

Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Digital Commons @ Disciples History

Foundational Documents

1934

A Defense Against the Supreme Effort of the Apostolic Review to Crush Carl Ketcherside, D. A. Sommer and the Macedonian Call

William Carl Ketcherside

Daniel Austen Sommer

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/
all_foundationaldocuments](https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/all_foundationaldocuments)

A DEFENSE

Against The Supreme Effort of The Apostolic Review To Crush Carl Ketcherside, D. A. Sommer and The Macedonian Call

Part I—Defense by Carl Ketcherside

Since the publication and circulation of the document, wrongfully entitled, "Important Information," I have had many letters from brethren desirous of knowing the truth about those statements which relate to me, and which were sent forth to the brotherhood by the Review managers. I regret the necessity of answering their thrusts, for in so doing I am forced to prove by their own correspondence that they have misrepresented facts and are perverters of the truth. I think it would have been much nearer the truth had they called the leaflet, "Unimportant Misinformation." If you think this language is too strong, I have a letter from one of the Review publishers in which he says, "The faithful preachers have turned out to be false liars." The man who wrote this is John says, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer," yet he circulates such statements among people, even of the world. I presume this is the method by which the originators of the Rough Draft want us to put into effect Article 15 of that creed, which says, "Brotherly love is as much of a command as baptism." If this late circular is an evidence of the way you brethren in the Review office talk when you love a person, I sincerely trust that you never become real affectionate with me. No telling what you might say.

I am accused in this latest document of sowing discord among brethren. That is rather a serious charge. Then why did not these men prefer charges against me to that effect, before my eldership at Nevada? Is it scriptural to print and circulate such a charge and at the same time never have taken it up with that scriptural authority to which I am amenable? Or, did the editors of the Review think they might damage me more by sending this to those who are uninformed, many of whom are readers of the Review because in times past I encouraged them to subscribe, even giving some of them the money with which to pay their subscriptions?

They also state that in my negotiations with them relative to a meeting in North Indianapolis, I made the mistake of telling them I would occupy time in preaching against the Rough Draft. Then they say, "The elders paid no more attention to such childishness. One remarked that if that was Carl's chief business as a preacher, he wasn't fit to preach anywhere." They circulated this Rough Draft publicly and if anyone stands up and defends it, that is fine. But if a man opposes it then he is childish. If it is childish to oppose this modern drifting from the truth, then I am guilty as charged. If it is childish to oppose the Rough Draft, then what would you label the writing of it? And I want my brethren to know that my "chief business" as a preacher is to fight the devil and all of his agencies. I grant you that makes me unfit to preach in a number of places in these days of looseness, but wherever brethren are willing to abide by the simplicity of the gospel, I am sure that type of preaching will be satisfactory. The Rough Draft represents a compromise with sin, and inasmuch as my chief business is to fight wrong, then naturally I would have to oppose the Rough Draft, because it comes in that category.

Now I want to notice two misrepresentations made by the Review managers in "Important Information." First, their statement that the North Indianapolis elders "had no date set for my meeting so broke no engagement—as the M.C. falsely published."

After I had written to C. W. Sommer telling him I was opposed to the present policy of the Review, he waited some months and wrote me that the church at North Indianapolis of which he was elder desired me to hold a meeting for them. I wrote back that I could come in February, 1934, as that was the only time I had that was open. He then wrote me to schedule a meeting with them for that time and I did. In December, 1933, he again wrote me and told me to come right on, that they were not letting the Rough Draft controversy affect the situation in the

church. He requested that I set the definite time of my beginning the work in Indianapolis, because anytime that I could arrange would be satisfactory. January 9 I wrote to C. W. S. that I would be in Indianapolis on February 18 to continue until March 4. I said in that letter, concerning the Rough Draft, "I regret that this document was ever presented to the brotherhood, and I regret even more that it was not withdrawn when its consequences were beheld. But inasmuch as it has been presented and has not been withdrawn, in spite of opposition to it by faithful preachers, I consider it my duty to oppose it as a humanly devised system for regulating the Body of Christ. Consistency and my conscience demand that I warn brethren against it at Indianapolis as well as elsewhere. If you still desire me to assist you in light of the above, I am willing to come and do my utmost in preaching the WORD." Because of that letter the elders decided in Indianapolis that I was not fit to preach anywhere and secured a man who has been one of the chief supporters of their nefarious document. I will leave it to my readers to decide whether or not I had an engagement with them. Now they say they had no engagement with me, and therefore did not break one. They accuse the M.C. of publishing a falsehood. Those men know that they are telling something that is absolutely not according to facts. It is true that there has been a falsehood published, but it was not in the M.C., rather was it in a circular supposed to contain some important information.

The second thing I desire to notice is the charge that I challenged them to debate the Rough Draft, then backed out because my courage and convictions failed me. This would be laughable if it were not for the fact that the uninformed might believe the story they tell, since there was a time when you could depend upon the Review publishers to tell the truth. I think there may have been a time when it was not necessary to save the correspondence with the Review publishers, but that day is past. I have every one of their letters on file, and my answers to the same, and I am glad now that I kept them. I never did challenge them to debate the Rough Draft, but here is the truth about the matter. Shortly after the Rough Draft was printed Daniel Sommer challenged the brotherhood to prove where it contained one thing that we did not always advocate. I accepted that challenge in a letter written in January, 1933. In it I said (writing to C. W. S.), "I have watched the columns of the A.R. closely to see if someone would accept the challenge your father made sometime ago. Now I am going to tell you what I will do. I am perfectly willing to accept the responsibility of proving that the attitude of the Review since June 21, 1932, is an absolute reversal of its former policies." I received a reply from C. W. dated February 13, '33, containing this statement, "We doubt very much the advisability of carrying on such a discussion as you suggested, even though father challenged the brotherhood." Now you can see who crawled! The A.R. flung a challenge out to the world, but when the bluff did not work and they found a man who was willing to discuss it, they backed completely down and doubted the advisability of holding a discussion. Whose courage and convictions failed that time? This letter is in C. W.'s handwriting and signed by him.

In January, 1934, Daniel Sommer attended my meeting in Barnard, Mo., for two weeks. He seemed to know nothing about the above and made the statement that not one of the opposers of the Rough Draft had offered to affirm their stand. I pointed out to him that I had accepted his challenge exactly a year previously. He issued another challenge and I accepted. He affirmed that the Rough Draft was scriptural in all of its declarations and assertions. I have the original copy of that proposition with my name affixed in the place for the negative. The thing drifted along until mid-summer. I have a letter from Brother Sommer dated May 1 in which he again says he is interested in

holding the discussion. My answer is dated May 4, 1934, and contains this in conclusion, "I will be pleased to meet you in this discussion either at Indianapolis or some other mutually agreeable location, and will try to arrange a satisfactory time." In July I received a letter from Daniel Sommer saying he would not debate it, but had turned his part of the discussion to Allen Sommer. Allen wrote me a card to that effect also. I wrote Allen August 2. In the opening paragraph were these words, "I would just as soon debate the issue with you as anyone else. . . . It makes little difference to me who the champion of the Rough Draft may be, as I am sure there is no real defense for it." I closed the letter thus, "Let me plead with you to make the arrangements to hold the debate in Indianapolis, and let us get to work to show the brethren whether or not the thing you advocate is scriptural." Allen answered that he would be willing to withstand me to the face any time and place. I presume he did not include Indianapolis in that statement though, for he spent the rest of his paper in the letter, arguing against holding the debate there, and berating with such slang expressions as "Kingfish of the Macedonians," those who dared oppose him.

The only reason we have not debated this issue before is simply because these men have refused positively to permit me to come to their city and debate it with them. I am ready to go anytime and meet anyone of them, or all of them, and I feel sure they know it. They asked me in the last letter to affirm that those who plead for New Testament work and worship are bound for Hell. I would not affirm something that I do not believe. But I will affirm that the Rough Draft is a departure from the teaching of the New Testament scriptures and the former policies of the Review. I am satisfied with the New Testament, but they are not. Had they been content to abide by it, they would not have formulated this divisive instrument, the Rough Draft, which requires men to misrepresent and slander their brethren in order to defend it. In closing I will say I am ready to debate these issues anytime, anyplace. Arrange the debate and give me time to check the train schedules and I will be seeing you!

Yours for the Truth, without compromise,

W. CARL KETCHERSIDE.
Nevada, Mo.

Part II—Defense by D. A. Sommer.

This tract I am reviewing is put out by the "Review Managers" and named "Important Information," and circulated throughout the brotherhood to crush those mentioned above. It is 100 per cent personal and contains many false statements, half truths and false arguments. My friends have told me that I should answer it fully. When you know that the writers charge me with "envy," and refer to me as a "Jews harp" and "The Macedonian Kingfish" (an embodiment of trickery, covetousness, lying), you can see the spirit back of the whole tract. **The authors are determined to do almost anything to force their apostasy on the brotherhood.**

An Important Background.

Forty years ago in a little frame dwelling in Indianapolis, used then as a meeting house of a little band of disciples, now called the North Indianapolis Church of Christ, I went forward with tears in my eyes and gave my hand to the preacher and said that I wished to be a Christian. My brother Chester, two and a half years older, followed later and was baptized at the same time. He soon deserted the Cause and went into the world and stayed about fifteen years. Allen was baptized a few years later, but he, too, went back soon into the world and remained about thirty years. I was thus the only boy in the congregation, but made up my mind when I accepted Christ that I would preach the gospel. I did not take the regular course in the high school, but took only those subjects which I thought would help me in my life's work. It was discouraging to a young boy, but my mother encouraged me. I visited weak members of

the church often, trying to strengthen them. Then later I gradually went into the gospel field, and for thirty-seven years have done nothing but preach and write the gospel. I was always a home boy, yet have spent nearly all my life away from home. I have not accomplished what I would like to have done, but I have tried to be faithful.

Perhaps some things I say sound like boasting, but Paul did it to enforce truth and overcome the efforts of false brethren, and possibly I can be excused. I have never been **carelessly** absent from any meeting of the church through those years. The past two years I have purposely stayed away from some meetings because I did not wish to lend my endorsement to disturbers of the churches. No man or woman can truthfully say that I ever brought reproach on the cause of Christ by my moral conduct. The father has often said to me, "You are the only son I have who has not disgraced me." The father and mother both wished me to take charge of the Review after them, and it was finally turned over to me legally.

Why did I turn it back to them? There were several reasons. First, the paper was five thousand dollars in debt, though with a possibility that only about half of that would have to be paid. Yet it was not a certainty. But in the times of financial prosperity of the country I was in favor of raising the subscription price, so that the paper could pay off its debts. The former publisher was not in favor of that plan and the present Review Managers stood with her, and I did not propose to stick my head into a financial yoke and not have the privilege of getting out. Second, the former publisher wished the other two boys to help run the paper (yet me to foot the bills), and I did not have much confidence in their soundness. Finally, I turned it back and they have run it, and everyone can see that my fears were well founded. Of course, we are all glad when men return to Christ, but the natural self-will which these two had in rebelling against God all those years and the further development of that by such a life has well nigh wrecked the brotherhood, for they have carried such spirit over and have been determined to push their Rough Draft through.

I have always been strong for building the church and doing mission work. For twenty years my plan has been: Develop the talent in the churches by preachers committing what they know to faithful men who shall teach others; make the brethren so that they can edify one another, as God commands; then we can have a greater number from whom to select elders who are "apt to teach" and who can "feed the flock" as the Book enjoins. Preachers who visit churches should have in mind the development of the talents and not the mere preaching to it. There is no authority for an outside preacher to come into a church where there are elders and preach every Sunday morning and night for years, and thus do the work of the elders. By developing the church as we have said, churches will have more money to help their poor and to help the preachers in new and weak fields. I have written much on these subjects through twenty years or more.

But the men at the A. R. office put very little missionary spirit into their paper and opposed my efforts, and I started the Macedonian Call so that I might have a free hand in presenting those ideas. I also printed between 100,000 and 200,000 copies of Back to Bible Helper to circulate among outsiders. They have thrown almost every obstacle in my way. Every issue for months at a time have contained thrusts at my work from the pen of C. W. S. It was ridiculed by the same one. I commended in an article to the Review the effort of L. E. Ketcherside to stir to greater missionary work, but he cut it out. He told me personally that L. E.'s writing were a lot of "wind." Finally, I quit writing for such a paper. The reader knows much of the rest—how the paper has been continually jabbing at me since. I had no way of replying to their misrepresentations among thousands of their readers who do not get the M. C., and it has hurt my work very much.

When out among the brethren and D. S. was asked what is the different between D. A. and C. W. he told me many times that he always answered, "Austen is ten years ahead of Chester." And Austen has not changed.

Position of Fred Sommer.

Fred Sommer years ago became very broad in his ideas of Christian fellowship and union. He said that a man is a Christian as far as he goes, and that we ought to recognize him as such. (Sounds

much like the Rough Draft, doesn't it?) But he was laying down the bars for almost anything. His father and mother saw that, and Mrs. K. W. S. had E. M. Zerr show up the unscripturalness of his position in the Review. Fred then went to the Christian Leader, and they received him with open arms, thinking they had gained a point. But soon he became too broad for them. He then wrote for a Christian Church journal in Canada, where he was then living, and where he was preaching for the Christian Church. He also made an effort to become a worker in the Ohio Christian Missionary Society, but they refused him. A digressive preacher who was an officer in it at the time told me that. And Fred's father told me that Fred preached for months in a sectarian church in Canada, wearing a long robe at the time.

When he visited Indianapolis a few years ago C. W. S., one of the elders then, consented for him to preach, and he did. I have it on good authority that Dawson Hall, a preacher whose membership was there then and still is, I think, objected to his preaching. I have never learned that he ever gave up these broad ideas. Now he is one of the chief writers of the Review, without a word of acknowledgment showing change. Was the Review wrong when it threw him out? And yet it says it has not changed.

Former Position of the Review on the Colleges.

The older folks remember what a battle raged twenty and thirty years ago out in the west over the colleges. Daniel Sommer had debates with Rhodes at two places, and he had another debate with Armstrong. It was a bitter conflict. If we had just let it go at that the excitement might have died, but we drew the lines on these college men and tried to keep them out of the churches because we knew they would, at least privately, teach false doctrines. Daniel Sommer was the chief one in drawing the lines. The past thirty years one of the great fights of the Review has been to keep college men out of the churches, just as its fight had been before that to keep old digressives out. Daniel Sommer is the one who fastened the name "new digressives" on the college people. If they were "new digressives" two decades ago, why not now? It was emphasized that "If there come 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.) Well do I remember that Brother Daniel Sommer has said to me more than once that one of his great works now was to "round up the brotherhood," which simply meant solidify them against these false teachers. Though the college people have not changed, the effort of the Review is now to amalgamate the two divergent groups—to undo much that has been done.

The Rough Draft.

This document was a proposition for unity put out by the Review Managers June, 1932. It contained many unscriptural things, among which is this:

"If the preacher we employ wants to give part of what we give him to aid a human religious society, that's HIS PERSONAL AFFAIR, and RISK. The Head of the Church will settle with him in the Last Day for helping a RIVAL INSTITUTION. But retain the Church funds strictly for Church work and we'll have a GLORIOUS REUNION!"

If a preacher has faith enough in "rival institutions" to take the money we give him for preaching and gives to them, he will have faith enough to talk for such "rival institutions," and to throw his influence for them. And if he does that he will cause division, and Paul says, "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and AVOID THEM." But the Rough Draft says, RECEIVE THEM. Which shall we follow?

The reader will remember that the Review Managers have made no effort to reply to these arguments from the scriptures, but have nearly altogether simply tried to show that we are in the same boat with them—that we are inconsistent, too. But granting their argument, whoever heard that two inconsistencies made one consistency, or that two unscriptural practices made one scriptural practice? But why do they not try to show that John did not mean what he said? They are fighting a most vital principle of protection of God's Church.

They try to excuse themselves by saying that the R.D. says to exclude the heretic. But that is for those who are **inside** the congregation. Our discussion is concerning those who worm their way in from the **outside** (and there are hosts of

these vultures standing around.) John says not to let them in. Keep them out. **"Receive them not," when they come to us.** If we had not adopted that principle with the Christian Church, there would not now be any true Church of Christ, and if we had not adopted that principle with the college people they would have gobbled us, too, by this time. Old Brother Thurman, who has preached 65 years in Texas and Oklahoma, has been driven out of the churches he has established by these college people, and the Review force is trying to keep him in Indianapolis, where he has worked a little for a couple of months. But if we had not kept those fellows out of the church in the North, they would have swallowed us, too, as they swallowed his work down South, and he would not now have a place up here to preach. What silly arguments the Review Managers present when they get on the wrong side of a question!

To show you the dishonesty of the authors of the R.D., let me remind you that they published all the favorable comments on it, but **threw into the waste basket dozens of criticisms of it from faithful brethren.** Because of lack of information many of their readers have inferred that the sentiment for their apostasy was almost universal.

And they did not stop with offering it for consideration, but **have tried to force the brotherhood to accept it.** That is the reason so many have rebelled against their tyranny.

Let the reader note closely in the tract signed by Zerr, Ballenger, Ketcherside, etc., the quotation from C. W. S. regarding "Tides ebb and flow." He said of the Review, "Hope was gone that we could go on, then we proposed a change—a new deal, the Rough Draft." **So the R.D. was put out to save the Review.**

False Arguments, Misrepresentations, Half Truths and Falsehoods.

"He's not the first who has had a copy of the Review sub list in his possession for a while." This is one of those dirty insinuations of Allen's that I have started the M. C. on the Review list. He has made it before. **There is not now nor ever has been a single name on my list which has been obtained from the Review list.** When a man serves the "father of lies" for thirty years, it is naturally hard for him to work the blood out of his system.

A. R. S. has continually declared that I "said" that C. W. S. had been baptized into A. M. M. Now here is another misrepresentation. I never "said" that, but there was an intimation. Now I wish to correct that, and say that from all indication from their slurs, sarcasm, misrepresentations, half truths, falsehoods, that neither one of them evidently was baptized into Him who is "the way, the TRUTH, and the life"; or if they were, they certainly have not lived up to it.

A few years ago C. W. S. printed false statements about me in the columns of his paper, and I wrote three letters to him to try to get him to correct them, one of the letters being registered that I might know he received it, but he has never withdrawn them. I believe he will have to answer for them and all the others before the God of Truth. These men we are defending ourselves against have little regard for truth, and with a knowledge of some of these things you will see that our Defense is mild.

It has been charged that I was inconsistent in refusing to go hear Horney preach, who always worked with the anti-college people, yet went to hear Thurman preach who has always worked with the college people. I try to give every one the benefit of any doubt. But the differences between the men is this: Thurman has been driven out of Rome and has his face toward Jerusalem, ever though, like Lot's wife, he is looking back some; while Horney is in the suburbs of Jerusalem, with grips packed and tank full of gas, and his car headed toward Rome, and with the Review Managers at the wheel.

A. R. S. also said in the Review that I "sent" my children to a church school. Now for me to denounce these schools as I have, then "send" my children to them, would make me not only an inconsistent man but a hypocrite. Of course, C. W. S. does not have to make any defense now, though all three of his children have gone to the same college. I have shown that I never "sent" my children to any college. Not one dollar have I given for that purpose. With my meager remuneration in preaching I could not afford it, —remuneration made meager by the falsehoods these boys have been circulating against me for years. My children have gone where they could (the school is within walking distance from home), but they have taken no Bible nor re-

religious instruction in any school. I believe that the writer of that falsehood will have to answer to God for it and his other false statements and misrepresentations.

"He was . . . striving to turn churches from employing preaching brethren who also worked at manual labor to 'make ends meet.'" Here is another manifestation of the blood of his adopted "father" for thirty years. But I have been and still am opposed to a man's making a living at some secular work, then merely running out and bleeding churches by merely preaching to them instead of developing them. If such men would build up weak churches that would be good, but they look for the fat ones. I still believe that it is the business of a preacher to "commit what he has learned to faithful men who shall be able to teach others." The preacher who visits a church year after year yet does not develop teachers, is not a full gospel preacher according to Paul's idea.

"He objected to certain men reporting cases of Gospel obedience in the Review, but now, in the M. C., invites 'collegites' into the churches to 'teach and admonish' through human literature—their song-books. There's money in it." In other words, it is just as scriptural to open the columns of a religious paper for college-ites to advertise themselves, men who support and hence talk for, colleges, as it is to open the columns of that paper to advertise a song-book, compiled by a collegeite, which does NOT teach and admonish to uphold Bible colleges or any other evil. And as the Review advertises song-books and other books by Christian church people and sectarians, it will also be just as scriptural to let them advertise themselves in their columns. Now, brethren, this is not a mere reducing his argument to an absurdity—from his reasoning that is their position. That is what they here teach, and that is actually what they are practicing in its columns, for Lappin, a Christian Church preacher, and editor for years of the Christian Standard, recently had in an article, and other such men the same. If the Review Managers are not sincere in this argument, they are hypocrites, and should be shunned; and if they are sincere, they are apostates from the faith they have held in the past, and from the Sacred Scriptures which say of false teachers, "Receive them not."

"As children in the same earthly and heavenly families, we deeply resent the continued reflections by D. A. S. on the age of our father (Daniel Sommer). The decent deportment of a child toward its parents requires at least silence rather than public ranting." Here is another falsehood when the writers say we have "ranted" at this brother. His work is interwoven with the work of the church, and when he makes mistakes it hurts the Cause. The old brother has done a great work, but he is undoing part of it now, like many old people. Jesus says, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me."

Several times have I said to him, and say it now, "You are my father, and have done a great work for the Lord, regardless of your mistakes. When you are old and have no place to go, you can always have a home with me." And yet the Church of the Blessed Redeemer must be protected from the softening of age, and from stubbornness in younger ones.

But since when have these critics developed such great filial love. For about fifteen years with one, and about thirty years with the other, they grieved this same old brother by their wayward conduct. Many a time have I mingled my tears with their mothers' over these same boys who would now trample me into small dust, simply because I call attention to their "changes" from the teaching of their father and mother through their vigorous years, and from the Word of God. Many a time has the old brother said to me, "Austen, you are the only one of my boys that has never disgraced me."

The simple truth is that they are using their old father as a tool to help them out. Twenty years ago he said to me and others a number of times, "When I get old, I want Austen to oversee my manuscripts, for I do not wish to change as did Alexander Campbell, Moses E. Lard and many others." Austen stands now exactly where he stood then, but the old father has fallen into the hands of those who "use" him rather than protect him.

Has C. W. S. forgotten that twelve or fifteen years ago, when complaint was made to him and his brother elder, against this same old brother, they both excused their handling of the case by printing a document and sending it into the far northwest, telling of the declining ability

of the old brother? When trying to protect themselves they did the same thing they charge against me, but when it comes to protecting the blood-bought Church of God they "deeply resent" their same reasoning when I use it. This "deep resentment" seems to be a flow of crocodile tears.

For years, every one knows that they kept the old brother out of the columns of the paper, and in order to protect himself from them he had his mail sent to my address for months. Right now they are keeping from him letters of criticism from his old friends, just as they have kept out of their own columns many letters of criticism of their course. Last week a brother in Indiana sent me a letter of criticism he had written to D. S., marked "personal" and "forward," but which had been returned to the writer from the Review office by Allen with the statement that D. S. was "very busy." The old brother supports them with his words and his remuneration from preaching and his plea for money to the old friends of the paper. Like Demetrius, these boys "deeply resent" that which puts their craft in danger. It sounds to me like hypocrisy.

"This talk against the Review 'slipping' had its birth in personal envy, and the rage of certain preachers who saw their self-erected pedestals of authority knocked from under them by a Brotherhood that has decided to think and act for itself." But the "Review Managers" alone formulated the R. D., and the brotherhood had nothing to do with it, and then they tried to cram it down our throats. How did the brotherhood think for itself on that? There never was a case of religious Hitlerism stronger than this one.

Allen Sommer said in the Kansas City Mass Meeting that he had belonged to four secret orders till a year before that time. He belonged to them, then, when he helped formulate the R. D. Think of it, brethren! **A man not knowing any more about the great principles of the New Testament than to belong to four such societies, and then at the same time, dictating to you and trying to drive you into his compromise ideas of religious matters.**

C. W. S. is the one who should have gone to K. C. but he was two cowardly and turned it over to the irresponsible Allen. The brethren there graciously gave Allen more time than any one else to defend their R. D., and he utterly failed. But he had received more prominence than he ever received in all his lifetime before, and he went home puffed up. It was remarked to me a number of times how conspicuous he tried to make himself in the home church. His head was often united with the elder's head in consultation. No such consultations were going on with other members except C. W. The elder is under the sway of their apostate principles. C. W. and D. S. have turned all the correspondence on the R. D. over to Allen with his slang and sarcasm and misrepresentation and falsehood, and he is writing such letters of abuse against me all over the country. I have a number of them in my possession.

The Review fought for fifty years the use of tobacco by Christians; but how can the present managers consistently continue that. The office editor for years often filled the A. R. office with his cigarette smoke, for I have seen it; and if he has quit (I have not learned that he has), it has been because his doctor told him to. A few weeks ago I met the other one on the street with a pipe in his mouth. I mention this to show that the policy of their paper will have to be changed on this as well as many other things. Maybe this was one of those things of "contention" which they are going to cast aside!

The reader may think we are very plain in what we are saying, but if they could see the tract they have put out, and could remember the ugly thrusts that have been made through years, they would look with charity on our effort to exonerate the truth. The father said to me about a year ago, "Austen, don't argue with the folks at the office, for you can not stoop to their methods."

"Probably not one congregation can be named that has even been disturbed by any college preacher." Why should the college preachers make any disturbance now when the supposedly anti-college people have surrendered, under the influence of the dope administered by the People's Bible Advocate and its preachers, and the Apostolic Review and its managers? These supposedly anti folks are doing the work for the college men who have wisdom enough to let the other fellow do their dirty work. But thirty years ago the Review seemed to think they created

disturbance and corrupted the doctrine. Can an Ethiopian change his skin or a leopard his spots? But there is a large group that will not thus give up. "The old guard dies—it never surrenders."

"They have by implication decided to make every error in a disciple a subject of discipline rather than of teaching and exhortation." We have implied no such thing, but we have implied and decided that the inspired John meant what he said when he declared of false teachers, "Receive them not." Too bad, that these critics don't believe that John was inspired and thus worth listening to! "He that keepeth the whole law and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all."

"They have all ignored the apostle Paul's appeal for unity in 1 Cor. 1:10-13." Paul gives the details of the basis for unity in Eph. 4, which shows that there must be "one Body," the Church. Now missionary societies, Bible colleges, and orphan homes are **other bodies**, which are supplanting the "one Body," the Church, and how can there be unity while, professed members of the "one Body," the Church, take their money and support, a "rival institution," (another body), the Rough Draft being witness? And the Review tries to force the brotherhood into such a conglomerated unity, while inspired John says, "Receive them not." "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable."

"They (the college people) adopted the one man pastorate very much as the Christian Church had, also the religious secular college with its athletics and theatricals, and other evidences of union of the church with the world. These were then called 'New Digressives,' while the so-called Christian Church was designated 'Old Digressives.' Both these grades of digressives were clearly shown to be **departures or defections** from the simplicity that is in Christ." If these college people were a "defection" and "departure" twenty years ago, then why in the name of common sense do you wish us to amalgamate with them since you spent so many years trying to separate us from them. The reader can see clearly that the old brother that wrote this does not see things clearly now, for he is certainly putting himself in a most evident contradiction to himself.

The plea that some are "trying to hasten his funeral" is an effort to work sympathy. But I have heard that for twenty years. It was first used of the old digressives, then of the college people, and now of those who are trying to hold the old brother to the doctrines he fought for so hard in his prime.

For fifty years the brotherhood cried, "Who splits the log, the man who drives the wedge, or the man who says, 'Don't drive it? Who splits the church, the man who introduces the organ, or the one who says, 'Don't introduce it?'" For thirty years we have said, "Who splits the church, the man who introduces Bible colleges, etc., or the man who says, 'Don't introduce them.'" And now we have to say to the old paper, the Review, which emphasized that argument, "Who splits the church, the man who introduces the Rough Draft, or the one who says, 'Don't introduce it.'" **The Apostolic Review is going to have the time of its life trying to disprove the arguments it has used for fifty years.**

Details on Some "Changes."

Did not the Review Managers arrange for D. S. to make a trip among the college people in the South? And did not D. S. tell me that G. H. P. Showalter, publisher of the college journal, Firm Foundation, wrote, or wired, back that if D. S. would not publicly press his ideas regarding colleges that he would arrange a trip, or would not oppose it? And was it not with that understanding that he took that trip among those he had opposed so long? And did he not keep still publicly on the matters which have divided the two groups of brethren? And did he not excuse himself by saying that privately he talked on the subject to some of those "who seemed to be of repute"? Here is what F. B. Srygley, an editor of the Gospel Advocate, the chief college journal, said, March 9, 1933:

"The Gospel Advocate so far has said nothing about the visit of Bro. Daniel Sommer in this city. He was here from Saturday till the following Wednesday. He preached on Sunday morning at the Reid Avenue church, where Bro. Boles was to have preached, and two Sunday nights in Bro. Hall's place at Russell Street. FROM WHAT I HAVE HEARD HIS PREACHING WAS VERY ACCEPTABLE TO ALL WHO HEARD HIM. He made two or three Chapel talks at David Lipscomb College, and WAS PRESENT IN SEVERAL CLASSES WHERE THE

BIBLE WAS TAUGHT, and perhaps HEARD one or two classes in the Bible. HIS WORK IN THE CITY WAS WELL RECEIVED BY ALL WHO HEARD HIM, as far as I know. HE MADE THE IMPRESSION ON THE BRETHREN IN HIS ASSOCIATION WITH THEM THAT THERE WAS LITTLE, IF ANY, DIFFERENCE IN HIS POSITION AND THEIRS ON THE COLLEGE QUESTION. He seems to believe that the college or school where the Bible is taught, not as an adjunct to the church, but as an aid to parents, is permissible.

Can you imagine the D. S. of twenty-five years ago, debating Rhodes and Armstrong so strongly, then going down South after the debates and making a trip like this one? Hundreds of columns have appeared in the Advocate against the position of the Review on the college question, and almost thousands in the Review against the position of the Advocate on it through thirty years; but now it seems that D. S. makes the impression in his trip among them that there is "little difference" between their positions. How does all this come? It is evident to all that the Advocate has not changed. When visiting down there the old brother wrote back often to the Review that he was "treated the best ever." Would his preaching have been "acceptable" to those college people, if he had preached on the subject like he has been preaching and writing the past thirty years?

In a letter to me a few days ago from California, one of the best friends Bro. D. S. ever had, said in sadness, "One of the ——— sisters said to one of my sisters, 'Even Bro. Daniel Sommer has changed his ideas on religion and is more broad-minded than he used to be.' My sister thought she gained her knowledge from reading the Review." This is the general sentiment in this religious movement throughout the United States. Among the college people it has done untold harm to the cause we have upheld so long.

The Pratt mass meeting in 1932 was composed of college and anti-college people of Kansas and adjoining states, and it seemed generally agreed from the discussions that if they left the church treasury alone, individually they could support Bible colleges and orphan homes. **But still they are human organizations established by Christians to do work of the Church, and are contrary to the scripture which says, "Unto God be glory in the Church."** The Kansas City mass meeting was called to try to counteract the position put out by the Rough Draft and practiced in the Pratt meeting. Daniel Sommer and A. M. Morris were both at Pratt and seemed to endorse the compromise made there, so contrary to what they have contended for all these years.

D. A. Sommer Withdraws Membership from the North Indianapolis Church. (Sept. 24, 1934.)

This letter of withdrawal was written before I knew that there was an "important information" tract with its vicious attack. For forty years I was a member of this church, except three years that I lived in Illinois, and myself and my six children all shared the gospel there. On the first of this year I wrote a letter to D. O. Taylor, one of the elders, telling him of the evil effects of the Rough Draft in the brotherhood, and asking him to try to get C. W., his brother elder, to withdraw it, but there is no evidence that he tried. When C. W. S. resigned his eldership, he said something about not wishing to fall into the hands of evangelists. His resignation leaves him under Taylor, who was in favor of his compromise. Another Lord's day Taylor said that the general things of the church he had left to C. W. S. (which includes the Rough Draft). A prominent brother in the church said to me that day, "Yes, and C. W. will continue to run things." In his resignation, C. W. S. said that he could do more good outside the eldership, which evidently means that he could use some one else as a tool. He is doing that with Taylor and with his old father. The elder sent to the east side college church to announce Horney's meeting in North Indianapolis, and when their college preacher came, he had Horney call on him for introductory work in the services. **That is the first time they ever had a college man in the pulpit.** Now there is a preacher whose membership is in the North congregation who is every Sunday teaching a Bible class in the East college church and boasts about it in the North church. A week ago, C. W. S. made a proposition in the North church that the four churches in the city, two college and two otherwise, work together in supporting a preacher there.

When I talked with the elder, for an hour or more he made apologies for the colleges and orphanages, and said maybe we had been too strict; and that he would rather send his children to a church school than a state school. The Rough Draft dominates the North Indianapolis leadership; and because of my opposition to changing the principles of the church, the elder has for many months utterly ignored me in the services but continually used some who favor this change. Seeing that I could do them no good, I withdrew my membership.

Since that time the Review has said that I withdrew "not even asking for a letter." Why not? **A letter from the North Indianapolis church as it is now dominated would do me more harm than good.** Immediately I received this from A. Joynes, elder of the church in Philadelphia, and a friend of the Review for near forty years, concerning my letter of withdrawal: "If what you say to him (the elder) is true, then I would say you are justified in your action. The evidences of compromise and spiritual decay in the Church are many, and heart-rending to the faithful. These are hard times for public men and leaders who would serve God and feed the flock of God. **You have my sympathy and ENDORSEMENT.**" A. Joynes."

Many brethren have told me the same thing, or written it to me.

Since writing the above the following has appeared in the Review from C. W. S.: "Indianapolis, Ind.—For several weeks Bro. W. L. Thurman has been visiting with the five churches in Indianapolis. Members of the different congregations have been co-operating in these meetings. One of these congregations is of colored brethren. The East Side church has started an endeavor to build up another congregation in the northeast part of the city which is known as Brightwood. **The day is past for believing that the Church of Christ will grow and spread over a city when the churches there are not of one mind.**—C. W. S."

Now two of these churches are college. The South Side received money to finish paying for its house by contributions raised by the Gospel Advocate, the greatest of all college papers, and the East Side has had none but college preachers, and takes "special contributions" for orphan homes. This mission of the East Side college church was announced in the North Side church, and C. W. personally advocated that they all work together. So we see the determination to be "of one mind" with the college people. What faithful gospel preacher would wish a letter from such leaders?

The Present Position of the Review and Its Fruit.

Every old reader of the Review knows that for thirty or forty years it fought to keep college preachers out of the churches, but now it is fighting harder than any other paper to let them in. Both it and Morris' paper upheld the Pratt, Kans., meeting which was a compromise of our former position. Fred Sommer is about its chief writer now, though he falsifies the Christian Church and sects. Lappin, a Christian Church preacher, is put into the paper as if he were a faithful preacher. Other Christian Church preachers the same. Bro. J. S. Johns, a booster of the paper with its compromising Rough Draft, invited Bro. Alexander, a college man who received his education largely in a Bible college, to preach at Mentone, Ind., where Johns lives. The day before he went, Alexander tried to show me for an hour that Bible colleges and orphan homes are scriptural. I tried to get him to debate it, but he thought it was "not necessary." The Highland Park church in Topeka, Kans., left the Polk St. church to get away from the college element, but now under the softening influence of Morris' Bible Advocate and the Review, they are consolidating under "Utley, the Polk St. pastor, who was a member of the board of directors at Harper college for five years, and is a strong college advocate." The Review published a list of so-called churches of Christ in Southern California, and all of them are associated with the college movement. It printed a list of churches in Chicago, and only one of them is not associated with the movement. **The question of whether they touch the church treasury has fallen into the background,** and the great thing now is to get together.

Bro. J. C. Roody is about the only regular old writer of the Review that still writes regularly for it, except the publishers, and he sends a list of subs from nearly every place he visits. He surely

believes in its principles. Actions speak louder than any words one may utter.

THROUGH THE ROUGH DRAFT THE APOSTOLIC REVIEW IS TRYING TO FORCE THE BROTHERHOOD AS A WHOLE TO DO THE SAME COMPROMISING THEY HAVE DONE.

Only yesterday I received this from El Paso, Texas: "Hope you stand firm for the truth. You are all right on your statements that the college preachers are making trouble for the churches. **CAN'T HAVE ELDERS HERE FOR THEM. AND THE COLLEGES HELP THEM OUT, PROMISING THEM PLACES TO PREACH.**"

Repeatedly we have shown these compromisers that they are violating a great doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures embodied in this: "If there come 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." They have made no effort to try to explain this.

When these college preachers come in they bring the pastor system with them, and generally, organized Sunday schools, literature, worldliness, etc., for most of them are time servers. John says, "Receive them not," but the Review and Bible Advocate now say, "Receive them."

A prominent brother in the church in Indianapolis, who upholds the Rough Draft, said, "The boys at the office need not say that they have not changed, for they have, and such a change that if their old mother knew it, she would turn over in her grave." But the Church will move on, regardless of the apostasy of some.

When the Rough Draft was first presented, the framers of it asked for comments. They received many favorable words from college people. Thad Hutson and other college men from the South wrote that that is what they presented a quarter of a century ago, and it seemed for a while that there was going to be a discussion as to who should get the glory for this "new deal." Finally the Review settled it by saying that "there is glory enough for all!" Then when criticisms came in to spoil this "glory" that was going to be received, the Review Managers became peeved, then angry, then stubborn, and decided to push the thing through regardless of any division it might make. In other words, they loved the college people so well that they consented to drive the anti-college people away, and divide the Church of God. It was a clear case of stubbornness. Now inspired Samuel said, "Stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry." And Solomon said, "Six things the Lord hates, seven are an abomination ——— he that soweth discord among brethren."

The Morris Group in the West.

Under the softening influence of the People's Bible Advocate, there is practically no opposition to the compromise its preachers and editors are making. Without any apparent outward protest, they are going in with the college people. Recent meetings at Topeka, Kans., and Stafford, Kans., were compromise meetings like the Pratt, Kans., meeting, and college men such as Utley, Wallace, Homer E. Moore (editor of a college journal), were all lovingly embraced by the former anti-college group. I learn this from Morris' paper. The Reedy church in Los Angeles had a play called "Queen Esther," and the Morris church in Long Beach had an Easter program last Easter. These are straws showing which way the wind is blowing. Who would have ever thought that these old brethren would have been wheeled into such changes from the truth for which they fought so long? But there are some who will be neither wheeled nor whacked into apostasy.

Position of the Macedonian Call.

WE STAND IN ALMOST EVERY PARTICULAR WHERE THE APOSTOLIC REVIEW USED TO STAND BEFORE IT MADE ITS PRESENT COMPROMISE. We believe strongly in developing all the talent in the church so that we can have more and better elders to feed and watch the flocks, and so we can do more heeding of the Macedonian call to come over into Macedonia and help plant churches.

CONCLUSION.

I have read this tract at least eight times, and believe every word is true; yet shall be glad to correct any misstatement. Brethren, a supreme effort has been made to crush the M. C. and its principles, and it is up to you to make a supreme effort to save it. **We need more subs. and REGULAR Contributions.**