

MACEDONIAN CALL

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

Volume 10

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, OCTOBER, 1936

Number 10

MACEDONIAN CALL

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

Published Monthly by
D. A. SOMMER,
918 Congress Avenue,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Subscription Price, \$1.00 a Year

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

THE LIGHT AT HOME

The Light at Home! How bright it beams
When evening shades around us fall;
And from the lattice far it gleams,
To love, and rest and comfort call.
When tired with the toils of the day,
The strife for glory, gold or fame,
How sweet to seek the quiet way,
Where loving lips will hush our name,
Around the Light at Home.

When through the dark and stormy night,
The wayward wandered homeward hies,
How cheering is that twinkling light,
Which through the forest gloom he spies!
It is the light at home, he feels
That loving hearts will greet him there,
And softly through his bosom steals
That joy and love which banish care,
Around the Light at Home.

The Light at Home, when'er at last
It greets the seaman through the storm
He feels no more the chilling blast
That beats upon his manly form.
Long years upon the sea have fled
Since Mary gave the parting kiss,
But the sad tears which then she shed
Will now be paid with rapturous bliss,
Around the Light at Home.

The Light at Home! how still and sweet
It peeps from yonder cottage door
The weary laborer to greet.
When the rough toils of day are o'er,
Sad is the soul that does not know
The blessings that its beams impart,
The cheerful hopes and joys that flow,
And lighten up the heaviest heart
Around the Light at Home.

—Author Unknown.

NOURISHMENT OF THE BODY

In a previous article was shown the similarity between the body of man and that of Christ or the Church. At present we wish to study the likenesses between the mode of nourishment for the two. Since they are so much alike in their composition we would expect to find much same-

ness in the laws and requirements governing their perpetuation. In order for the human body to continue in life and strength it must be continually fed with the proper food that has been adapted to it by the Creator. Of course we would find no surprise in the fact that the being who knew so well how to form the body would know how to provide for its support since the body is more important than its meat. This much is taught us in Matt. 6:25. Be it understood that when referring to the body of man in this connection the whole of man, body, soul and spirit, is meant, considering that they must all be cared for in the systematic manner intended by the Creator.

It is required that the food given to man must be adapted to his age and that meat that would be proper for an adult would not be proper for a babe. Hence we read this from the apostle Peter: "As newborn babes desire the sincere [or pure] milk of the word." The same thought is given in Heb. 5:13, 14, which see. In view of this how unwise it would be for young disciples to begin their study of the Bible in the prophecies of either the Old or New Testament as I have known of being done. Also the folly of those preachers who will not make this distinction when planning their lessons for their audiences. Not only should above considerations be observed as to the mildness or strength of the food administered but care must also be had to see that material put into the body is of a kind that may be digested at all. If something is taken into the body that cannot be digested it will not only fail to add any strength to that body but will interfere with the effects of other food taken or even result in death. Likewise if the body of Christ attempts to take food that cannot be digested it will result very disastrously.

But even if the food taken is not as bad as here described—that while the body may be able to take care of it in the sense of passing it through the channels and expelling it from the body without any apparent evil effects, yet if it will not add nourishment to the body it should not be used. So it is with the body of Christ. What gain would be had if subject matter were undertaken that could add no strength to the cause even if a solution could be reached. Thus, why waste much time in speculation over the numberless questions that so often spring up. How did Cain get his wife? Who was Melchisedek, personally? What had the thieves stolen who were crucified with Christ? What was Paul doing in Arabia? Even if most of these questions could be answered, what benefit would it do us after we learned about it? It was with this idea in mind that Paul wrote this to Timothy: "But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes." (2 Tim. 2:23.) The word "unlearned" is from *APAIDEUTOS* and means uninstructional. Questions which even if answered correctly would not make the body of Christ stronger should be considered as useless and not given time and thought that should be

devoted to that which will benefit the hearer. To this end Paul wrote as follows in Rom. 14:19: "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another."

But this is not all that is necessary for the upbuilding of the body of Christ. Even if the food provided were the proper kind, yet unless each member of the body does its part in administering that food no satisfactory results will follow. The body of man is so constituted that every part thereof must function or the result will be the same as undernourishment. It is true we generally consider the so-called digestive organs the parts relied upon to perform this work, but there is not a member of the body that is not involved, either directly or indirectly, in the process of nourishment and building up of the body. And if some member is coming short of its part in this important work it is because it is not in harmony with the head or fundamental portion of the body. This is likewise true in the body of Christ. There are certain members thereof that are considered responsible primarily for the spiritual nourishment needed for growth and all of these are expected to work in conjunction with the head of the body which is Christ. And if some member is not keeping in proper relation to Christ the effect is to make the body undernourished. In this line of thought we find Paul in Col. 2:19 saying: "And not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." This scripture does not sound much like the doctrine that only certain members of the church are expected to edify the body.

But perhaps we may find further and more specific teaching than this if any doubt lingers as to the duty of all members to contribute to the growth of the body. In Eph. 4:16 we read: "From whom [Christ] the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which **EVERY JOINT SUPPLIETH**, according to the effectual working in the measure of **EVERY PART**, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." No conclusion was ever set forth any clearer than is here shown, that **NOT A SINGLE MEMBER OF THE BODY OR CHURCH IS EXEMPT FROM THE DUTY OF EDIFYING THAT BODY**. Of course, just as the human body has its more important (apparently) members or organs for the process of nourishment, so the church has its more outstanding members, such as the Elders, who are first responsible for the spiritual food to be given to the body and who must supervise the entire diet to be administered. But each of the other members is required to take a part in the work of edifying the body. Look at the passage just quoted once more and note the strong language of the apostle which I have copied in emphasis. "Every joint" and "every part" do not mean just certain parts with the rest left to pass the time in ease and idleness. **The church cannot grow as expected by the Founder unless this work of building up and nourishing the body is engaged in by the entire membership, subject of course to the Head and the special organs immediately connected with him in this great work.** So that we must conclude that if there is a single member of the church that is not contributing some edification to the institution, it is a useless member. If it cannot be aroused and stimulated to participate in this work it should be operated on with the spiritual surgery and removed from the body before its own decay is communicated to the other members of the body and general death occur.—E. M. Zerr.

WE MUST BE APOSTOLIC IN BOTH WORSHIP AND WORK TO BE ACCEPTABLE

While there is a clear distinction between the worship and work of the Church, the two items are closely allied and more or less associated together. If we finally would be approved, our efforts in both, worship and work must be acceptable. Apostolic worship does not of itself render our work so, nor will apostolic work render the worship apostolic. If it be correct that a body of disciples must be apostolic in both worship and work to be acceptable in Heaven's sight, how can we fellowship those we declare are advocating a heresy relative to the work?

The A. R. publishers say the college advocates promote and encourage an institution that is a rival of the Church. The Apostle John says those who transgress and abide not in the doctrine (teaching) of Christ have not God. The A. R. publishers contend (and we agree) that the college advocates transgress or go beyond the bounds set by N. T., teaching in promoting and supporting such institutions, and that such institutions are not only not divinely authorized, but are in opposition to the Church, and rivals of it. If the Apostle John wrote correctly, and the A. R. publishers are correct when they tell us the college advocates transgress the N. T. teaching in promoting and defending an institution that is in opposition to the Church, and a rival of it, and we fellowship those the A. R. publishers declare guilty of transgressing, are we not fellowshipping those who have not God? I have been unable to find scriptural authority by which I could justify myself in fellowshipping those I declare are transgressing N. T. teaching and concerning whom the Apostle says have not God.—E. C. Rose.

THE PURPOSE OF WORLD AND CHURCH

In creation this world was designed as a transient abode for the human family. A place where life, death, burial and resurrection should obtain; a state to develop character, a training school for man. To this end Satan was allowed to enter and each responsible person was on trial with the promise of deliverance from death and defeat of the adversary.

The first 1656 years was minus civil government with no organized religion outside the family circle. Such was a failure and ended with the flood. Then came 800 years of family religion with civil government added, but results were no better; this was followed by the Jewish religion, a union of church and state, called "a theocracy"; this was national and lasted 1500 years to the coming of Christ; a state of society with earthly blessings and curses. It was letter, not spirit; sight, not faith; present, not future. Through the Jewish nation God broadcast His power, His wisdom, His foreknowledge and His generosity to the nations of earth. From here humanity can take a retrospective view of its moral delinquency. It is 1900 years since the birth of the Christian era and the formation of the Church which is our training school for Heaven—it is divorced from the world, the state, the home and all human expedients. In Christ is a 100 per cent life; He suffered a 100 per cent punishment and paid a 100 per cent debt. He has given us a 100 per cent Church, that has a 100 per cent head that insures a 100 per cent salvation. When in the Church I am in a ship that cannot sink, a building that cannot burn, a business that cannot fail and a kingdom that cannot be moved. (Heb. 12:28).—A. R. Moore.

SOME PROFITABLE HISTORY

I enjoyed very much the articles in a recent M. C. Bro. Zerr's article just called to my memory some things which have come to my notice in the last twenty-five years. About twenty-five years ago there was a religious paper called Christian Leader being published and which I think is still published, and there was another one then called Octographic Review. It also is still published but it now is called Apostolic Review, and being run by a different editor. At that time the editor of the Leader didn't seem to put very little if any restrictions on anyone who wanted to advertise himself in its columns, but more especially would it throw open its columns to any who differed from the principles upheld by the Review editor.

About this time there were some preachers who had been writing in the Review and it seemed they were not getting the notoriety they wished and they began to advocate things that weren't right; and because of their teaching the editor of the Review shut them out of its columns. Then what did we see? We saw their names show up in the Leader, and they began to cry "evangelistic authority" and "Pope rule." At that time the A. R. editors stood firm for the exercise of discipline and the recognition of the independence of the local congregation. Wherever there was a case of discipline exercised, if there should happen to be a preacher present, about the next thing you would hear would be a report in the Leader of "another case of evangelistic authority." The preacher came in, took the case in hand and put some out to suit himself. I know whereof I speak. I was present when some rebellious characters in a Northern Missouri congregation, after being duly admonished but to no avail, were withdrawn from, and the editor of this paper was there at that time conducting a Bible reading. The Elders chose him as chairman and the parties wouldn't confess their wrongs after being proven guilty and were withdrawn from. Soon there appeared in the columns of the Leader, "The big preacher came in and set some out much older than himself—another case of evangelistic authority." This reporter lived several hundred miles from there but all he had to know was that there was a preacher present from a distance.

So we see how the editor of the Leader and other rebellious characters recognized discipline and the independence of the Church at that time. Some would say it's just a paper fight—just a preacher jealousy. Let's just take note of those preachers, and others of that day who were advertising themselves in the Leader—where are the majority of them today? What have they done to maintain and uphold the purity of the Church? But on the other hand, take note of the ones who were accused in that day of ruling and tearing up churches.

Then, seemingly this wave died down but not so but there was only a new brood getting ready to hatch off and it was hatched. What do we hear now: "The preacher hierarchy," "the boss rule". And where do they advertise themselves? In the Leader of old? Oh, no, the Leader has retired. They won the battle over their former enemy and are now carrying that on. How do I know? Because I recently was present when a case of discipline was exercised which grew out of a would-be case of evangelistic authority pure and simple—tried to set at naught the say of the Elders of an old established congregation without bringing public charges. Do we see any recognition of the independence of the Church in

such? Where did this party take his story of woe to get it published? To the captured enemy of the Leader. Of course all he had to do was cry "preacher hierarchy", "boss rule", and he got the advertising. And that wasn't all. He got a nice little note of sympathy from the editor. The boss rule in this case was tried to be carried out by this party like Paul told the Jews they were doing in Rom. 2:2.

But don't forget the Leader didn't win this battle until the old editor was called to his long home. But what do we hear from some now? The same as of old: "Just a paper fight", "a family quarrel". Second Peter, third chapter, tells us of a class that would show up in the last days—mockers. Peter calls them, speaking lightly of facts. See what Peter says—was wrong with that class.

It becomes us as eternity-bound creatures to take notice and see if there are not some principles involved, and if so we had better arm ourselves and march to the front, for it's a battle and should be carried on both with tongue and pen. Yours for the recognition of the independence of the Church and the purity and maintenance of the same.—Robt. Morrow.

A LETTER FROM SISTER BAKER

Topeka, Kans., Sept. 15, 1936.

Dear Bro. Sommer: Enclosed find check for \$5.60 to pay for two new subs to Macedonian Call (names enclosed), and twelve copies of "Guide Through Bible History," which please send to my address. Like to keep some of them on hand for whenever they can be used to advantage. Find they come in handy to be used as a gift to a friend sometimes. Hope brethren and sisters who are able to do so will order them freely and use them where good may be accomplished with their aid. Glad that faithful brethren have become imbued with sufficient zeal for the Lord of Hosts, and have made it possible for the M. C. to be made larger and better, and that it can now be sent out on its mission each month. Let the good work continue, and increase more and more. If you can't do much, do all that you can and your efforts will not be in vain. And now to brethren everywhere: In September M. C. read again the timely warning given by Bro. C. J. Beidel: **Meditate seriously and prayerfully on what he says. We must act quickly, if a remnant is to be saved, for when sin gains a foothold in the church, the very body is in danger:** "A little leaven leavens the whole lump." "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God? **And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinners appear?**" (1 Pet. 4:17, 18; see also Tit. 2:11, 12.) "Let us awake to righteousness, and sin not."—Emily Baker.

JONES VS. JONES

A short time ago I published a letter from Bro. Gilbert showing that Gilbert had changed, though he claims he has not. Now I must publish some from W. F. Jones showing he, too, has changed. It is Jones versus Jones, as you will see.

Soon after the Rough Draft was published Bro. Jones printed a letter under the heading, "AS TO THE ROUGH DRAFT", and circulated it all over the country, or nearly so. Space forbids publishing that long letter containing fourteen indictments against that R. D., but I shall copy a few of his statements. In his sixth he says, "Can't we

agree on something?" itself implies Christians agreed on nothing, and condemns R. D. as an un-Scriptural document 'partaking of the nature of a human creed.' Yet Review publishers say R. D. contains 'what has been and still is the custom among churches of Christ.' Therefore the 'disciple brotherhood' never has agreed on anything taught in the N. T. Hence, this Indianapolis Compromise class with Apostles' Creed, Phil. Conf. of Faith, Book of Mormon, M. E. Discipline and Rome's council legislation."

But he has accepted the Review as a worthy journal. In his seventh indictment he says, "R. D. would debase N. T. folks to a base plane with 'weak and beggarly elements of the world,' to compromise with soft peddlers, speakeasies, slippers, strays and 'dumping grounds.'" We find this in his eighth: "... While endorsing discipline in one statement, it waives it by encouraging fellowship with innovators and innovations."

In his ninth he says, "It would bridge the insurmountable which Christ placed between His pure Church and this vain world, advocating 'OPEN FELLOWSHIP!'" Then in his 14th he says this: "The question is: Is this Indianapolis Compromise scriptural? I say, No. Let's get to the things making for Unity."

His letter is long and very strong against the Review, but I can't publish all of it, though I wish we had space to do so.

These are only a few of the many things he has said. Do you know of any one who has said so many hard things against their compromising with and fellowshipping persons who are identified with unscriptural organizations? William Freeman Jones has fought the Review harder, I think, than any one in the Brotherhood, but has now taken a flip-flop with them.

In replying to a card A. R. S. wrote him July 15, 1935, complimenting him for working with a leader of the faction in K. C., at conclusion he said this: "THE REVIEW AND I CAN'T WORK TOGETHER, for the R. D. is OPPOSED TO N. T. FELLOWSHIP. It cries, 'PEACE, PEACE, WHERE IS NO PEACE!' Being justified by Faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."—Rom. 5:1. (Capitals mine.—W. G. R.)

Here, as late as July, 1935, he emphatically said he could not work with the Review, and then told WHY. But in August 4, 1936, Review he says he CAN work with that paper. I'm wondering what has taken place to cause him to become converted to this "Indianapolis Compromising" creed, writing, "Rome's council legislations" imitators, "debase" us "to a plane with beggarly elements of the world," "compromising with soft peddlers, speakeasies, slippers, strays and dumping grounds," "OPEN FELLOWSHIP" class of folks. Jones has now lowered himself about as low as a person can be lowered, for he is NOW in that class. He has a lengthy article in the Review of August 4 defending the Review, apologizing for the Review's position, then closing with this: "Brethren, let's take the Review and encourage the publishers to be faithful in sounding out the Word which can save our souls. Fifty cents may not mean very much to you, but it will mean very much to them in these trying times. They can send the Truth to thousands of precious souls whom you cannot visit. Fifty cents may go a long way toward saving some poor deluded soul."

I wish all could read this article he had in the Review. It is all against Jones of July, 1935. So we allow Jones to defeat Jones. Jones condemns Jones, just as Gilbert condemned Gilbert. If Jones was right THEN he

is wrong NOW.—W. G. Roberts, 2708 Dewitt Ave., Mattoon, Ill.

MT. HOPE

Old Bro. Burnum (colored) says: "Noah's Ark with its three floors, is a type of the church with its cellar, dining room, and attic. During the protracted meeting some members become so enthused, and enraptured, that they are elevated or transported to the attic. Then soon after the meeting closes, they become discouraged, despondent, and dejected, and sink all the way down to the cellar, and we can't get them back into the dining room, where the Lord's table is, until they pass through it on their way to the attic again about the middle of the next protracted meeting." Thanks, Bro. Burnum. Your illustrations are a bit unusual, but you gave me an idea.

I was amused at the following incident, but for some reason, I could not laugh at it. Bro. Short is a good man and delights to stand before the audiences at the hour of worship and exhort the brethren to a life of faithfulness. But Bro. Short has no personal dignity whatever. Recently as he stood before the church his hair was uncut, and uncombed, one trousers leg was rolled up, the other down, and his necktie all twisted to one side. He closed his exhortation with these remarks: "Brethren, I am striving each day to be more and more like my blessed Savior, and I want you all to pray for me." Little Alex Smart, Jr., with a rather serious look on his face said: "Mother," and before Sister Smart could clasp her hand over his little mouth, added: "Does Jesus look like he was dragged through a brush heap backwards?"

It is all right for us parents to talk over matters of importance to the church, in our homes, but we should be careful how we express ourselves before the little ones.—Reporter.

APOSTASY ON THE PACIFIC COAST

A. M. Morris and W. P. Reedy and many associated with them used to try to keep the college preachers out of the faithful churches, but now they have deliberately junked that scriptural practice and are bringing them in. They have brought two college preachers into their midst named G. C. Brewer and T. W. Phillips. The former writes an article for the Gospel Advocate, a college paper, titled "Conditions on the Pacific Coast," and it is copied without a word of criticism in the Apostolic Review of September 1. Here are some statements in it in which Brewer tells of the apostasy of the southwest church in Los Angeles:

"The congregation has been for many years considered an anti-college church. William P. Reedy has from the beginning of this work been the minister, up until about the first of 1936, at which time T. W. Phillips II went from Detroit to take over the work while Bro. Reedy is given a two-year leave of absence. George Pepperdine is also a member of this congregation. **These brethren have not changed their views in reference to Christian colleges. They do not support these colleges, and they believe it would be wrong for the church to send money out of its treasury to the Colleges. But they have definitely decided that this question should not be made a test of fellowship, and the brethren who support colleges and those who do not support them may work together in brotherly love for the advancement of the cause of Christ. When they reached this decision they decided to have a protracted meeting, in which they should invite**

a 'college preacher' to do the preaching. They wanted to show to the entire brotherhood that they would not dis-fellowship a man and refuse to indorse his preaching because he might as an individual privilege support a college. When they had reached this decision, my name was suggested for the meeting. This was done, as I understand it, by Bro. Reedy himself. They voted to invite me for the meeting, and thus the meeting was held. * * * Bro. Phillips, who is also a 'college preacher,' is working with this church. * * * James A. Scott is the preacher of the church in Long Beach, and A. M. Morris is a teacher, preacher and very active member of the congregation. * * * I have always supported colleges and have urged others to do the same."

From these facts just given and from the entire article by Brewer, we draw the following conclusions concerning this surrender by Morris, Reedy, Scott and others:

1. The southwest church in Los Angeles started as an anti-college church under W. P. Reedy. It believed that the use of such institutions was unscriptural, and kept college preachers out.

2. Under the influence of Reedy it calls Brewer to hold a meeting who not only supports the colleges but urges others to do the same.

3. It also calls Phillips to come and be pastor (feeder) for the church for two years, who is "also a college preacher."

4. Brewer also holds a meeting for the Long Beach church where Scott is pastor (feeder), and where Bro. Morris belongs.

5. "These brethren have not changed their views in reference to Christian colleges," and thus occupy the most unscriptural position of being opposed to the colleges yet trying to show the "entire brotherhood" that we should let preachers in who support and urge others to support the colleges, and thus open the way for endless amount of confusion and division, as in the past. They have deliberately disregarded inspired John: "If there comes any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him godspeed, for he that biddeth him godspeed is partaker in his evil deeds." (2 John 10, 11.)

6. These self-confessed college preachers who support and urge others to support the Bible colleges, are frequent writers, and one is a regular writer, of Morris' paper, The People's Bible Advocate.

7. Morris is writing much on Unity now, and the trend of it is for this surrender to the college people. He is putting Unity before Purity, thus disregarding another scriptural doctrine, "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable."

8. Bro. Morris eulogizes much Paul's "seven-fold items of unity given in Ephesians" (see Advocate, Sept. 1, page 9), but utterly disregards it in letting the college advocates in. One of Paul's items is "one body," the Church. But the Bible college is **another body**, for it is incorporated, and that very word comes from the Latin "corpus," body. Brewer and Phillips glorify God in the Bible college bodies as well as the "one body", and "urge" others to do the same, when Paul commands them to "glorify God in the Church." (Eph. 3:21.) Thus Morris, Reedy, Scott and others with them unite with the enemies of the "one body" **alone**, and are partakers with them in evils that come to the "one body" through these rival institutions and through detraction from the "one body."

9. The same reasoning by which these men disregard the Word of God and let in the college advocates, can let in advocates of missionary societies, aid societies, etc., and many other unscriptural things. They could worship with the Christian Church, and keep still when the organ is played, etc.! This "individual privilege" business is going to become a boomerang, if we can join hands with those who add another "body" called a college to the work of the Church, "one body," we can join hands with those who add instrumental music to the worship of the Church. If not, why not?

10. If these men are not involved in a conglomeration of inconsistencies, unscripturalness and betrayals of the cause of Christ, then I am unable to reason.

11. The Apostolic Review endorses all this by its Rough Draft and by publishing this without criticism; and all those who are lending their influence to such papers, are evidently partakers, too, in these evil works.

12. So, brethren, you see what a fight we have before us to stem this tide of apostasy among us. The only remedy for the churches is to keep out every preacher who does not stand for the ancient order, and to keep out those who are doubtful or will not state where they stand. And help circulate literature which will inform innocent ones of the great falling away among us. I rejoice that there are thousands who will not join in this surrender to the enemy of the "one Body," the Church.—D. A. Sommer.

WHAT L. L. BALLENGER, AN ELDER, THINKS

Kansas City, Mo., Aug. 5, 1936.—I enjoy reading the many good articles, also the good reports, from our brethren, which I find in the M. C. each month. I would be glad indeed if I could meet and clasp the hand of all those writers, but while I cannot do that, I am glad that I can sit down in my home and read a few lines from them. I was especially impressed with the thought expressed by Bro. S. S. Retzer, in regard to Watching. The apostle warned the elders of the church at Ephesus that wolves would enter in among them, and our Lord said that they would come to us in sheep's clothing. Paul informs the elders that they will be required to give account of the souls that are under their oversight. Our Lord said, What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch. And Paul said to the Church at Corinth, Watch ye. Stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Now if all would heed those timely warnings, the Church, that was purchased with the life blood of the dear Son of God, would not be mangled and bleeding as it is today. Yes, brethren, it is indeed a sin to carelessly let one come into our midst and disrupt and throw into confusion the Church of the Living God.

We have some men who pose as preachers of the Word and declare that they are standing absolutely for that which is written, and yet they will not stand against and oppose those departures from the old paths (that are so clearly outlined in God's Holy Word), and are creating confusion, strife, and division in the Church of our Lord. I have had two letters recently from such preachers, trying to justify their position on the Rough Draft and the Bible college. As for the Rough Draft, the very fact its authors speak of the Bible as the very book over which we are divided, then offer that human document as a ground of unity, is evidence that it was intended to supplant the Word of God. And any one who claims to be a follower of Christ and does not oppose such a document is not worthy of the name Christian. And the man who

does not oppose the so-called Bible college further than to say he does not believe in the Church supporting the college, is trying to hide himself behind a screen that only serves to bring into bold relief his true position. The college was introduced as an institution through which to do work that the Church was commissioned to do, and is the product of that part of the Church that was not satisfied with the Lord's arrangements, and whether it is in the Church or tacked on the outside it is an illegitimate offspring, for it is not authorized in God's Word. Therefore those who are responsible for its existence are just as guilty of spiritual adultery as were the kings of the earth who committed fornication with spiritual Babylon. (Rev. 17:2.) And those who will have fellowship with them by going to their place of worship and partaking with them, when they know that they are privately and publicly advocating that for which they have no authority in the Word of God, are just as guilty as was the church at Corinth when they were associating in their worship in the church with a fornicator. (1 Cor. 5:1-6.)—L. L. Balenger.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Deeds or Death.—If you have not read Bro. Zerr's article I ask you to read it, especially the last few sentences. He shows that members of the Body of Christ should be active or else they die and should be cut off. Jesus strengthens this reasoning under the figure of a vine. "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away." (John 15:2.) Brethren, this is as saddening a message as there is in the Bible—to me, at least. When I think of the great number of professed Christians who are doing absolutely nothing for Christ, and remember that Jesus says they are going to be taken away, I am saddened. Again our Savior says, "Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue you out of my mouth." Elders of churches may leave names of such on the church record, but they are blotted from the Lamb's Book of Life.

The Remedy.—Let us all get busy and do something. A knowledge of the Word of God is first necessary. Are we all able to give a reason of our hope? Can we all sit down with a person and show him out of the Book, giving chapter and verse, the Bible salvation, the government, work and worship of the New Testament Church? Let us make every church a Bible training school. Can't many churches meet at least a week this winter and spend two or three hours each evening, or in the day time, or both, with a competent Bible teacher to help them learn God's Word? You will probably say that the church has not the money. Through January, February, March, many preachers have nothing to do, and I feel sure that many of them would come and teach you for even a dollar a day above expenses. If there were a dozen families, that would mean ten cents a day for each. You spend many times that for luxuries. Remember, "Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit he taketh away."

A Help in Private.—The Guide Through Bible History (35 cents, 30 cents by the dozen), was written to help study, especially of the Old Testament. Thousands have been helped by it. It makes a nice present either to a member or non-member. It shows the way of salvation plainly to an outsider, and in a little different way. We will send you a nice envelope in which to mail it, for your asking. Would it not be a good service for the Lord, to get a dozen copies NOW, so you will be sure to have them

when the holiday season comes, and then send them to your friends or to poor people who can buy nothing? Bible classes of young people would appreciate this help very much for their private study.

"Understandest What Thou Readest?"—The headings and definitions of hard words, and simplified translations of hundreds of hard passages on the pages they are needed, make the Simplified New Testament a very easy book to read. You can't get lost in the apostles' reasoning. Sister Langdon, whose husband is a noted physician in his city, says, "The Simplified New Testament came, and we are both delighted with it. Doctor says it is very desirable and worthwhile." Price \$2, cloth bound only; 6 for \$10, making only \$1.66 each. Get up a club, and start your group of disciples into more earnest study of God's Word. "Every branch in Me that beareth no fruit He taketh away."

Our Main Purpose.—We should like very much to have space for many good articles of practical living. But it seems we shall have to do the best we can till the depression and drought are entirely broken. But, after all, that is not our main purpose. We do not aim to hand you the bread of life or put it into your mouth, but help each church and each individual to feed himself. We do not purpose to sow your seed and reap it for you, but to help you do that for yourself. We don't wish to hunt the pearls for you, but show you how to do your own hunting. We wish to take you off of spiritual "relief" where you are looking to the other fellow for help, and to stimulate you to work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. We will put the worm in your mouth while you are a fledgling, but expect you to scratch for yourself after a while. We hope to turn the nursery where so many Christians have parked, into a gymnasium for the Lord. Is it wise to hand continually to Christians the water of life when we should teach them to dig a well and pump it themselves? The local church with elders who are apt to teach and with members who edify one another, and the family with fathers and mothers who can and do instruct their children—these are everything. The Macedonian Call is only a little help to this end. Will you help us make the Church and family stronger?—D. A. S.

WHAT READING AND THINKING WILL DO

Indiana.—The Macedonian Call has been coming to me for several years. I have been measuring it with the Bible. At first I was very much disgusted. It seemed to be using more space to fight the Review than to teach the way to heaven. You are older than I and no doubt you were next to many things that I did not understand but as far as I could see or have ever been able to see it still seems to me that was a little unjust. Be that as it may, I can not judge unless I fully understand.

Since the Review published the Rough Draft I have been measuring it carefully and can not make it harmonize with the Bible. I have also been reading your paper, studying and wondering. I have almost decided that the Macedonian Call has done the right thing by showing to the brotherhood the wrong in such a thing as the Review's plea for unity. Seems to me it has done the most harm the fastest of anything I have ever seen started. I have written Bessie tonight telling her I cannot make the Bible and Rough Draft agree. We are renewing our subscription to the Review that we may still see what they are going to do.

I am enclosing one dollar for our subscription to Macedonian Call and sending eight names with four dollars. Wish you to send the paper to them for six months if you will. I am afraid danger is ahead. I hope your paper will cause some to think.

Do you endorse baptismal certificates? Do you think it might be possible that some of the converts made by these **Unity** preachers are going to need certificates as a means of identification to distinguish them from the world? Am I wrong? I believe the Bible tells us exactly how to identify a Christian, without a framed certificate on the wall. Shall we use the Lord's money to buy these, or to spread the gospel? If I am looking at the whole thing wrong, I wish you would tell me. I am disgusted with lots of this trashy stuff. I would like to hear my father express himself today if he were living.—A Sister.

Windsor, Ill.—I am back in the work since day before yesterday, at which time I started in on the meeting at New Liberty. We had good crowds for the opening day and I believe will have a good meeting.—Carl Ketcherside.

Mattoon, Ill.—The good brethren at Kansas City, Mo., surprised me with the price of a new Bible. At close of our meeting there, Brother Brumback got up and made a talk showing my "Sword" was badly worn, having been in use many years. Then he handed me an envelop, saying, "That contains the price of a new Sword which the brethren are presenting you. Go buy you a new one." I bought a new one of Brother Morrow at St. Louis.—W. G. Roberts.

Festus, Mo.—The church at this place is moving along nicely. Had interesting meeting last May with Brother Lloyd Riggins—4 added, 3 by baptism. We also have had 4 additions since then. One soweth, another reapeth. The A. R. has changed but the church at this place has not changed. Brother Brumback of Kansas City was here over Lord's Day.—C. E. Priest, Ed Simms, Charley Sims, Harry Day.

Mountain Home, Ark.—The meeting near Devalls Bluff, Ark., closed with eleven baptisms, one an old man 70 years old. The meeting at Pepsin, Mo., closed with fine crowd and fine attention. Only one was baptized but I am sure much good was done. This is a mission point where I baptized four last fall with several confessions of faults also. We planned another meeting for next year. The church at Center has been a great help to this work. I would be glad if we had many more such churches who will not spend their money to build side shows to the church.—W. C. Rice.

Crestone, Colo.—It is with a sad heart that I am writing you this. I have just finished reading the M. C. for September, but I had to read it alone, as my dear husband passed away very suddenly the 7th of August. He always loved the papers so well.—Mrs. H. L. Sutton. (Brother Sutton was an old man but he did not soften toward error, and stood firm against the modern apostasy and fought it. Sister Sutton has the hope of the gospel to console her.—Pub.)

Topeka, Kan.—Want to assure you we are with you and your work, and hope to be able to show our faith by our works. Though extreme heat was against our tent meeting with Brother R. O. Webb, we feel it was not in vain. We who attended regularly heard very excellent lessons that strengthened us, and one's soul's obedience was worth more than money and efforts put forth. We find some showing renewed interest, and hope that the Church will take on new life. Anyway, it is OUR duty to STAND FAST and do our duty though others fail. We have, as you well know, some strong faithful souls here. We are thankful to be associated with them. Just got another "Guide Through Bible Study" to use in our neighborhood. Hope for good.—Nannie Gingrich.

Riverside, Calif.—We are getting along very well with church work here in West Riverside, trying to develop the talent of the younger members. I certainly am pleased with the articles that are coming out in the M. C. now; it has the ring of courage, soundness and of determination. I hope it continues so. Am sending \$1.00—wish could send more.—Walter J. Stone.

Hartford, Ill.—The Bible Reading at Hartford to be conducted by Brother Zerr is to begin about the 5th of October. We plan to have night sessions only, so all of the men here can attend as they nearly all work days. All who can are invited to attend and board will be about \$7.00 per week. Ar-

rangements have been made to get furnished rooms for those desiring at about \$3.00 and \$4.00 per week. The congregation here getting along very well. Hope to have a feast of good things in the study of the Bible at the reading. We are all looking forward to it. We are getting along with the addition to our meeting house very well.—Otto Schlieper.

Mattoon, Ill.—In 2 Peter 2:1-3 the apostle says: "There were false prophets even as there shall be false teachers among you;" referring to the Church, "who privily (or secretly) shall bring in damnable heresies. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you." A more damnable heresy has not been introduced than the **Rough Draft**. Now its supporters refuse to publicly discuss it but are secretly stealing the hearts of good but unstable men and selling them to Satan. In Deut. 24:7 "the Lord commanded if a man be found stealing his brethren and maketh merchandise of them that thief shall die."

September 8 I met with the brethren at River Rouge, Mich. I talked to them along the line of a more careful study of God's word and exhorted them to be satisfied with doing what it taught. After which Brother Spear made a short talk on the subject of "The Spiritual Armor of a Good Soldier."

September 13 I preached twice at the Church in Mattoon, Ill. The Church here is at peace and is looking forward to November 11 when we expect to begin a series of meetings with Brother W. Carl Ketcherside preaching. We are planning a mass-meeting of congregations in reach to be held November 22.—G. W. Shull.

Walnut Bottom, Pa.—I closed too short a meeting at Long Run Church, near Central Station, W. Va., Sept. 4. Two were restored, and two baptized. The work should have continued longer but our allotted time was spent. I began at Shippenburg, September 6th. The interest is poor, but all we can expect in that town. Shippenburg is given up by the church and preachers who have labored there, as being a hard field to work. There are several factories there employing both men and women, and the brethren hope that faithful members seeking employment will move there and help build up the church. Write C. J. Beidle, Walnut Bottom, Pa., for particulars. I find Long Run and Shippenburg churches free of compromisers and extremists. They are unalterably opposed to the apostasies promoted by the fathers of that Jezebel document known as "a Rough Draft." I have a meeting in North Missouri on my way home from the East, and have several weeks to spare if other churches in those parts need my services. Churches wishing my services after January 1, should write me at once. I go from here into Ohio, and perhaps back into West Virginia before starting west.—Wm. Ketcherside, 2010 East 11th St., Topeka, Kan.

Malta, Ohio.—I recently preached four times at Wolf Creek, Ohio. Was at East Branch September 13, and spoke at the morning service. There are but few there to take public part in speaking. I go there frequently and help them what I can. Glad to see many good articles in the M. C. The field reports are very encouraging. We can feel pretty sure that preachers reporting in it are not compromisers, and that there are still many brethren that stand squarely for the Church. But of course the big majority seem to be going the compromising road. Look what they did in Long Beach, Calif., where Brother A. M. Morris and Brother Reedy are leading members! They decided to not make the college a test of fellowship. So they sent and got G. C. Brewer to hold a long meeting. The Review published Brewer's writeup of his work out there, copied from the Gospel Advocate. He says he has always supported colleges and has urged others to do the same thing. So of course he urged the brethren there to support the colleges, if he acted consistently with the way he says he always has done. But he says those brethren still hold their views in reference to "Christian colleges." Maybe that is true. Maybe they never were opposed to colleges, but only pretended to be, and are now showing what they really have been all the time! And if anyone doubts that the Review has gone over to the college side, that one should read carefully Brewer's article in issue of September 1, and see how he boasts the colleges, and college preachers. The Review, by its appeals for unity, and the R. D. had many brethren confused for a time. But it is becoming plainer every day that they are simply surrendering. I have asked the publisher of the M. C. to send it to several brethren. It has been coming to you free. So now why not send in your subscription, Brethren, and thus help to get the needed information before as many brethren as possible. It carries information you won't find in any other paper.—C. G. Parsons.

Almantha, Mo.—The meeting at Jadwin was well attended and resulted in four making the good confession and were baptized the last day of the meeting. I began a meeting here in Almantha immediately afterwards and though everyone has been busy trying to find water for their stock, we have been having a good interest. I am also teaching the Bible to some of the younger brethren who can find time to attend the extra service. The meeting is scheduled to continue one more week and then I go to Brixey, Mo., for a three weeks' meeting.—John W. Rhodes.

Inavale, Neb.—I spent a week at Des Moines helping what I could. When the house was practically full I noticed that at least half of the people were under 25 years of age. More than forty men and young men take public part. Mutual teaching is a pre-eminent success there because the leaders believe in it with all their hearts, and are against the pastor system which is taking the apostatizing brethren. Strong efforts have been made to switch this church aside but hardly a family has been phased. Several years ago one of the elders put the M. C. into every home, and he believes it has helped much to keep them informed. I spent a Lord's day in all-day meeting at Gallatin, Mo., with very good interest. One sister there has done much to hold the little group together in the hall. Would that we had more such women! Brother Tee, a lawyer, is a great help to the church there now. Good crowds for the week at Chillicothe. Five took their stand, one by baptism, one from Babylon, and three by membership. Brethren were pleased with the interest. Some fine brethren there. Held ten days at Carrollton, with three by baptism and one by membership. More than half the congregation are young people, and they are taking a hold of the work very well. They appreciated my talks on Bible lands. Brother W. E. Ballenger and I started the church there 25 years ago in the court house. First audience consisted of three—the preacher, the singer, and the janitor! Other brethren have made sacrifices to keep the group there together. Had good visit one day with Brother Ben Huddleston, and heard Brother Riggins one afternoon at Hale. There is no compromise in these men and they should be kept busy. A longed-for rain has come here at Highland near Inavale, but has hindered our meeting. Some very earnest brethren here in the little group. Am headed toward California.—D. A. Sommer.

WHICH?

In the "Rough Draft" we find this statement: "So we submit the following **items of worship** which are **necessary to a New Testament Church.**" Immediately following this statement in the "Rough Draft", there are fifteen paragraphs captioned, respectively, as follows: Communion, Preaching and Mutual Edification, Pastor System, Officers, Singing, Contribution, Discipline, Workers, Preachers, Bible Classes, Lesson Leaves, Bible Colleges and Orphans' Homes, Foreign Missions, Societies, Brotherly Love.

From what we have thus far set forth from the "Rough Draft," the conclusion would naturally follow that each of the aforesaid "items" are items of worship, and that each of them are necessary, essential, or indispensable "to a New Testament Church."

However, by further perusal of the "Rough Draft," we learn from its contents that our suggested natural and logical conclusion is not warranted. The incoherent and illogical structure of the "Rough Draft" gives rise to such peculiar and self-contradictory situation. Let us examine three or four examples of the "Rough Draft's" imperfections in this respect.

First. Under the caption "**BIBLE CLASSES,**" the "Rough Draft" declares that "**As they [Bible Classes] are not part of the worship,** those not believing in them may stay away without censure." The question now arises, **WHICH** part of the "Rough Draft" controls or states the truth on this subject?—that part which indicates that the Bible Class is an item of worship and necessary to a New Testament Church, or the latter statement therein, which emphatically declares that the Bible Class is not an item

of worship, and that a Church member may absent himself or herself from such classes without censure, thereby indicating that the Bible Class is not necessary to a New Testament Church. In the paragraph of the "Rough Draft" which follows the paragraph now under discussion, it is said that "Bible Classes are not part of the worship."

Instead of the "Rough Draft" clarifying the alleged difficulties confronting Christians, we here see that it adds to their perplexities. In order to settle this unnecessary added difficulty which the "Rough Draft" has thus contributed, the reader is referred to the wholesome fountain of Life, pure and unadulterated by the pollutions of men, the New Testament; and more particularly Matthew 15:9, which strongly indicates that teaching is worship.

Second.—The paragraph title, "**Lesson-Leaves,**" read in connection with the preceding statement of the "Rough Draft" which says, "So we submit the following **items of worship which are necessary to a New Testament Church,**" suggests that "Lesson-Leaves" constitute "items of worship which are necessary to a New Testament Church."

Further treating of this subject, the "Rough Draft" lays it down as a rule of practice that, "If a Bible-class uses lesson-leaves, those **not agreeing** may use their Bibles without censure on the part of those using lesson-leaves." This last statement from the "Rough Draft" indicates that its authors do not deem lesson leaves necessary to worship.

From all of which, the "Rough Draft" position and rule of practice may reasonably be stated to be as follows: Lesson-leaves constitutes one of the necessary items of worship, but leave is hereby given each member to adhere to or reject this **necessary** item of worship and to substitute the Bible therefor.

Such freedom, so purportedly conferred by the "Rough Draft" upon the members of the New Testament Church, to comply or not comply with the "Rough Draft" as to its necessary item of worship, "Lesson-Leaves," strikes the writer as decidedly anomalous in view of the claim that the "Rough Draft" is a plan for unity.

The real question of importance to each Christian is: **WHICH** position on this matter is Scriptural? The "Rough Draft" cites no Scripture authorizing the use of lesson leaves.—O. C. Tee.

(Concluded next month.)

HOW THEY WORK

"Colorado Christian" is the name of a four-page mimeographed sheet, published by James L. Lovell, at Denver, Colo., and sent free to all the churches of Christ in that state. Its sole purpose, evidently, is to surrender over to the college element what few loyal churches there are left in that state, by soliciting closer cooperation in a greater mission work throughout the state. There is compromise and deception on every page of it. He refers to our differences on the church colleges, and salaried pastor system, etc., as "matters of personal opinion"; and our opposition to those evils as resulting from "prejudice and jealousy." He urges the brethren to support A. M. Morris and his paper. All who report in it are church college advocates or compromisers, except perhaps two, who have been deceived by his "fair words, and evil speeches." To the wise, the above warning will suffice. "for we are not ignorant of Satan's devices" (2 Cor. 2:11).
—Wm. Ketcherside.