

# MACEDONIAN CALL

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

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., 918 CONGRESS AVE, APRIL, 1931

## What "The Western Movement" Means To The Church

### Some Fruit Gives An Idea Of The Tree

—In a western state a certain preacher of a prominent church of Christ wished to preach all the time for it instead of simply half the time. Quite a number in the congregation were opposed to it. Getting into the favor of a couple of old elders in their dotage, he pushed his plans through, divided the church (largely over that), and settled down to become pastor all the time. There are now two churches of Christ in that city.

A few weeks ago I received the following from a brother: "Strange things are happening among some of the — so-called churches of Christ. —, at one time preaching at —, took up the work at —. Because he was asked to resign, he left the — place of meeting, taking with him a part of the congregation. They met in a hall, and then built a meeting-house on — Street. He labored there for a year or two."

In another large congregation, an eloquent preacher was running the whole church, to the chagrin of one of the elders, who was also himself a local preacher. The elder opposed so much preaching; but in a business meeting, the eloquent preacher read the first chapter of Acts where they cast lots for an apostle, and said that was voting, and called on all those who wished to relieve this elder of his office, to raise their hands. Suffice it to say that this elder, before he had time to say "scat," was sitting out by himself.

Such is some of the fruit in some of the churches of Christ, of this all-time preaching system by men brought in for that purpose. Within a stone's throw of where I am writing this, a Baptist church was divided several years ago, because some of the members wished him to resign. The same spirit is manifested in many places among digressive churches.

"The Western Movement."—Out in California began a movement to establish this all-time preaching system among churches of Christ. The trouble in part is expressed by the sign at the meeting house door where the movement started: "Preaching Each Lord's Day. — Minister." This contains the gist of the newest digression among the churches of Christ. It is not only contrary to the teachings of the fathers of

the Current Restoration of the Gospel, but I believe I can show that it is contrary to the New Testament. It is marvelous that we have to fight this question out again, when it was fought out once or twice before in the past hundred years in this same religious body.

Let us specify where the writers of the California paper stand, and we can see what they believe. Yadon was for several years a strong helper of the People's Bible Advocate, and he preached all the time at Winfield, Kans., through several years, then went full-fledged over to the Bible college people, and the last I heard of him was pastoring in California. Vernie Love has taken his place at Winfield, and is preaching there all the time. A. R. Kepple preaches all the time wherever he may. In three private letters to me Stephen Settle does not intimate that he does not endorse this system, but shows that he upholds it, especially by his statement, "I have never read nor heard anything that even looks to me like an argument against any amount of preaching at any given place, even if there are elders there." A. M. Morris, the editor of the Advocate, says in his paper of January 1, "The great preachers of the last three-quarters of a century, laboring unselfishly and nobly for a restoration of the apostolic church, had no scruples in preaching regularly for congregations, monthly, semi-monthly, or WEEKLY, and all the while, they opposed the one-man pastor system." Of the historical truth of this statement I shall speak later, but he produces it to prove his position of all-time preaching at a place by one man. S. W. Settle preached all the time for a couple or three years at Long Beach, and gave way for Wm. Whaley for a couple of years. Verna Gilbert is preaching all the time at Wenatchee, Wash. When Allen Peeler in Idaho heard he was going there, he wrote that he wished he would help him establish a church in Idaho, and Gilbert about promised; but when Gilbert got settled at Wenatchee, he wrote Peeler that there was a good church at Wenatchee, and the thing for him to do was to move his family to Wenatchee! J. C. Bunn told me that he endorsed the all-time preaching. J. J. Hogan preached nearly every Sunday

and night at Santa Cruz for several years. Wm. Reedy preached about a decade at one place in Long Beach, and has preached about half that length of time at one place in Los Angeles. Of course, some of these preachers run out and hold a meeting or two a year at some other place, as some of the Christian Church pastors do. That is fine—it makes a good vacation! This list includes practically every writer for the People's Bible Advocate. Brethren, if you wish this system worked up, you can accomplish that by sending for these men and pushing this paper.

Now some people don't like this thing of mentioning names, but I see nothing out of place in it. If I have misstated anything, let me know and I will gladly correct it. I am glad for people to know just where I stand on controverted questions; and if any are opposed to such publicity, it shows that they are sneaks and they ought to be exposed.

In the last Macedonian Call, I asked several of these preachers to affirm their practice as found in the following words: **Preaching every Lord's Day morning and night in a church with elders, by a preacher brought in for that purpose—is scriptural.** I deny that such is scriptural; and of those I challenged to affirm it, only Stephen Settle has noticed it, and he declines to discuss the question. If I were seeking popularity regardless of truth, possibly I too would let this proposition alone.

Paul wrote to the brethren at different places to edify one another, and in 1 Corinthians, 14th chapter, he shows that different brethren took part in the meeting when the whole church was gathered together. And other scriptures, also, which will be brought up in the course of this discussion, show that this all-time preaching system as described in our proposition is not scriptural.

A. M. Morris Speaks on the Subject.—In his "People's Bible Advocate," of Jan. 1, 1931, he says: "Some very serious mistakes are made in interpretation of the scriptures by failure to distinguish things that differ. A regular preacher, who does not rule, is not a pastor. Elders are pastors because they are the rulers in the congregations." (Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 3:4-5, 5:17; Heb.

## 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.

13:7-17.) Failure to make the distinction between rulers and teachers leads to confusion. Paul could live and labor with Barnabas and others a whole year, assemble with the church and teach much people, and the disciples be first called Christians in that congregation. (11:26.) He spent eighteen months in Corinth. (Acts 18:11.) And three years in Ephesus. (Acts 20:31.) He is a worthy example. He labored night and day, regularly, as you see. And there were elders there, too."

Notice that Bro. Morris says, and he emphasizes it, too: "Elders are pastors because they are rulers in the congregations." Now I deny that such is the case. But I affirm that elders are pastors because there are permanent feeders in the congregations.

When one reads the New Testament, he finds that the public leaders of the Church overlap somewhat in their work, but certain names are given leaders to bring out particular ideas of their work. Paul was an apostle, but he also says of the Gospel, "Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles." (2 Tim. 1:11.) He was a preacher because he heralded the Gospel of Christ, he was an apostle because he was sent from Christ, and he was a teacher when that was the main thing he was doing. And yet he taught when he was a herald, and when he was an apostle, just the same as when he was a "teacher." The prophets were so called in the apostolic church, because they spake by divine inspiration, especially foretelling future events, and yet they were teachers at the same time. The bishops of the churches were so-called because the word means "overseer," and yet these bishops must be "apt to teach." The bishops were also pastors, because they were feeders, for the word "pastor" means "shepherd," "feeder." The Greek word translated "pastors" in Ephesians 4:11, is translated "feed" in the verb form in Acts 20:28, and 1 Peter 5:2, in both of which instances the writers are talking of elders feeding the flocks of God. Therefore when Bro. Morris says "elders are pastors because they are rulers," he has the Greek against him. They are pastors, shepherds, because they are feeders, and they feed by teaching. What idea of ruling there may be in the word comes through feeding, teaching. And thus when a preacher does practically all the teaching in a congregation, he is the feeder, the pastor, for it is by teaching chiefly that people are led.

I am sorry that Bro. Morris does not understand the Greek so that he would not have made the blunder that he has with its evil consequences. But if he will look up the etymology in an unabridged dictionary he will find that the root word for "pastor" means "feed." Any of our readers can do that, and thus satisfy their own minds.

Two out of four of the scriptures which Bro. Morris adduces to prove that "elders are pastors because they are rulers in the congregations," prove the opposite largely; and the other two do not prove that "elders are pastors because they are rulers"—they do not even contain the word "pastor". Here is one of his proof-texts: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God." (Acts 20:28.) The word "Overseer" is the same Greek word which is translated "bishop" elsewhere, and "to feed" seems to be in apposition with it—that is, in explanation of it. In other words, it seems that this overseeing, which would include ruling, is done by feeding, teaching. Paul did not say to turn this feeding over to some one else to do all the time. And if all the teaching is turned over to some one else, that one is practically the "overseer" of the church, for how else does an elder lead a church if he doesn't do it by teaching it?

Here is another of his proof-texts: "Bishop . . . one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)" (1 Tim. 3:4, 5.) Does not a man rule his children largely by teaching them? Let a man turn the teaching of his children over to ungodly school teachers, or ruffians on the streets, and see what little his rule means to that child. One thing wrong in the nation today is that rule in home and state has broken down because the proper teaching has broken down. And when elders turn practically all the teaching of the church into the hands of a preacher, they are turning practically the whole means of ruling that church into his hands.

Now I will add a scripture which Bro. Morris forgot: "Elders . . . feed the flock of God, taking the oversight thereof." (1 Peter 5:2.) The word translated "feed" here is the same root which is translated "pastors" in Ephesians 4:11, and "feed" in Acts 20:28, where Paul is telling the elders what to do to their flock. The expression above, "taking the oversight thereof" seems to be in apposition with "feed the flock of God," thus showing how they were practically the same.

Many elders are saying, "We haven't time to do all the private visiting and talking to members that should be done; and we haven't time to prepare for public work: therefore we will rule and let the preacher do that." That is merely saying they haven't time to do the work for which they were appointed. So these all-time preachers do nearly all the public teaching of the church, and they spend time going from house to house, talking and instructing members privately. And when they do this week after week, and month after month, and year after year (oftentimes), they are permanent feeders of the church; and as a feeder is a pastor, they are permanent pastors of the church. He that denies this denies reason and revelation. Of course, right now while these things are under scrutiny, all-time preachers may work somewhat under the elders; but all history is against a continuance in that submission. Examples at the beginning of this article show that, and the whole Christian Church does too. All history and reason show that permanent teachers in any organization become the per-

manent rulers, present blindness among some disciples to the contrary notwithstanding.

Bro. Morris Vainly Appeals to Scriptures.—In his January Number, he continues: "Paul could live and labor with Barnabas and others a whole year, assemble with the church and teach much people, and the disciples be first called Christians in that congregation. (11:26.) He spent eighteen months at Corinth. (Acts 18:11.) And three years in Ephesus. (Acts 20:31.) He is a worthy example. He labored night and day, regularly as you see. And there were elders there, too. I shall ever think any interpretation of a preacher's duty which conflicts with this inspired example is erroneous."

Now let us get just what we are talking about. Is it the time a preacher is living in a city. No, no NO. Is it the amount of preaching and teaching done in a city to establish a new church or get it on a working basis? No, no, NO. And yet that is all Bro. Morris' references prove, regarding Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus. Antioch was the first church that was a mixture of Jews and Gentiles, and the amalgamation caused confusion there. That was where Paul rebuked Peter for acting the hypocrite on the subject. It was necessary that there be much teaching there in that new place. There is no evidence that the church there had been set in order with elders and deacons. A little later it was said, "There were in the church that was in Antioch certain prophets and teachers" (five are mentioned by name, Acts 13:1). Now where in the world does Bro. Morris get authority for a one-man teaching system in the two most important meetings of a church with elders (who are commanded to "feed"), out of an example of a new church two or three years old with at least five inspired (or at least very prominent) teachers and with no evidence yet that elders had been appointed? I am condemning a one-man permanent teaching system outside the eldership in an old church, and not a five-man temporary teaching system in a new church.

Bro. Morris can get no more justifiable consolation from Paul's stay of a year and six months at Corinth, for Paul was in the work of establishing that church. This "example" has absolutely nothing to do with this discussion, for we are not talking about the establishing of a new church but about old churches with elders (who are commanded to feed the church), calling in one man to do nearly all the feeding in that church. You would think that this reputedly-great Bible student could get better argument than that for this new apostasy.

Ephesus is the brother's strongest "example," because Paul was there three years. But, behold, this also was a NEW place, and would be no "example" at all for old churches; for starting with practically no disciples, in three years Demetrius the silver smith could say, "Not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people." (Acts 19:26.) So his time was spent largely converting outsiders and confirming new converts. What authority is there in that for a preacher's discouraging twice a week nearly altogether to old members in an old church where

they have elders who were ordained for the purpose of "feeding the flock!"

And Bro. Morris says, "And there were elders there, too," in this period. Now I should like for this professedly-great Bible teacher, who claims to have taught twenty-five Bible readings, to please point me to the scripture which shows that there were elders there through the three years Paul was at Ephesus, and that Paul preached there every Lord's day morning and night. Now, brethren, we are getting down to business. It is up to him to show this, or withdraw his statement and misrepresentation of the facts in Holy Writ. There were elders there afterwards, and when Paul left them he told them to "feed the church of God," (Acts 20:28), but he did not tell them to send for some preacher to come and feed them in the two most important weekly meetings of the church. Bro. Morris can not prove there were elders in the church through the three years when Paul worked there; and even if he could it wouldn't mean anything for the system he is defending, for Paul had the care of all the churches then much as he is now guiding the churches through his inspired words. So the brother's so-called "examples" vanish into thin air.

Bro. Morris Misrepresents "Great Preachers" of this Religious Movement.—The brother says, "The great preachers of the last three-quarters of a century, laboring unselfishly and nobly for a restoration of the apostolic church, had no scruples in preaching regularly for congregations, monthly, semi-monthly, or WEEKLY, and, all the while, they opposed the one-man-pastor system." (His paper, January 1.)

Notice, reader, that Bro. Morris refers you to the "last three-quarters of a century." Doesn't he know that this religious movement has been going on through an entire century? Why didn't he include the first generation of the movement? I will tell you why. Because Alexander Campbell and the men of the first generation stood where I stand on this question and against Morris! Joseph Franklin, the son of Benjamin Franklin, that great preacher and founder of the Review said of that first quarter-century, "Samuel Rogers in the Deer Creek Church, had nearly the whole congregation at work at the first, and developed eight preachers out of their number. THE SAME IS TRUE OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES. The lapse was in the SECOND GENERATION. The recovery is a thing of the future." (Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin, p. 74.) So Morris does not go to the first generation of this movement to get proof for his all-time preaching system, but to the second and succeeding generations, to the period of "LAPSE" (apostasy) as the historian puts it. This shows where this western movement stands.

Notice, again, that Bro. Morris says "the great preachers" of the last three-quarters of a century endorsed "weekly" preaching at one place by a man. The word "the" includes them all. Now I deny this. David Lipscomb was no doubt the greatest preacher in the south for half a century, and he stood practically where I stand. And J. A. Harding, who came close behind him in prominence in the South, endorsed the position I advocate. And A. M. Morris himself endorsed it thirty years ago. Read the statements from Morris, Harding, Lips-

comb and Campbell in my number of the Macedonian Call, on "How the Pope Got Started." If you don't have a copy, send to me for one.

Possibly Bro. Morris is now thinking of what Joseph Franklin said of Benjamin Franklin, so I quote it: "He [B. F.] did not regard an engagement between a church and a preacher for preaching once a month, or twice a month, or every Lord's day, as necessarily involving the exercise of the pastoral function. [There seemed to have been some doubt and discussion on the subject.—D. A. S.] He made such engagements himself as late as 1854. To the last year of his life he heartily cooperated with the church at Anderson, Ind., where he then held membership, in securing the regular services of a preacher. But he held that the preacher had no executive authority; that, on the contrary, the executive authority was lodged in the bishops or elders, of the church. The preacher, he maintained, did not 'have charge of the church,' but that the church had charge of him." (But what Franklin "held" on that subject didn't "hold" long with other preachers, for now in practically all those Christian churches the preachers DO HAVE CHARGE nearly altogether.—D. A. S.)

Benjamin Franklin fell in with the societies at first, but saw his error in time to throw his influence against them. He also fell in with the all-time preaching system but saw the dangers of it too late to throw his influence against it. With the establishment of the Christian Standard, his influence in the brotherhood waned, and when his home church selected preachers, he evidently saw that about the only thing he could do was to help select as good a man as possible. Read closely the history in the following paragraphs.

Events in the First Quarter of a Century in the Current Restoration, which Morris Shrewdly Evades.—Here are events preceding the quotation above concerning Benjamin Franklin. "Very gradually, but very steadily, the churches learned to rely on these monthly visits for their spiritual edification. Very gradually, and very steadily, they learned to feel more interest in these monthly meetings than in the acts of devotion and worship which might be observed on any Lord's day. Very gradually, the preachers left off their efforts to develop the talent in the churches to which they ministered, and finally adopted the habit of merely delivering their three sermons and then going home. \* \* \* A more difficult and delicate work does not appertain to the edification of churches, than that of teaching them how to hold profitable meetings among themselves—how to edify one another."

"In the early day of which we are now writing [it was the second generation—D. A. S.] the preachers understood full well how to convert sinners. They were adepts in the art of controverting sectarianism, and were never better pleased than when engaged in a contest on sectarian creeds and names, on baptism or Universalism. But they were not so apt in the edification of saints, and especially in showing the disciples how to edify themselves. A generation has not greatly improved the ministry in this respect. This remark, however, does not apply to the earliest preachers of the Reformation. We have already seen that Samuel Rogers, in the Deer Creek church, had nearly the whole congrega-

tion at work at the first, and developed eight preachers out of their number. The same was true of his contemporaries. THE LAPSE WAS IN THE SECOND GENERATION. The recovery is a thing of the future.

"Benjamin Franklin saw this error of the past before he died, and frequently expressed his regret that he had not come to see the matter in a clearer light thirty years ago, in time to have given his influence to remedy the evil. In his last days he was of the opinion that the instructions of Paul to the church in Corinth (1 Cor. 11th to 14th chapters, inclusive), had been greatly undervalued, and that neglect of that instruction, and the routine work of monthly appointments, had together laid the foundation upon which the pastoral system has been built. He regarded the 'pastorate' as an unscriptural office, and constantly made war upon it."—Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin, pp. 73-75.

"Arguments" for this All-Time Preaching System.—Some say, "Preaching is a divine ordinance"—yes, and so is teaching by an eldership. You can't drive one divine ordinance practically out of existence by another. Says another person, "There is no limit to a man's preaching." Yes there is. When it interferes with the feeding by elders, and the edification by other members, it is limited. "But look at the success we are having." So spake the pastors of the Christian Church forty or fifty years ago, and look at that system now. Briney in his debate with Otey, held up a map of the many foreign missions and boasted of them; but see what a mess all that is in now. A fat man is generally a weak man, and a fat church is generally a weak one. "Don't fool yourself" by numbers, brethren. The devil has caught many a Christian (?) by that bait.

Morris' distinction between the all-time preaching system and the pastorate was made by some brethren fifty years ago in the days of apostasy among us, but there is no such distinction now among the digressives of the Christian Church—the pastor is the directing hand. They have tried the same among the college brethren, and their preachers, in general, run things as they do in the Christian Church. Different sectarian denominations have tried the same thing with as little success. Unless Bro. Morris is wiser and more powerful than the great men of these movements which have failed, his group of followers will be doing the same thing in a very short while—running the whole thing.

Now while we are reasoning for a strong eldership to feed and watch the church of God, we are not trying to establish one which lords it over God's heritage, for Peter condemns this in 1 Peter 5:3. Elders who do not take at least well informed brethren into their confidence, and do not get the wisdom of the church on important matters, will sooner or latter get into trouble with that congregation.

What "the Western Movement" Means.—"The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2:2.) But what's the use of developing teachers if a preacher discourses every Sunday morning and night, possibly taking charge of the prayer meeting, and doing the private visiting and teaching?

Paul and Silas "ordained elders in every church" (Acts 14:28). But why did they not also appoint a preacher to do three-fourths of the teaching, or practically all of it?

Paul says that a bishop must be "apt to teach" (1 Tim. 3:2); but why be so particular when the bishop does almost no teaching where a preacher takes all the time Lord's day morning and night?

Why must an elder be "able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the ganisayers," (Titus 1:9) when you hire the preacher to do that?

New Testament elders were to "feed the flock of God," and other brethren were to "edify one another," of which they can do very little when a preacher discourses every Sunday morning and night.

Paul commanded the Ephesian elders to "feed the church of God" (Acts 20:28), but he did not command them to send for a preacher to come and do that for them since they themselves were too busy making money or attending to pleasures to do it.

Thus does the western movement make void the Word of God by its opinions and practices.

Strive as it may it can not keep the all-time preacher from becoming the all-time ruler. All the history of the past is against Morris and the group of preachers gathered around him and his paper. And remember—when you leave the Word of God in this one point you have opened the flood gate for many other evils to flow in. Don't flatter yourselves that you will stop with this one step of digression. These self-seeking preachers will creep into houses and will carry the church whithersoever many of them would rather not go. Bro. Morris is helping bind upon the church shackles which will grow tighter and bigger long after his body is molding in the ground. Those who would keep from being bound must keep themselves out of the influence of such doctrines. And if you endorse the warnings in this tract, see that many others receive it, and remember that our little sheet keeps going only through the support of earnest Christians who send us help. This will go to about a thousand leading brethren and sisters. My work is donated—help pay for the printing and postage. Send us names for our mailing list.

#### "MONTHLY PREACHING"

D. A. Sommer Not Against Monthly Preaching.—"That's strange; I have always heard that he was; it has been reported all over the country that he is; there must be a mistake somewhere." Well, he is not; and I think I know better than any one else. "Who is it, then, who makes those false statements about his position?" It is people who do not read closely what he says or who wish to misrepresent him. If you take the connection of his statements, you will see that he has not opposed it. "Well, there is something here that I do not understand. Has he never said anything which might be misunderstood?" This is what he has opposed: MERE MONTHLY PREACHING. Do you get that? And he challenges any one to show otherwise. He has opposed a preacher's year after year going to an appointment on the last train Saturday night and leaving on the first train Monday morning (now it is go early Sunday

morning and leave that night), and doing nothing to develop public talent for the church.

A few months ago, a preacher went into a tearful strain in the Review as he told the brethren that he championed the cause of the monthly preacher. He misrepresented the question, just as so many others are misrepresenting it. I should like to see him affirm the following proposition:

**MERE monthly preaching year after year by a preacher brought in for that purpose, who makes no effort to develop teachers in the church—is in harmony with the Scriptures.**

That's what we are talking about, brethren. I deny that such practice is scriptural, and history shows that it is followed by great evils to the church. Paul told Timothy, a preacher, to commit what he knew "to faithful men who shall be able to teach others." (2 Tim. 2:2.) Mere monthly preaching does not do that.

I know a mere monthly preacher who for a good while went to an appointment on Saturday, with no preaching or anything else that night, and the church had to hurry through its Lord's day morning services, so that he could catch the train back home (no meeting Sunday night), so that he could get to his work. I believe such work did that church far more harm than good. The same preacher in his home church seldom goes to services Sunday night or Thursday night, unless he preaches. Do you think such a man is much of a Christian, saying nothing about being an example to the flock? I think he is a hireling, or one trying to exalt himself, or both. There are many churches which have had mere monthly preaching for years, and they are no better prepared to have interesting social meetings among themselves than when they commenced such preaching. Such procedure saps the church, but gives it little or no real strength in return. Members must be put to work if a church is to grow.

"In his (Benjamin Franklin's) last days he was of the opinion that the instructions of Paul to the church in Corinth (1 Cor. 12 to 14th chapters, inclusive), HAD BEEN GREATLY UNDERVALUED, and that NEGLECT of that instruction, and the routine work of monthly appointments, had together laid the foundation upon which the pastoral system had been built."

The Macedonian Call is trying to carry out dying wish of this great preacher, and founder of the Review, for we believe it is in harmony with the New Testament.

Why do not those who have regular appointments start in NOW to be New Testament evangelists by not only preaching to the world but by committing what they know to "faithful men who shall be able to teach others"? It is not preachers the church needs now, for we have more than the church is supporting; but we need good teachers, good elders who are "apt to teach," and who live the Christian life. Some all-time preachers at one place develop some talent, but never use it Lord's day morning or night. What's the purpose of developing this talent, if it is not to be used to release the preacher? If churches are not sufficiently interested to study with you, what's the use of wasting time with such unconverted ones if you can't convert them?

Some of these old preachers may make good elders in churches, and might receive some support, since the Scriptures talk of supporting those who labor in word and doctrine. Younger preachers can get out more in new and weak places, and the churches can and should stand behind them. The aim should be to stir every one to do his part, so that the most can be done to answer every worthy call to "come over into Macedonia and help us."

Brethren, preserve these papers; you may wish to refer to these quotations in the future.

The downfall of western civilization is foreseen by Hendrick Van Loon, noted Dutch author.

In a recent gloomy interview he compared the condition of America and Europe with that of Rome before that empire's collapse.

Boredom, he says, is the main trouble with us. Gorged with food, and with all our senses surfeited with the things the mechanical age has brought us, we have nothing to do but lead a mad dance of death while our culture crumbles, he declares.

Another terrible factor, according to Van Loon, is that we don't care, but are willing to let things go hang while we enjoy ourselves.

All of which deductions might be drawn by any intelligent person who based his idea on "civilization" by observing the tenth of a per cent of our population that idles its time away at night clubs and silly social functions.—Daily Papers.

"Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord."

Fourteen million boys in America receive no religious training, say the statistics, and no doubt there are as many girls. Can we wonder what is the matter with the country. There are no ideals raised in the minds of these future leaders in society. The home is the first and best place to raise these high ideals in children's minds. Every professed Christian father and mother who is neglecting to bring up his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is partly responsible for this failure which is making so many criminals.

A Millionaire Speaks.—"I was thirty-seven when I had my first million. My salary was the same as the President of the United States was then getting—\$50,000 a year. My first major discovery on attaining \$1,000,000 was one which I believe is made sooner or later by every wealthy person who is the least bit thoughtful. It was this: That there is a ceiling to man's primary personal needs—a point beyond which, in seeking the zenith of comfort and pleasure, the going becomes exceedingly difficult. Three meals a day, if one can enjoy that many; comfortable clothing, a comfortable house, a little leisure and entertainment between times—how surprisingly little money is needed to accomplish these! How low is the ceiling. And beyond it lie surfeit, boredom, ennui, unhappiness. Beyond it the characters of the wealthy are tested!"

Happiness is IN one, not in what one possesses. So, why toil so hard to be rich?