

MACEDONIAN CALL

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

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., 918 CONGRESS AVE., APRIL, 1930

WHERE ARE WE?

A Possible Basis of Greater Unity Among Disciples of Christ

Confusion in the Religious World in General.—Recently a prominent ecclesiastic in the Episcopal Church said, "There is still no doubt that the world faces today the greatest moral confusion of any age of which there is any record. The problem presses upon the Church: How to shock the lethargic wide awake, how to convert the harassed, how to win the bewildered seekers for the truth. Perhaps it can be met in simple terms. First of all, the church can refuse to lower the standard of discipleship. We are asked from time to time to emasculate the severity of the Christian commitment. There is nothing novel about that. It is the temptation that was offered to our divine Lord. I wonder if the church will have the courage to say with the Lord Jesus, 'Get thee behind me, Satan.'"

So far, neither the Episcopal Church nor the denominations in general are doing much to put Satan behind them but rather are they catering to him, and letting him more and more into their ranks.

Confusion in the Church of Christ.—Nor can we expect those who claim to be the true people of God to be uninfluenced by the confusion about them. There is no denying the truth that in doctrine there is considerable confusion among us, and in morals we are getting into the same state. We have innovationism on the one hand, and undue restriction on the other. While the battle against the former has been going on for fifty years and a victory gained, in a sense, still some are now willing to give up the advantage gained and slip into the apostasy we have fought our way out of. On the other hand, some are trying to be more strict than the Scriptures demand, and to magnify things which have no principle connected with them. Is there any way by which we can keep out of the ditches on each side of the road? This is a very important question, and I ask each disciple to read with care what we have to say, and we may be able to get closer together.

How to Keep Out of the Ditches(?)—Here is a proposition which may help us keep on the main track of truth: **THE COMMAND TO DO A THING IMPLIES EVERYTHING NECESSARY TO OBEY THAT COMMAND; ALSO, EVERYTHING HELPFUL IN OBEYING THAT COMMAND, IF IT IS IN HARMONY WITH THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.**

How to Go and Preach.—The command to go and preach implies everything necessary to obey that command and everything helpful if it does not antagonize any other scripture. It implies the use

of horses, boats, cars, etc. Yes, says the digressive, it implies the use of our missionary society. But the Lord has restricted us to the auspices under which we are to go—"Unto him be glory in the Church;" which we are not doing when we use a human organization of a missionary society.

How and Where to Baptize.—Christ commanded the apostles to baptize believers, and showed them that the penitents were to be buried in baptism. But he did not tell them where to baptize. Some people won't be baptized except in "running water." If the command had read, "He that believeth and is baptized in running water, shall be saved," then there would be something to that; but it leaves off the "running water." So, we perform what Christ has commanded, if we are buried in baptism in the ocean, a river, creek, pond, or baptistry. The place has nothing to do with the command. Nor has clothing anything to do with it, hence we use special baptismal clothes sometimes.

When and Where to Worship.—The command to meet and worship implies everything necessary to obey that command, and everything helpful if it is in harmony with the rest of the Scriptures. I have found a few disciples who say we should meet to observe the Lord's Supper at night. I wouldn't be surprised if most of the early Christians did that, for most of them were servants or slaves and could not leave their work for their masters in the daytime, yet could slip off at night or early morning. We have heathen records that they met at early morn. But there is no principle involved in the hour of worship, just so we meet on the "first day of the week to break bread." The scripture, "Let all things be done decently and in order," must guide us, and we should meet at the hour which is most suitable for most of the disciples.

The command to meet implies seats, lights, etc., for which the innovators have called so often when we ask them for authority for their societies and instrumental music in Christian worship. It implies, too, a house. The early Christians met in private houses and upper rooms, and history shows that they did not have any houses of their own for Christian worship for at least three hundred years. This destroys the idea so prevalent today that you do not have a church unless you have a special church house. The church is the people, not the house. And yet the apostolic church advanced as it has never advanced since. The Russellites have no church houses of their own, and yet they advance. In most communities it is more economical for a permanent church to have a modest

house of their own, according to the principle of economy taught by our Savior when He said, "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost." And there is no principle of Scripture violated. But if the spirit of apostasy continues, I expect to see in the future about as many churches meeting in private homes and halls as in houses of their own.

But the building of fine meeting houses has become a curse in the Christian world and is contrary to the Scripture to "mind not high things, but condescend to things that are lowly." Great debts are piled up and begging continued till masses of poor people are driven away from the churches. It is one of the greatest curses in the Christian world, for people are spending their money in monuments of pride instead of taking care of the poor and sick.

In some places "churches of Christ" are falling in line with the sects in building these monuments of pride. The "Southwest Church" in Los Angeles, where Wm. Reedy is "minister" has a building and grounds which have probably cost \$75,000 (with a cross on it). And in their meetings, they are evidently trying to manifest the same pride. Before me lies a program of its meeting "Sunday, June 23rd, 1929." "William P. Reedy" and "A. R. Kepple" are "Ministers" at the head of the program, followed by "I. E. Robertson, R. C. Cooper, Elders." Except that "I. E. Robertson" is "musical director in the song practice Friday nights," I can not find in the four pages of program that these elders took any part. The two sermons were delivered by Reedy, and the Bible classes were taught by Reedy and Kepple and four women. The elders don't seem to be doing much "feeding" in that flock, like Paul commands them to do. The program of worship starts with "Prelude: Male Quartette." Now I can see how it is necessary (or, at least helpful) in case of funerals to have a quartette, for it is almost impossible to get singers together; but why should we have quartette singing in our worship when the house is filled with singers, unless it is merely to entertain? A sister who attended one of their meetings said that when she was there the singers were out of sight somewhere, and the music came wafting over to the audience from their unseen place. Then the program also says, "Responsive Reading, Psalm 103." The preacher reads a verse and then the audience. Where are we going to stop in the effort to imitate the sects and appeal to the spirit of pride. Will this church soon have a vested choir, and will Bro. Reedy preach in a long robe? Apostasies grow little by little. A few

MACEDONIAN CALL

Published once in three months by
D. A. SOMMER,
918 Congress Avenue,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

FREE.—And yet brethren should remember that I am depending on them for donations to put it out.

hours ago I passed by a Christian Church which was once as sound in the faith as any church of Christ today, yet the display board said, "Worship here Palm Sunday." Shades of Alexander Campbell and the Apostle Paul! Says the latter, "Ye observe days and months and times and years. I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed labor upon you in vain." Again Paul says, "Mind not high things, but condescend to things that are lowly." Why can't brethren be satisfied to be just plain Christians without these manifestations of pride which will lead them farther and farther from the truth? "Where are we?" And where shall we soon be?

"Evangelist in Charge"—Right Hand of Fellowship.—When the apostles went out and established churches, they looked after them, or saw that some one else did, till elders were appointed. An evangelist today who establishes a church should not leave it to shift for itself, to die or to become a prey to wolves, but should look after it himself or have some one else to do it till elders are developed. The expression "evangelist in charge" has grown up, though the expression is not in the Bible, yet the idea is. But he should make an effort to develop elders. Generally a "leader" in the little band is appointed to look after things in a temporal or spiritual way, or both. That is according to the principle, "Let all things be done decently and in order." What's everyone's business is no one's business, and good sense as well as the Bible requires such order. It's in harmony with the Bible and not contrary to any passage of Scripture.

Elders had flocks they were to feed, and flocks of sheep on the prairies have definite outlines to them. How does one become a member of a particular flock? When one is baptized that brings him into the Church universal, but not necessarily into any particular church, for the word "church" is used in these two senses in the New Testament. Now as the Lord does not tell us just how one becomes a member of a local church, he leaves that to our wisdom. Most churches have the person come forward and all the members pass around and extend to him the right hand of Christian fellowship, or partnership, acknowledging him as a member with them. Some churches have the elder or preacher extend the hand in behalf of the church. Still others simply have the person come forward, and the statement is made publicly that this one wishes to become a member in the church. Any of these is in harmony with the Scriptures. There should be some way to let the people and world know when a person becomes a member of that flock. To destroy all public ways of accepting people as members in a local church is to destroy all order and throw the Church as a whole into confusion. I suppose there is no organization in the world but what has

some public way to receive members. Every Christian should have his membership some place, and if he is an isolated disciple should send his contribution back there, or at least show some interest in that church. The fact that elders have a flock "over which the Holy Ghost has made them overseers," shows that they are not over some other flock where the Holy Spirit has made some other men overseers. The doctrine that because one is an elder one place, therefore he is an official elder every where he goes, also falls down.

Authority of Elders.—The elders are to feed, watch and oversee (which includes developing) the flock. In things in general where principle is not involved, the membership is to "obey them that have the rule over you." But the doctrine of the paper on the Pacific coast that elders are absolute rulers in the churches and that they can throw people out of the church without a hearing, and that an elder can not be tried against his will (even when he is given as much chance as his accusers to choose an impartial hearing—which should be always), such unscriptural doctrines have wrought untold havoc in the Church of Christ, and they will do much more in the future. Peter says that elders are not to be lords over God's heritage but ensamples to the flock. When elders disburse large sums of money and engage preachers and do other important things without consulting at least a few of the other leading brethren, or without putting it before the church and asking if there are any scriptural reasons why they should not go on with such work, they are opening the way for the accusation of being lords, and sooner or later will throw the church into confusion. If people wish to belong to the Roman Catholic Church, they will go and join it and be done with it, but they are expecting better things of the Church of Christ. The new doctrine that we should obey the elders right or wrong, which is practically the substance of the teaching on the Pacific coast, is not of God. If some elders were as anxious to be ensamples to the flock and not to be lords, as they are to "RULE," there would be less trouble than there is. Brethren should be exceedingly careful whom they put into the bishopric, and then should obey them as long as they follow the Bible, but turn from them when they try to impose false doctrines and practices on the Church.

"Convention of Elders."—And now comes the proposition to bring harmony among the churches by having a "convention of elders." Fine, that's about the second step which led to the Pope of Rome. The first one was in exalting one of the elders above another and making him "the bishop," and having him do all the preaching—the same in substance as the preacher-pastor system we have been condemning. Of course, this convention would only make suggestions(?) at first, but—! No, we don't want any convention of elders, preachers or any other group of uninspired men. That has been one of the chief evils of the Christian world, and it is astonishing that any writer in the Church of Christ would make such a suggestion. The convention in Acts 15 was of inspired men to learn what God had done through the different inspired men at different places. Even the Gospel Advocate, as far as they are away from the Bible in some things, wrote a strong denunciation of

this proposed "convention of elders." But the chief advocate of this convention says that he has not given it up, and not many months ago he advocated it in his home church. "Where are we?" and where shall we be in the future, if some one does not call attention to the looseness of some of the writing and preaching today? But remember, brethren, I can not do much of this work, unless you stand behind me, for it makes many enemies to me who work against me. Will you work as strong for the truth?

Music.—The command to sing implies everything necessary to obey that command, and everything helpful, if it is in harmony with the rest of God's Word. A tuning fork is a help, and nothing but a help, for it does not make another kind of music. The same is true of song books. But instruments make another kind of music, and thus are an addition to the Bible and forbidden. But displays of music where the base runs around by itself a while, or the alto, etc., is a display of art which is contrary to the simplicity in Christ. If Jesus condemns vain repetitions in prayers, wouldn't He condemn vain repetitions in musical prayers and other hymns of devotion which many are offering today? He said they wished to be heard for their "much speaking," and will He not say that we wish to be heard for our "much" singing? God commands us to sing, but He puts some restriction on it.

How to Gather the Contribution.—God commands us to give on the first day of the week, but does not tell us just how that money is to be gathered, and so leaves that to our wisdom, provided it is in harmony with the rest of the Bible. Some churches have their members all pass forward and lay their contribution on the table, but this is a little confusing if the house is full. Some churches pass the baskets. I saw one place where they had a box at the door, and the members put their contribution in as they went in or out. In any of these, the disciples are doing what the Lord commanded, if indeed they are giving as they are prospered.

Individual Communion Cups.—When Jesus gave the Lord's Supper, they probably had only one cup, for they did not need any more. To have only one cup in a large assembly would not be according to order nor edification. Nearly all churches have two or more cups, and if for the sake of order and edification we can scripturally have two or more cups, can we not for the sake of health and for the relief of the minds of those who are fearful of disease, have as many cups as there are people. I see no principle of Scripture violated in the individual communion cups, if the wine is poured into them after thanks is given, and I don't know of many disciples who would then object to them. Some places a stanza of a reverential hymn is softly sung while the deacon is pouring the wine into the cups. This helps break the silence and helps prepare the mind for the communion of the blood of Christ. I used to think fifteen years ago that the demand for individual communion cups was a mere matter of pride and an effort to keep up with the times; but now that all the young people are educated on the question of germs (and there is no doubt much truth in what they learn), the common cup is destroying the very purpose of the communion oftentimes by causing them to think of

germs instead of Christ. Brethren should be reasonable, and be sure that what they are contending for is not a mere custom but a vital principle of the gospel.

Orphan Homes and Sunday Schools.—The Church of Christ has taken the position that there is but one organization, one body, the Church, through which we are to work, and has opposed the use of any human organization through which to do work of the Lord. "Unto God be glory in the Church." We have used this argument against the missionary societies and aid societies of the Christian Church. But many who oppose missionary societies, favor orphan homes, organized Sunday Schools and Bible colleges.

The orphan homes have the double money-drawing power of teaching the Bible and of charity. How they do get the money by their tears for the poor, little orphans! Sam Witty seems to be the head man in promoting an orphan home in Ontario, Calif., the place where Yaron has now gone to be pastor for the Bible college church. God tells us how to care for orphans. Pure religion is to "visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction." The Jerusalem church took care of its widows, and a local church might in part look after orphans in addition to the individual work of Christians. But the apostolic Church had no extra organization with president, secretary, treasurer, trustees to do this work. And when we form a human organization to take care of orphans or the poor or sick, or preach the gospel, we have left the simplicity in Christ. There is as much authority for an aid society or missionary society as for an orphan home. The command to take care of widows and orphans implies everything necessary and helpful in doing that, if it is in harmony with the rest of the Bible; but to form another organization is contrary to the scripture to "glorify God in the Church."

We are commanded to teach our children, and the home is the chief place. Many churches have Bible classes before the hour of worship on Lord's day, under the supervision of the elders or other leaders, and they do not have any treasury or officers. I see no scripture violated. But when they form these classes into an organization with superintendent, treasurer, secretary, etc., then they have a body different from the "one Body," the Church. But if a church was moving along without Bible classes, and good, conscientious brethren were not in favor of them, I would not think of urging Bible classes to the disruption of the church, but would urge them to teach the children in the only way they think is scriptural—in the home.

Bible Colleges.—In this question of Bible colleges which has been under fire for a quarter of a century, I have offered this proposition to some of the main preachers in the South, and not one of them would debate it: THE HUMAN ORGANIZATION OF A BIBLE COLLEGE, SUCH AS DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE, ESTABLISHED BY CHRISTIANS FOR THE PURPOSE OF TEACHING THE BIBLE ALONG WITH SECULAR BRANCHES, IS SCRIPTURAL. Why won't they discuss it? It is because it states the issue fairly. These institutions are organizations, they are human, they are established by Christians, they teach the Bible along with secular branches. They can not deny a

single point in the proposition, but they are afraid to debate it. If we can establish a Bible college to teach the Bible, we can establish a missionary society to preach the Bible.

After twenty-five years of trying to keep this innovation out, it is astonishing to see some who have seemed to be against it now compromising with it. Several months ago I quoted from a private letter of Jesse C. Bunn, in which he put individually-owned religious paper on a par with the organizations of Bible colleges. In response to doubts expressed about his loyalty on the college question, Bro. Bunn writes thus in the "People's Bible Advocate," Morris' paper: "They and brethren wherever I have been will bear witness as to what I advocate in order to convert sinners and edify souls in Christ. I have been out in the open now almost 30 years. If my life's work does not speak for itself, it is too late now for me to testify."

Here is some of Brother Bunn's "open" work, which seems also to have been done somewhat underhanded, if brethren on the ground are to be believed. In Springfield, Mo., there are several churches which have tried to say they are not Bible colleges, yet they will permit only those who tolerate Bible colleges to preach for them, and these churches permit the advocacy of such colleges in the pulpit. About a dozen years ago, several disciples withdrew from these churches and established the Boulevard church on the east side. They wished a church which would permit the preaching of the whole truth. Brother Bunn has held a number of meetings and a Bible reading with this church, and has always seemed to be in harmony with it. But a year or two ago he and J. L. Ferguson drew up a paper for the brethren to sign, saying that they did wrong in drawing off and starting another church, and that they wished now to be in fellowship with these churches. These two men threw this church into great confusion. Ferguson has since gone to Kansas City and goes to a Bible college church with its preacher-pastor, and Bunn is a chief supporter of Morris' paper, and is circulating among the churches that are supposed to be against the human organizations of Bible colleges to do work of the Church. "Where Are We" and where will the churches soon be unless some one calls attention to such work? If Brother Edward Buttram had not left the field and devoted all his time to saving this church, I doubt whether we would have a church now in Springfield where the full gospel can be preached, but last Lord's day I was there, and the house was nearly full at both meetings, and there was a fine interest then and at the other meetings I held through the week. But Brother Buttram probably did not average more than five dollars a week for six months, in his work of saving this church from these compromisers, and he used up his little savings for years. If he receives several hundred dollars, he will receive only what the most humble working man gets. Send to him at 726 N. Rogers, Springfield, Mo. The church on the Boulevard, including Brother Buttram, will stand behind all I have said. This is some of Brother Bunn's work which "speaks for itself," and if churches wish that kind of work, they will know whom to call. I say these things, not because I do not love Brother Bunn, but because I love the cause of Christ more.

Linking Ourselves with the Sects.—In California there is a "federated church" movement, the object of which seems to be to form organizations of the men in every church to fight for better things in local communities. Wm. P. Reedy seems to be one of the leaders in this movement, but I don't know whether he has one of these organizations in his church or not. Last year when I was at Compton, he made a speech at one of their conventions in that city while I was there, and did the same at Riverside when I was there. Also, this year, he did the same thing when I was in Riverside, and the following is part of the account of the convention: "A meeting to arouse interest in the state federated church brotherhood's convention was held at Calvary Presbyterian Church last night and was attended by forty representatives of church brotherhoods of Riverside and men from surrounding cities. Dr. Harrison M. Pierce presided. Dr. William P. Reedy, pastor of the Church of Christ in Los Angeles, delivered an address on "Aims and Ideals of Church Brotherhoods?" etc. Should preachers of the Church of Christ go into human organizations of "church brotherhoods" of the denominations to do good works, or should they do it through the Church which Christ established? (See Eph. 3:21.) Brother Reedy is one of the chief writers in Brother Morris' paper. "Where are we," anyway?"

All-Time Preaching.—Yes, preaching is a divine institution, but we can not exalt one divine institution to the destruction of another. It is a divine institution that disciples edify one another, and that elders feed the church of God. Yes, Paul stayed at Ephesus for three years, but all Asia heard the Word, and elders were evidently developed, for later when he passed that way he told the elders to feed the church and watch and oversee. He that can get the all-time preaching system by one man at one place out of Paul's stay at Ephesus, can get almost anything out of the Bible.

And now comes the plea that we must have some one present our plea forcefully so that when we bring our friends we can instruct them. I wonder if any one denies that. But there is a time for everything. The Sunday night meetings are supposed to be evangelistic meetings to convert the world. If a church can have preaching every Sunday night, they can scripturally do so, and all make an effort to get strangers out. But the meeting Sunday morning was not intended for outsiders. The disciples came together to break bread, not to convert the world, in the meetings when they had their worship with the Lord's Supper as the central item. If the world is present and hear things which convince them, all right. One of the most marvelous things to me is that disciples who claim to have good common sense can not see that when a preacher occupies all the time publicly in both meetings on Lord's day, the members become weaker and weaker, and fall more and more into the hands of such preacher. When his personality is gone, a good part of the church is gone. And it is marvelous that we can't see that the sects have tried that system and it has failed. True, for the moment we may make a show, but this one-man system does not build a strong church for time. David Lipscomb was perhaps the most prominent preacher and writer among

the college brethren in the South in the past century. In his book of Questions and Answers, we have this Warning:

Extract from "Questions and Answers" by D. Lipscomb, p. 90.—"(1) Is it right for a preacher of the gospel to have regular monthly, semi-monthly, or weekly appointments at the same church? "

"These examples show that Paul remained, one, two, or three years at a place; that he taught in meetings of the church and publicly on every occasion that offered. He also threw himself with such energy and devotion into the work that both day and night and from house to house he warned and admonished both Jew and Gentile to repent and turn to God.

"Public preaching, monthly or weekly, is a poor substitute for the earnest labors of the early preachers and teachers. These early preachers kept constantly in view the preparation of the church to live, worship, and edify itself without the presence and help of a preacher or teacher from a distance.

"A preacher may by weekly or monthly appointments aid and instruct a church how to worship and develop its abilities to worship and serve the Lord. I cannot see that weekly or monthly appointments, if that is kept in view, are wrong. There is danger, if this is not kept in view, that the church accept this as the permanent condition of things and all its worship degenerate into a routine of monthly meetings, or merely a meeting to be entertained by a speech from the preacher."

Here is practically the gist of all that I have said for years on Mutual Edification expressed by this old preacher: "These early preachers kept constantly in view the preparation of the church to live, worship, and edify itself WITHOUT THE PRESENCE AND HELP OF A PREACHER OR TEACHER FROM A DISTANCE." I have put it in this form: A preacher should work his way out of the services of the church rather than into them. That is the very thing for which many preachers dislike my teaching. A. M. Morris expressed the same thing thirty years ago (though he has now changed), when he said, "There is MANIFESTLY A FAULT in the preacher who does all the preaching, praying, reading of the Scriptures, talking at the Lord's table, baptizing, once a month in any given locality, and does not develop the church so that it can hold intensely interesting and profitable meetings on the following Lord's days." Benjamin Franklin expressed much the same thought, and so did J. A. Harding and Alexander Campbell. Send to D. A. Sommer, 918 Congress Ave., Indianapolis, Ind., for his number of the Macedonian Call on "How the Pope Got Started," and read what these men say. Can it be that these men were not expressing a great principle of the gospel but a little local or temporary custom? I believe this is a great principle and applies in all ages of the Church. In fact, there is not much bigger question which can come before us, for it is a question whether we shall have an apostolic eldership or a Romanized clergy! The principles of God's Word do not change simply because a church gets rich or big.

One of the chief causes of the Long Beach church trouble was that Morris and Rucker and others were determined to have this all-time preaching system by one man. Reedy preached practically

all the time for that church for six or eight years, Silas Settle two or three years, Whaley two or three years; and though they have thus had preaching practically all the time for about fifteen years by a man brought in for that purpose, the church has only one elder (February, 1930, as one of their members told me), and he was not developed there! If these preachers haven't been pastors, doing the work of the elders, what have they been?

J. J. Hogan took up the same divisive work. He lived and preached six or eight years at Santa Cruz, with his membership at Long Beach, the last several years preaching every Sunday morning and night there. When some favored his doing the work of an evangelist by working at least part of the time somewhere else, he threw them out of the church, and divided it, leaving there now two little bands. I suppose this is some of that "evangelistic assumption" the western paper has talked about! Fine showing to present to the Lord for the work of six or eight years! If you wish that kind of work, send for Hogan. Six things the Lord hates—he that soweth discord among brethren. "Where Are We?"

Ernest Beam helped the band there opposed to this pastor system, then he afterwards took up the same kind of pastoring at the other church in Long Beach, and when some opposed it, he helped vote them out of the church. Ernest had written a tract for mutual edification and against the pastor system, then became a pastor himself, preaching every Sunday morning and night for two or three years (except a protracted meeting or two a year somewhere else). He betrayed the cause of Christ. "Where are We?"

T. L. Gray announces with pride his work of getting I. D. Moffitt back into the Morris group of brethren at Long Beach, and an effort is made to influence many brethren with that. I. D. Moffitt was in mental confusion the past few years of his life. Three of his relatives told me that he could not count a simple column of figures in addition, and that when his wife wished him to go to a doctor he realized his declining mentality by saying he was afraid the doctor would send him to the asylum. He was just like many old people become, and like I may become some time—irresponsible. I saw him nearly a year before he died, and though I believed he had a wrong position religiously, I did not have the unfairness to take advantage of his declining mentality to try to get him to change. But T. L. Gray thinks he can put a feather in his cap and help the cause of error. But such work is not new for him.

The principles of the Long Beach church trouble remain the same in my mind. The doctrine that elders are absolute rulers in the church, and can throw people out without a hearing, and that they can not be tried except by their consent (which could be never), even when they have as much say as their accusers in selecting judges, and the doctrine that the elders can hire a preacher to discourse every Sunday morning and night to them—these doctrines remain heresies as much as they ever were, and I shall continue to throw my influence against them. Increase in wealth and numbers does not change the eternal principles of God's Word.

To show my sincerity in the matter, I challenge Reedy, Silas Settle, Whaley,

Kepple, or Beam to affirm the following proposition: **PREACHING EVERY SUNDAY MORNING AND NIGHT, IN A CHURCH WITH ELDERS, BY A PREACHER OR PREACHERS BROUGHT IN FOR THAT PURPOSE, IS SCRIPTURAL.** Long Beach would be a good place to hold this discussion. This is their practice—now let them affirm it. I will affirm my practice. The discussion can be put in book form, so that the whole brotherhood can read it.

Conclusion.—"Where are We?" Well, you know where I am, and you know where some others are. I don't think these brethren should be offended at my mentioning their names. If I have misrepresented them anyway, they should let me know and I will correct. I am glad for people to know just where I stand, and all true soldiers of the cross are glad to do the same. If men don't wish others to know their position, they are sneaks and should be exposed. We have too many of such today. I know that such an article as this will make me more enemies, and I suppose I have now about as many as anyone else in the brotherhood. But just so I don't make the Lord an enemy.

Some today are crying in substance what many in ancient Israel cried, "Prophecy not unto us right things; prophecy smooth things, prophecy deceits." We must not say anything about the evils going on in the brotherhood, it might cause trouble, we must talk of LOVE, LOVE. It may be true that there are not the outward troubles there were a few years ago, but as a result in part of the dope administered innovationism is spreading rapidly among us (as this article attests), indifferentism is increasing, and moral corruption and general looseness are growing by leaps and bounds. Yet elders have been so "fed up" on "Love" and "no-troubleism" that they no longer have the courage to keep the church clean, but give the excuse of a certain elder for this neglect, "Every one automatically takes himself out of the Church by his misconduct." Paul thought differently when he said, "What know ye not that a little leaven leaven-

Brethren, we have another column already set up that we can't get in for lack of space. We have many words of encouragement such as this from a preacher who has calls for many more meetings than he can fill:

"I have read all that knowledge at my command against the worldly tendencies so constantly manifesting themselves in the lives of supposed followers of Christ. It sickens me to hear so many of our brethren talking with apparent unconcern about 'worldly Christians.' In my vocabulary there is no such term as a 'worldly Christian.' Might as well talk about a 'pious devil' . . . I am going to say candidly and frankly, that any change or reformation in minds of the brotherhood at large, can be traced directly and indirectly to the circulation of the Macedonian Call. I am sure that brethren can not persistently and consistently read that organ of truth without being benefitted."

And here's one from A. T. Kerr, an elder at Brookport, Ill.: "Enclosed you will find a contribution to the fund for getting out the M. C. I would suggest that brethren over the U. S. give to this fund liberally so that you can issue it often. Brethren, send to Bro. D. at once."