

MACEDONIAN CALL

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

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

Things that Don't Make for Peace

Since the introduction of sin into the world, there has been confusion, trouble and every evil work; and I suppose that this condition will continue till time shall be no more. But the purpose of God in Christ is to bring man back to the peace and happiness which he had before the fall. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fating together, and a little child shall lead them." "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." "Let us follow after the things which make for peace, and things whereby with one may edify another."

But there can be no lasting peace, either among people of the world, or people in the church, unless it is established upon truth and righteousness. Temporary peace is not to be desired at the expense of permanent peace. "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable."

The peace which should exist among disciples of Jesus is the one which now interests us very much. But this can not be obtained, except for a very short while, and often not then, by permitting justice and truth to languish. We are living now in days of indifference, ungodliness and apostasy, and an effort to try to right things will generally result in friction. Church troubles have sometimes led to outward division and reproach to the cause of Christ. Perhaps, wisdom has not always been used in the effort to eliminate ungodliness, yet if the evil had remained corruption would have reigned which is worse than division. There must be patience toward wrong doers, till it is discovered beyond a doubt that there is not the evident desire there to follow strictly the commandments of God. Then the scripture must be remembered, "A little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump," and to save themselves the other scripture must be followed, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person." Sometimes it may seem that everything is going to pieces by adhering strictly to the divine Word, but in the end real peace will reign. "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable."

But the spirit has come over the people today to follow peace at the expense of truth and purity. Such peace will not be lasting. Sooner or later the corruption will break forth, and it will probably be worse than it would have been if dealt with in an incipient state.

There are many things which do not make for peace, and I shall again mention some of these with lessons which we may learn.

You may wonder why I have said so much on certain subjects, and my answer is that most of them have to do with foundation principles. And for the same reason that Paul said so much about the Jewish law, Luther about Romanism; the early preachers of this religious movement, about the mourner's bench and infant baptism. Every generation has present evils which it has to combat. And of course all these men were "hobbyists," at their time on the particular subjects they talked of so much! When one of our preachers was once asked why he preached so much on baptism, he answered, "Well, it is this way: God has put it in a certain place in the plan of redemption, and you won't preach on it, or if you do, will put it out of the place where God put it; so I have to do my talking on the subject and yours too. Now, if you will preach on it as the early evangelists did, I will not have to preach so much on it." So if other preachers would discourse on some of these things, I would not have to write so much about them.

In a far western city a church of Christ had this on its display board on its meeting house: "CHURCH OF CHRIST, preaching Each Lord's Day, W. P. R. — minister." The churches of Christ, since the digressives sloughed off from them, have been opposed to this "preaching each Lord's day" business. When done by one man it is the preacher-pastor system, for a pastor is a "feeder" and that is what such a preacher is doing. Such a system is a big departure from the divine plan, and is a foundation stone of the Roman Catholic church.

Half of this church was opposed to this system and some other unscriptural things, and condemned them, but the elders were determined to do as they pleased. When charges were brought against the elders they determined never to be tried, though they were given the choice of selecting their judges as much as those condemning them. Every proposition was made for a fair trial, but NO. They threw their accusers out of the church without a hearing, (which the judge in the civil court condemned strongly). Was all this according to justice and the Word of God? Were these elders "following after things which make for peace?" The history of the case tells another tale.

An old preacher living in the same city, could have stopped all that if he had kept to the principles which he had contended for in years past. He could probably have preserved peace if he had at this time upheld the doctrine he once taught in the Review that "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 (how much more so, "each Lord's day"? D. A. S.) 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." And if he had still upheld the doctrine that charges can be heard against elders by an evangelist or evangelists, called in by the accusers, and accused—the doctrine which he had upheld for many years—he could probably have saved the brotherhood much confusion. I have no evidence that he had changed his position before this trouble, and the indication is that he changed simply to defend his friends. He loved them more than he loved the Lord, and bent every effort to uphold them in their apostasy and wrong doing. On the witness stand in Los Angeles, when he opposed the method of having evangelists hear charges against elders and was asked by the judge how elders should be tried, he replied, "I am sure, judge, I don't know." As we passed out of the court room I said to Silas Settle that I would not make a speech like that for a million dollars. He had just sworn before God that he would tell the truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth; but it was the speech of a man who was willing almost to deny the Scriptures to carry his point. It seems that he afterwards realized what an awful blunder he had made in defending these elders to that extent, and he had their lawyer question him on the same subject when he tried to present some of his former doctrine. Was this old preacher following after things which make for peace when he was so acting?

Since then he started a paper, and has printed scores of columns against evangelists' hearing charges against an elder, as Paul instructs Timothy to do; and practically nothing on how they should be tried. The reader of his paper would learn about as much on how to bring charges against an elder, as an attendant at a picture show would about moral living.

In Winfield, Kan., Yadon had some human organization (I think, the Klan) march into the meeting house Lord's day morning with the American flag, etc.; inaugurated himself as preacher pastor there; and divided the church by these and other unscriptural practices; and this same old preacher went there, endorsed Yadon's divisive work, and his endorsement was published in the local papers. This church has had Bible college preachers hold meetings, and Yadon

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.

is now preaching for a full-fledged Bible college church. A regular writer for this old brother's paper on the Pacific coast spoke to me last summer about two other prominent writers in the paper, and said he thought they would soon be with the Bible college people. Still other writers in it are going arm in arm with Bible College preachers. And the evidence is that this western paper is becoming a half-way house between the faithful disciples and the Bible College people. Is such a paper and the owner following after things that make for peace as Paul commands? He has left his former teaching and the Word of God and is striking out along more popular ways. In other words, he is leading in a new apostasy.

And now as this old preacher takes a trip among churches, the publisher of an eastern paper calls on him to preach (who makes only a talk because of physical inability); and thus lends his public endorsement, in a way, to the false doctrines and practices advanced from the western coast, which have wrought such havoc among churches. Does such endorsement make for permanent peace among disciples? There must be peace before there can be permanent peace.

Now I can see how persons who are incidental in factions and apostasies may be treated with a good deal of complacency, and I can see how some troubles are merely local with little bearing on the brotherhood at large, but when leaders of such apostasies which are contrary to their former teaching and the New Testament, and which have caused divisions in different places, show up and we endorse them, what about the exhortation which says, "Mark them with cause divisions and offenses (occasions of stumbling) contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; AND AVOID THEM." (Rom. 16:17.)

Then this eastern publisher starts in with all his might to defend his loose course. He apologizes for the teaching of the western publisher thus: "been accused of teaching heresy years ago," "he taught a heresy once," "taught a wrong doctrine at one time." Now this writer knows that this old preacher teaches NOW the same doctrine he has been teaching the past six or eight years, and many people are going to conclude that the Indiana publisher here makes a wilful and deliberate attempt to deceive the reader.

And notice how he decides to call on him: "We had to make some quick decisions," "in a flash", "an instant's time," "snap out of it." Here are questions which have consumed the attention of brethren for years—peace and unity. You don't need now to spend any time considering the merits of a case. It doesn't make any difference what has been taught nor how much division has

been wrought by a chief apostle of certain new doctrines and practices, contrary to his former teaching and to the word of God. Let elders of the churches who have been appointed to watch and keep out wolves, lend them their endorsement, so that they can go on with their unscriptural and divisive doctrines. "What's the difference between one heresy and another." Instead of avoiding such men, as Paul commands, we will eulogize them and help them on their way; and instead of rejecting a heretic, we will accept him! Surely here is a Gordian knot untied "in a flash" with one stroke of this new Alexander's sword!

Now I wish to be reasonable in all things. I can see how a publisher can not always at first know just what to do in certain church troubles when he does not have all the evidence at hand. But even then, let him stay out of it instead of dropping down on a particular side because of popularity, flattery and subs. We need publishers who are seeking purity more than subscriptions. It is the business of every disciple to do what he can to keep false doctrines from spreading among Christians. But when elders who have been specially ordained to watch the church, endorse instead of avoid divisive teachers, and then wish all the churches to know that they had disregarded Paul's command to the Romans and to Titus, is such action a following of "things which make for peace"?

And now we wish to know what has become of the "convention of elders", which this eastern publisher advocated strongly a year or two ago, and which he still endorses, even if it was the chief means by which the Pope was developed? With one bold stroke, such convention is kicked out of court as a useless thing. The way to settle church troubles and heretics, is to pay no attention to the Word of God; and "in a flash", "in an instant's time", jump at conclusions and then defend them. Good bye, Old Book!

One excuse for calling on this old preacher is the good life he says he has lived. That's the way a certain writer in the Review talked twenty years ago, and he landed in the Christian Church and with the denominations. That is stale stuff, for the denominational people have used that from time immemorial. Men must be right in their lives, and they certainly, also, should not be causing divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine in the New Testament.

Possibly the reason this eastern publisher endorses the western publisher is that he believes as he does. The eastern man has followed the western man in using many columns in trying to tear down. I Tim. 5:19, and yet he has not given a single note in which he shows how an elder can be tried. I have heard him say time and again that when charges are brought against an elder if they can't settle it among themselves the only thing for the church to do is to divide. This harmonizes with what the old preacher said on the witness stand, when asked by the judge how they should be tried—"I'm sure judge I don't know."

And he seems to agree with him on the all-time preaching question. He has several times eulogized in his home church a congregation where at that time they had preaching every Sunday morning and night. And he has preach-

ing about three-fourths of the time in his home church of which he is an elder.

Now those brethren who contend against these new doctrines and this looseness in discipline which are springing up on every hand, are trouble-makers—"sons of Zeruliah", says our eastern publisher. But such talk is not new. The wicked old Ahab, sounded the same note in his accusation against the old prophet Elijah, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" But the answer of the old prophet came strong and bold, "I have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and has followed Baalim." So today. Many are still contending for the principles advocated by the Review fifteen years ago, and the trouble is not caused by them but by those who have left the teaching of the New Testament and that of the brotherhood then. The writer must have been looking in a mirror when he wrote his "sons of Zeruliah" Notes in defense of his endorsement of the new departures. Paul still says, "mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine you have learned, and avoid them."

Now let us see what this new doctrine of endorsement means. About twenty years ago a certain writer in the Review advocated certain loose ideas of Christian union—talked about the good lives of many in the denominations, etc., like our eastern publisher today—and of course he was shut out of the Review. The Leader gladly took him up, but he soon became too broad for them. Then he worked with the Christian Church. But a Christian Church preacher a few days ago spoke about this writer's preaching with robes on, etc., and said he would not endorse him. A Christian Church preacher in Ohio told me about a year ago, that that preacher and writer had made application to the Ohio Christian Missionary Society to work with it. He has worked even with the sects. This same preacher has several times visited a certain church where he used to hold membership, and it has ignored him, but recently when he visited it again, our eastern publisher called on him to preach, which he did. Another preacher in the church (and it was not I) told that publisher in substance that if that church was going to endorse such preachers he would take his membership out of it! Well, indeed, may be ask, "Where are we?"

Our publisher wishes us to understand that his looseness of fellowship does not extend to the Bible college people. But why not? Art not many of the Bible college preachers "men whose lives are above reproach, men whose first and second principles and third are sound and who have the welfare of the Church at heart; men who perhaps taught things we'd not subscribe to."

Several of the writers of the western paper take this view of the Bible college people, and even work confusion to carry it through; and the eastern paper is now in fellowship with them.

Does this endorsement of division and offenses contrary to the doctrine we have learned, make for peace? The wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable.

The teaching of the New Testament on mutual edification is plain to those who wish to learn the truth. Elders

were to be "apt to teach." What for, if they were not to teach? Paul told the Ephesian elders in Acts 20, to "feed the church of God." He also commanded them to "oversee" it, the very word "bishop" meaning "overseer." This means in part, that these elders will look to the future of the church and try to prepare men for future eldership and for work in general. They will, then, develop the talent in the church. 1 Cor. 14 chapter, shows that different ones took part in the public service when the whole church was gathered together, and Paul writes to the brethren in general and commands them to "edify one another." Then in addition to this, we learn that when Paul incidentally stopped at Troas, he preached to the disciples. Here is a threefold method of instructing the church—by the elders, by other members under them, by a preacher who incidentally stops. The ideal human organization is one which can support itself within itself, and can reach out and establish other such organizations, if that is desirable. So with the church. The ideal church is the one which can support itself within itself, and can then reach out and establish other churches. Mutual edification of the right kind is at the foundation of real missionary work.

The hecklers of mutual edification would have you think that we believe in putting forth the worst talent in the church when the whole church is gathered together. Well, it may be necessary to develop talent Sunday morning if it is done at all, for there are many small churches that do not have meeting any other time. It is for the benefit of many of these churches that I have written as I have on mutual teaching. They must be taught to make their meetings more edifying. I have said much about a preacher's visiting a place like that and staying several days a month and trying to help them develop themselves so that, as Bro. Morris said, thirty years ago, they may have intensely interesting meetings among themselves.

But if this wail for "best talent" always had been carried out in the past, would we have had any preachers or elders today? When Morris, the Settles, the Sommers, Piety and others started out, were they the best talent in the audience? In practically all our first efforts were there not elders and possibly older preachers and others who bore with our childish efforts, as we tried to think on our feet, staring into faces that frightened us? If this cry for best talent always, had been carried out always in the past, we would today have few preachers and elders. Does it make for peace to tear down principles of the New Testament and which we taught and practised ourselves for years, and to which we owe our very usefulness as public servants of the church?

Our eastern publisher recently visited some churches in Brown county and found them decadent, because, he said they had not had enough preaching, and he vowed that they should have more preaching, etc. That is fine, now we wish to see how it is all done. Who is going to support the families of the preachers as they go to these poor churches and try to build them up? "Who goeth a warfare at his own charge?" It is easy to sling out some fine words, but it is quite a different

proposition to get down to business to do something. If they would take some of that three-fourths preaching (about) which they have in the church of which he is an elder and put it out there, possibly more could be done. And one of the chief purposes of the mutual edification which I have been advocating so strongly for twenty years, has been to develop churches so that the preachers would not be needed with the larger churches, and could be sent out by these churches to such weak places as in Brown county. But no one has done more to hinder such work than this publisher.

In their endeavor to overthrow mutual edification and to establish, in substance the all-time preaching system Sunday mornings, the plea is now put forth that we should "do our best to make our Lord's day morning meetings instructive to the world." And our Indiana publisher quotes the following from 1 Cor. 14 to prove it:

"Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not; but prophesying serveth not for them that believe not, but for them which believe. If therefore the whole church become together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad? But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all: and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth."

To this I add the next verse, "How it is then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying."

Let the reader peruse 1 Cor. 12-14 closely and get the subject. The passages quoted show that tongues specially were intended for unbelievers, and prophesying for believers. The whole burden of Paul's instructions in these three chapters is to show them that tongues (which were for unbelievers) should be thrown into the background unless there was an interpreter, and that prophesying (which was for believers) was to have the pre-eminence. Therefore, these meetings were specially "for them which believe." Yet tongues may be helpful for believers, and prophesying may be helpful for unbelievers, but it is incidental. A preacher today may discourse to Christians on Christian duty, and an outsider there may be touched by the talk on the purity of the life we are to live, and be won to Christ, but that is evidently incidental. A church may have mutual teaching, and the earnestness of the speakers, together with what they say, may win people to Christ. The disciples at Troas came together TO break bread, not convert the world; and Paul preached "UNTO THEM" not the world, our eastern publisher to the contrary notwithstanding. There might have been outsiders there, and they might have been convinced, but nothing is said about such; and even if such were true it would have been incidental.

The brethren in this religious movement of which we are a part have always believed that the meetings Lord's day mornings are for Christians, and

nearly every preacher directs his discourse to them. This is evidently the teaching of the New Testament, as we have seen. But "in the latter times some shall depart from the faith" and try to overthrow this that they may make way for their all-time preaching system. Yet our critic says he is not "slipping".

The passages quoted above by him show the very thing I have been contending for—that SEVERAL took part in the meetings "when the whole church was gathered together." This one-man preaching system should be only incidental, as Paul at Troas, if we wish to be apostolic.

This Indiana publisher has written dozens of columns trying to overthrow this doctrine of the New Testament, has ridiculed it, and slurred it; yet he has never written a paragraph encouraging churches to do more of it, though it is a foundation stone in true missionary work, as it makes the churches self-sustaining so that they can send their preachers into new and weak fields. Is all this following the things which make for peace and all things whereby one may edify another?

In my last M. C. I said this, "The Sunday night meetings are supposed to be evangelistic meetings to convert the world." And the same scribe writes several Notes on the Book of Suppositions. Why did I say "supposed"? Because many times there are no outsiders there, and brethren turn such meetings into development meetings for Christians. He tried to confuse the mind of the reader by saying that the meeting at Troas was at night, when we showed clearly that we were talking of the meeting when the disciples assemble to break bread. All he says about "the book of Suppositions" is without point so far as my writings are concerned. It is such wresting of language that is helping to keep disciples divided. It shows that he is looking for something to criticize. Is such carping criticisms a following after things that make for peace?

The same critic misrepresents brethren in this Note when he says he is enumerating some "heresies":

1. That 1 Tim. 5:19 is scripture authority for calling a number of preachers together to try elders, and to create the general confusion that has followed that practise.
2. Obey elders, right or wrong.
3. Evangelists are officers in the Church.
4. Evangelists are in charge of congregations they are called to hold meetings for. (This hasn't been preached yet, but it is coming.)
5. Denying the efficacy of preaching.
6. Evangelists are not subject to discipline.

Now let us notice some of these. 1. We have discussed this one. 2. The practical teaching of the western paper has been to obey the elders right or wrong, and the publisher of the eastern paper has now endorsed it in its work and labor of —! 3. It's a quibble about words to talk of evangelists as "officers" in the church. 4. This critic can't find enough "heresies" to make his point stand out, so he supposes one—he turns to his "Book of Suppositions" which he admitted he often referred to when he was out of the way. 5. Who denies the "efficacy" "power" of preaching? I know I don't, and I never heard of anybody that did. This is another misrepresentation. But I do deny that it is scriptural for a church with elders to

import a preacher or preachers to discourse each Lord's day. 6. I never heard of any one saying an evangelist was not subject to discipline.

There is about as much misrepresentation in this paragraph as one could find in the same space. Yet this is the scribe who would tell us just how things are to be done. Is he following after things which make for peace by such misrepresentation?

When a preacher delivers a series of discourses without specifically hitting any error, this same scribe eulogizes his affirmative preacher by saying that he preached the affirmative so strong that he didn't need to preach the negative. Old Paul didn't know very much when he told Timothy to reprove and rebuke, as well as preach and exhort! Is it following things which make for peace, when one thus discards the word of God.

To try to allay fears against the charge of softening, he calls the attention of his readers to some strong articles in his paper; yet he does not tell what a fight has been made in the past that some of those strong articles might get to the people. A few years ago a brother was writing on "Letters to Christians", and when I defended them this same publisher used very uncomplimentary words to me about his articles. Some words of commendation of those "Letters" by me were thrown out of his paper, and that is one reason I quit writing for it. If the Church is to be saved today, it will only be by the strongest kind of preaching; and when a publisher merely tolerates such strong writings just for sub purposes and to allay suspicion, and then often taking a dig at them, it is certainly not following after things which make for peace.

There are brethren who are fighting strongly for what the Review used to contend for, and the same scribe often takes a thrust at them. In fact, he fights these worse than almost any one else. They are living monuments of the apostasy that is now going on.

His paper urges brethren to report their Good News in its columns, then if they criticize it or will not fall all over themselves to get subs for it, they are using the paper "to advertise themselves" but are very ungrateful. They wish to bind us hand and foot so that we will not show the drift of conditions in the brotherhood.

The office editor says, "Our modern 'Macedonian Call' should read this way, 'Come over into Macedonia and help us start a journal to down the Review.'" Well, when a paper leaves the principles it once fought for, some one should call the attention of the brotherhood to it. They don't like the little Macedonian Call. But it will continue to cry out and spare not as long as there are people who still hold to the New Testament principles and to the principles for which the Apostolic Review used to contend with clearness. And when an office editor who has not attended church services Sunday mornings a dozen times a year in ten years, is permitted to thrust at brethren simply because they insist on the things for which the Review used to contend, then it is time for brethren to sit up and take notice to the changes going on.

The columns of this old paper are again opened for a thrust at the Mace-

donian Call, from Somerset, Pa. If this little sheet makes any statements which are not true, we are glad for brethren to call attention to it, and we shall make corrections. The brother thinks the "finger of suspicion" has been wrongly pointed at a certain preacher, and he exhorts the readers to "pay more attention to what God says and less attention to what some men have to say." That is the very point in the whole matter. God says, "Preach the word, reprove, rebuke, exhort." Now is a man an apostolic preacher who can hold a meeting over three Lord's days for a church of 150 members, in these days of worldliness, and never say anything against the dance, card party, picture show, etc.? Is he an apostolic preacher when he goes back the next year and does not preach on those things till near the end of the meeting when a brother warns him that there will be criticisms unless he does? Is a preacher following Paul's instructions when he preaches the affirmative so strong that he does not need to preach the negative, as our eastern publisher expresses it, though Paul says to "reprove and rebuke"? That's right, my brother, when men and papers change by leaving the Word of God; then we should pay little attention to them. If we have made some men stronger by criticisms, then we have done some good; but we need to watch these people who are strong through policy.

The brother speaks of his meeting and says that he had "looked forward to this three years." Possibly he would not have had to wait so long, if the preacher had not taken on so many new meetings in that time with large and influential churches. When little churches have to wait from three to five years for a meeting, yet a big church can generally get another meeting the next year, and often the third year in succession—is there no ground for "suspicion"? Did Paul look out the fat places, and put the small ones into the background? Possibly I am wrong, but the reader can judge.

Maybe the brother from Somerset doesn't like the M. C. as it strikes his practice in part. It is strong against the one-man preacher pastor system, and he has been preaching practically all the time at one place for five or ten years. But I have tried in my mind to apologize for his work, as the church is small and the field is hard, and there are few there who can be developed.

And now, brethren, as we take a general survey of the field, we should not feel that some strange thing had happened unto us if some depart from the faith, for apostasies have been in nearly all ages of the world. Martin Luther said that one generation is about as long as a reformation lasts. In all ages when God's people increased in numbers and wealth, they began to wander away from him, and that seems to be the case now in the Church of Christ.

Brethren, you may think I enjoy the kind of writing and preaching I am doing, but I assure you I do not. I should rather sit down quietly and think that all is well. But how can one truthfully say that with an open Bible before him and a knowledge of conditions as they are? The sooner brethren get out of their minds the idea that we are living in the days of Solomon, and learn that we are living in the days of the prophets, the sooner we shall be able to do something

worth while for the Lord. Read Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, and so on through practically all the prophets, and you will see that nearly all their writings are negative and denunciatory of the sins of the people. I do not believe that any other kind of preaching will save the Church today, and possibly that will not save more than a remnant. See how the prophets were mistreated by the people then, and you have an idea of what the true preachers of the gospel may expect from the apostates today. But we can not waver. If Paul found it necessary for three years to cease not to warn the disciples at Ephesus night and day with tears, surely gospel preachers today will find it necessary to do the same. Let us be sure that we do our part.

I am glad to report that in one way I am more encouraged to go on than I have been in five years. Although I expect to see most of the big churches fall in with the one-man preacher pastor system, as they are now doing, and not stop there but go onward toward the Christian Church and the world; yet there is a remnant which is awakening, and it will come out purified with fire. This remnant is in the smaller churches, and to them we look for real advancement of the kingdom in the future.

So, brethren, the Macedonian Call stands for peace according to the principle—"first pure, then peaceable." I preach the same old doctrines I have always preached. I do not believe that the writing of foolishness and pathos will keep the old ship of Zion off the rocks. Nor do I believe that deciding important questions "in an instant," "in a flash," will bring peace to the Church of God. We need men and women who have the courage to come out clearly and let the brotherhood know where they stand. Send us names of brethren who need to read this sheet, and remember, too, that the paper is free but we are depending on your donations to keep it going.

"Watch thou in all things."

"By the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears."—Paul.

"Not every one that saith, Lord, Lord; shall enter the kingdom of heaven."—Jesus.

What the Prophet Amos Thinks of our Luxuries and Indifference.—

"Woe to them that are at ease in Zion, and trust in the mountain of Samaria, which are named chief of the nations, to whom the house of Israel came! * * * Ye that put far away the evil day, and cause the seat of violence to come near; that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; that chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music, like David: that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments—but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph. Therefore now shall they go captive with the first that go captive, and the banquet of them that stretched themselves shall be removed. The Lord God hath sworn by himself, saith the Lord God of hosts, I abhor the excellency of Jacob, and hate his palaces; therefore will I deliver up the city with all that is therein." (Amos 6).