectively. John W. Rhodes, Ozark, Mo.

Red Cloud, Nebr.—Am at this place in a three weeks effort, with the church which was established this spring. Bro. Bill

Hensley has been working in the community for several months in preparation for this session, and when I say "working" I mean just that. He took a religious census of the entire city, learned the name of every family, their church affiliations, and left with all who were interested a Macedonian Call. Then he made return calls on those he thought to be interested, going back as many as five or six times where conditions warranted. He worked with the congregation in developing the talent of the membership of eleven souls, then distributed notices throughout the city, of a vacation Bible study for the youngsters. With cooperation of Sister Grace Minster, boys and girls were taught the Word, who never had looked into the Bible. Before I came Bro. Hensley once more covered the entire city, leaving a blotter in each home announcing the meeting, and brethren mailed an announcement to every person on a rural route out of this city. Since I came we have featured newspaper advertising heavily, this week's meeting being given special notice in eight papers in Kansas and Nebraska. We have printed lists of the subjects, which Bro. Hensley has placed in every business house, and we have also mailed them out to all rural residents. As a result of this effort, carried out systematically, the audiences are beyond expectations, and we expect to be crowded out before this second week is over. Prejudice and sectarian opposition is running high, but we know that is advertising which we don't have to pay for, and we thank God for it. If we were not doing anything that was worth fighting we wouldn't be doing anything worth writing about! I go from here to Springfield, Mo., and then to Kansas City and Des Moines. Bro. Hensley will likewise leave for several meetings in Missouri and Kansas. He is a young man, only 21, but he is a good servant of the Master. May he live long to help wage the battle. My work in California closed with a total of 70 restored and baptized for the entire time I was there.—W. Carl Ketcherside.

Red Cloud, Nebr.—The outstanding event during our meeting with Brother Carl was the great all-day service and fellowship we enjoyed, Lord's Day, August 27th. There were four states represented at this gathering, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa and Missouri. The attendance was outstanding. In the evening Brother Ketcherside delivered his fine message, "Hitler and the German Jews." It was received great by all and I feel will long be remembered.—Bill Hensley.

Springfield, Mo.—I have just closed a two weeks effort at a mission point in Waynesville, Ill. The town of approximately five hundred is badly affected with whooping cough at present. Many people who I feel certain would have attended our meetings, were restrained from doing so because of their fear of their children contracting the disease. Nevertheless interest began to rise from the beginning until quite a few extra chairs were put into use. There were nine individuals who took their stand for the faith of our fathers, and so from this time forward there will be a recognized congregation of Jesus Christ meeting at that place. I feel that much good can be accomplished there in the future, because of the manifested interest of several who were late getting started attending the meeting. Much credit for our success should go to Bro. Cisco. He had formerly been affiliated with the Christian church at that place, but he became dissatisfied with its practices through the years as it departed farther and farther from the ancient truth. For the past several months he and his family had been meeting in their home. Since they were isolated in Waynesville no one knew of their condition for quite a while. Sister Nichols from the Long Point congregation reported it to Bro. Charles Phillips of the same congregation. Since Bro. Cisco held to the belief of the Church of Christ, faithful preachers in the reach of Waynesville began assisting them by preaching in their home. The Community Hall was used for the meeting and they will continue meeting there until other arrangements are made. Those who took their stand for the church were either members of the Christian or Methodist church. Two of them had never been baptized up to the time of the meeting. Brethren, I have found out that there are still those of this world hungering and thirsting after true righteousness. It has been left to us to reach those individuals and do our part in satisfying their want for the pure gospel. May we all familiarize ourselves with the wants of those about us and ever keep busy in the vineyard of our Master. A return trip has been requested by the congregation of Waynesville and Long Point, so I am contemplating a return visit of six weeks starting the last two weeks of next March. May God bless all of those desiring the truth is my continuous prayer.—Harold Shaasteen.

To Faithful Churches and Brethren, Greetings: We, the undersigned, leaders of the church meeting in the American Legion Bldg., corner 1st and B streets in Glendale, Arizona, feel it our duty to lay before our Brethren elsewhere the true situation of the churches of Christ in Arizona, and to also announce our intention of future work. Through the unscrupulous work of designing men at Glendale in 1938, a few of us were forced to seek another place of worship and, so far as we know, there is not another of the few local congregations in our State but what is affected either wholly, or in part, by the present wave of apostasy now sweeping the brotherhood, wrecking churches in its wake. We are, in no sense, discouraged, but we are sure it will require a long time to rehabilitate the affected churches, while we labor faithfully to carry the Gospel to new and untried fields. Being few in number, and standing practically alone in this gigantic task, we greatly need the prayers and financial assistance of faithful churches and Brethren more favorably situated than ourselves. Carl and William Ketcherside have made a brief survey of the situation here, and are fully agreed that there is a bright prospect for the Church here in the future. California churches and brethren have agreed to help support Bro. C. R. Turner in a meeting at Glendale this winter which, we hope, will mark the beginning of a more extensive work in the future.

Phoenix has approximately 100,000 population and not a faithful Church there. It is one of the many cities and towns in which we hope to plant the cause in the future. It is our hope that, with the aid of really aggressive Brethren, we can locate a faithful man in this district who will devote his entire time to building up the churches weakened by the present apostasy, and in carrying the Gospel to new fields. Truly the field is "white unto harvest" here. A Lord's day contribution each month from a few of the established churches, and aid from private individuals for a while, will soon put us to where we can be self supporting, and able to assist others also. Brethren, if you are interested, please let us hear from you at once. Don't forget to pray that we may ever remain worthy of your implicit confidence, and faithful to our task as servants of God. Signed, C. A. Sanderson, Route 2, Glendale, Ariz.; C. H. Cassell, Route 8, Box 491-A, Phoenix, Ariz.

Berkeley, Calif.—The Church of Christ here expects to use Bro. C. R. Turner of Sullivan, Ill., during January-February, 1940, in a missionary effort. We ask your earnest prayers in behalf of the church here as we are very few in numbers and it will require your active cooperation if we use Bro. Turner to the best advantage. We believe there are many living in this vicinity, i.e., San Francisco, Oakland, Alameda, San Leandro, Hayward, Richmond and Berkeley, who have either been connected with, or know of the church. If you know of any, who have moved here from your locality, or otherwise, whom you think might be interested in the church, please send me their names, addresses and briefly outline their religious background, so that we may contact them. If a direct appeal from you would help, write them, suggesting they get in touch with us. Please keep this constantly before your local congregation and let us see how much good can be accomplished by this method of evangelizing!—Geo. A. Robinson, 2223 Union St., Phone AS-berry 5164.

Here is another place for churches to send missionary money.—Publisher.

LaJunta, Colo.—We are steadily growing in number, and have a nice congregation willing and ready to work. We are starting to build a new church building at 8th and Grace ave. The lots have been bought, and actual construction work begun Aug. 28th. We attribute most of our progress to the efforts of Bro. Carl Ketcherside and Bro. C. R. Turner who have held meetings here recently. We do not have money enough on hand to complete the building, but with most of the work donated, and with possibly some help from other congregations we hope to complete the building this winter, the Lord willing. I enjoy reading your paper very much. Keep the good work up.—C. C. Dudley, 622 Smithland Ave.

That "Voice in the Wilderness," Again

Mississippi.—I noted with interest your article "A Bit of History," in May issue of Macedonian Call. You are surely right when you state that men have grown up who know not the great principles around that clarion call, "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent." Some of my brethren

here in the South are very bold with reference to organs in the worship of God, but hesitate not to keep hoisting the clergy system over the heads of the saints of God. Thus they have closed the gates to some things and opened them to others, and thus they are heading the Church as swiftly as possible to the gates of Babylon.

I therefore, voice and sanction your conviction that a set of men have grown up in the churches of Christ that know not the New Testament or the great work which the saints of old advocated and accomplished. We are afflicted here in the South with a school of striplings—products from incubators—who are a generation of imitators of great pastors, from voice inflections to pernicious doctrinal oracles, and every sound gospel preacher that writes for some of our journals must have his articles examined through green goggles of the clergy system. And all this has led to soft preaching and the advocacy of "conservative, dignified" preaching, so called. The majority of them seem to have a great desire to have journals and systems of preaching that will meet the approval of human institutions and give the churches of Christ an orthodox position with the daughters of Babylon.

I charge that many preachers in the churches of Christ are disgusted with the New Testament system of edifying the churches and of evangelizing, and some do not hesitate to say they much more prefer the positions of sectarians. Thus as far as some men are concerned the position of speaking where the Scriptures speak, has lost its influence and power. I have said for some time that many of my preaching brethren are the clearest examples which history affords of men sinning against light and knowledge.

I have many things I would like to say to you, but I just want you to know how I appreciate the good work you are doing. May you continue to combat "every false way," whether in the churches or out of them. Keep distributing the Macedonian Call in the South. You may be sowing precious seed that some day will bring forth an abundant harvest.

For the Truth of God,
D. P. Craig, Evangelist.

Walking With God

"And Enoch walked with God; and he was not; for God took him." (Gen. 5:24.) The above text suggests the heading of this article. It is quite evident according to the context of this verse of Scripture, that the man of the seventh generation from Adam whose name was Enoch stood in high favor with the God of heaven. And was it because God was, or is a respecter of persons? We hardly believe so because the Bible makes it very clear that He is no respecter of persons. See Deut. 10:17 also Acts 10:34. But Enoch stood favorably in God's sight because of his righteous life.

Though there is little given in God's word concerning Enoch, yet, the book contains enough inspiration about him to show us why he was translated and did not see death. In Heb. 11:5 the record states that "before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." And verse 6 of this same Hebrew Epistle tells us what it takes to please God, and that is **faith**. Therefore Enoch surely had faith and the right kind of a faith that would produce this testimony. Rom. 10:17 states that faith comes by hearing God's word. Therefore the word of the Lord produces the one and the only one kind of a faith that will please God, providing man will receive that word into a good and honest heart and let it germinate. We believe that Enoch was such a person that was ever satisfied with a thus saith the Lord. Nothing more and nothing less. Not like that wicked Cain, but similar to Abel.

Enoch was also a prophet. He foretold of Christ's second coming with ten thousands of his saints to judge the world. See Jude verses 14-15, and who knows but what perhaps Enoch may be among that number?

There was another great and good man who came to the stage of action after Enoch's day whose name was Noah. Gen. 6:9 says that "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God." After God had informed this man of a coming flood, and had given full instruction to him concerning the building of the Ark, the book says "Thus did Noah according to all that God commanded him, so did he." (Gen. 6:22.) Having been warned of God, it was through faith and by faith that Noah prepared the Ark to the saving of his house; by that which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. (Heb. 11:7.) He manifested similar faith to that of Enoch which comes only by hearing and doing exactly what God commands.

We fully believe and are persuaded that Noah too pleased God. To hear and do exactly as God says is all it ever takes to please the Creator of the universe regardless of what age of the world man lives in. "For we walk by faith, not by sight." (II Cor. 5:7.)

"Furthermore, then we beseech you, brethren, and exhort you by the Lord Jesus, that as ye have received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, so ye would abound more and more." (I Thess. 4:1.)—(The writer of this did not sign his name here and the publisher failed to transfer it from other communications he sent at the same time.)

Today

We have today; let's not forget,
In all our life we never yet
Have seen tomorrow; nor can we borrow
Just one brief hour from yesterday.

Of yesterdays we've had a plenty,
If three score years, or only twenty
Have flitted by! no use to cry
About our wasted yesterdays.

Today is ours to use or waste,
Across Life's page a line is traced
For which we'll sorrow, perhaps tomorrow
Unless we do our best today.

Tomorrow, like a mist, defies
Our grasp. It may hide a surprise
Of weal or woe; but as we sow
Today, we reap our destiny.

—Alson Secor.

"Every Day"

I goes to church on Sunday an' I listens to de text
It sho'ly helps my feelin's when my mind is gettin' vexed.
De Lord's Day religion puts a calmness in de heart—
But every day religion needs a chance to do its part.

Dar's de Monday religion, when you's got to go to work;
And de Tuesday religion when you mustn't stop to shirk.
Wednesday, Thursday, Friday an' Saturday as well
Needs de every day religion, 'tho no ringin of de bell.

One day a learnin' 'bout de goodness an' de light
De other six a-showin' dat you got de lesson right.
Sunday brings us comfort wif de beauty an' de rest,
But de every-day religion is what puts you to de test.

—Selected.