

Please return  
H.C.

Mission Interests Committee  
Hutchinson, Kansas R1  
September 26, 1954

Harvey Graber  
R1 Goshen, Ind.

Dear Bro. Harvey:

It is somewhat with a feeling of guilt that I sit down to write to regarding your form letter of July 31 and the one dated September 26. I fully intended to write an article for the last "Witnessing", but I failed to get one written that was good enough to send in time. I suppose that it is better this way. It seemed that I was unable to settle myself on any topic that could do justice to. Recently I had been thinking of writing one on the work of the committee. With your suggestion, I want to develop this article that I have begun.

Concerning your questions about the mailing list, I had mentioned before that the record of its growth is not complete, that is we failed to record each new name that was added. I have tried to do justice all the names that you have sent me. Eli Tice has been on our list for quite some time. The total list now numbers right around 615. I am a little disappointed with the Mennonite Press recently, as the next to the last printing had some pages with a blurred effect. I wrote them a letter mentioning this, also ordering 800 copies for our next printing, and giving directions to send the billings to Mahlon and mentioning how the return address should be changed. They acknowledged my letter very gratefully, thanking me for my criticism. However they printed 700 this time and have billed the printing to me. The quality of the printing seems to be satisfactory. They changed managers since we have begun to work with them. The amt. of the bill was \$45.09, which is nearly \$10 cheaper than it has been running. I suspicion that this is a mistake. The return address indicates that they should be returned to a P. O. address. This has caused the Hutchinson Post Office's employees some inconvenience.

I have read your document or treatise and in general am favorably impressed. I am certain that you needed to gear down your usual rate of thinking to include so much milk so minutely, nevertheless, I suppose that should be that way. I think there remains quite a bit for the revisers to do, and I trust they will all take their tasks seriously. Do you feel that this could best be accomplished by individuals or could it profitably be gone over at a committee meeting? I wonder if Daniel may have a little of the same trouble that I have especially since we have moved, that is finding time to keep up his committee work as he would like to. I have not heard from him since the very brief that there would not be a conference in Holmes County this year. I personally feel that we as a committee have been seriously crippled, and that steps should be taken to repair the breach without too much delay. I wrote Andrew once. I tried to be charitable, but I did ask quite a number of questions. This has been several months ago and I have not heard from him since. While hasty action should be avoided, I fear that total inactivity can prove very costly. John B. Mast of Oklahoma went to Ohio and investigated the matter personally. He reports that Andrew feels that the work of the committee is finished. He saw the end last winter when there was consideration to

postpone the conference because of opposition. He also reports that Andrew was quite let-down in not getting the sympathy from Oklahoma and Kansas that he expected. I sometimes wish that he would be given a chance to re-consider and then we would know if he could remain on the committee. You understand that I am a little handicapped to write an article on the work or purpose of the M. I. C. with ~~\$\$~~ things in their present shape. I do not know if I can speak for all of the members or not in stating its purpose. Should I send it to Daniel for his endorsement before it is published?

Coming to the suggested list of revisers, I would consider Raymond Wagler to be better qualified than any one else in this settlement to assist in such a task. His comprehension is keen and he is very much the middle of the road type, though he is in favor of the positive side of Christainity. Another man who I think is unusually keen and might have valuable advice is Ervin N. Hershberger of Meyersdale, Pa. He belongs to the Beachy church. I do not know if the committee as a whole would like to have him as one the rev~~i~~sers or not, but I personally would not have any objections. I suppose that the Zock church of which Ezra Peachy is a member will eventually be a part of the Beachy group as they now have the automobiles.

You asked what my impressions have been of the recent "Witnessing" The next to the last one had not particualy impressed me as the "best one yet" until I re-examined it with the comparative element in mind. I can believe that editorship is much as other public or church services, pretty much a thankless job. I do not feel that I would have been a check on you, had I had the privilege to check the material before publication. I wonder how it would work to have it examined by Daniel instead of Andrew, or it would not necessarily need to be a committee member. Possibly it would need to be no one.

I feel that there are so many things mounting up that a committee meeting is becoming an imperitive. We from Kansas extend the welcome to have it here.

Probably all of the list that you submitted would be more or less qualified to help revise it, but I would favor keeping the number down to five or at the most seven.

I must close and go to work. (It is now Monday morn.) Present plans are to have communion and ordination in our district in two weeks. Pray that God's will may be carried out.

Sincerely,

*David*  
David L. Miller

If you find it convenient, you might let D. H. B read this.