

Price 4d

September, 1923

THE BEREAN Christadelphian.

A Christadelphian Magazine devoted to the exposition and defence of the
Faith once for all delivered to the Saints; and opposed to the
dogmas of the Papal and Protestant Churches

“The entrance of Thy Word giveth light; it giveth
understanding to the simple”

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY

GEO. H. DENNEY, at 47 Birchington Rd., Crouch End, London, N.8.,

Subscription ... 5/- per annum, post free

CONTENTS	Page
Dr. John Thomas.....	269
The Bible Wholly Inspired and Infallible—	271
No. 99. — Why were there no written documents prepared By the Lord Jesus?	
Editorial	273
A Personal Note	277
Why Halt Ye?.....	278
“Lest we Forget”	280
“A Review of recent Ecclesial Trouble”	283
The “Strickler” Heresy	288
The J. Bell “Clean Flesh” Heresy	292
“Fictions in Birmingham Frictions”	293
Correspondence	294
Answers to Correspondence	295
Ecclesial News.	297

F. WALKER, Printer, 41, Stokes Croft, Bristol.

Notes.

Every month we intend devoting a few pages to Ecclesial News, thus keeping readers in touch with Ecclesias no longer in fellowship with the Temperance Hall, Birmingham, Ecclesia (on account of its unfaithfulness), and, therefore, not represented by the Christadelphian. We welcome Ecclesial News, but brevity is requested.

The question of fellowship at the time of the Inspiration and Responsibility Divisions presented many anomalies; and such are sure to arise at the present crisis. We urge, as did brother Roberts, patience and forbearance, on the lines laid down in the Clapham intimation appearing on page 300 of the current Berean.

The Berean has no financial interest in any Christadelphian publications; but, has a real interest in all such, by whosoever published; and, for that reason, we recommend readers to study the catalogues issued by: —

F. Walker, 41 Stokes Croft, Bristol.

The Maranatha Press, 100 Southwark Street, London, S.E. 1.

C. C. Walker, 21 Hendon Road, Sparkhill, Birmingham.

Especial attention is directed to the Editorial Personal Note this month, also “Why Halt ye?” with the sincere hope that every reader will succeed in getting at least one new subscriber.

H. FRY. —Thanks; but, criticisms of details given in Expositions of Daniel usually call for rejoinders ad lib; and I have not the space at the moment. We are sure you will understand; you know our views.

B. J. DOWLING. —You will see we have inserted the letter addressed to brother C.C. Walker. We quite understand what “elation” his championship, in April Christadelphian, caused the Strickler section at Los Angeles, and what pain to every true Christadelphian; but, we are pleased to learn that the “elation was of short duration,” seeing that 50 percent of those who left, have since recovered from their elation, and returned to fellowship with the faithful ecclesia.

S. WOODS, Brixton. —We fail to see any ground for your complaint at a brother appealing to sisters in an exhortation; or addressing the Report of such to “Mrs.” as well as “Mr.” Why not? Surely sisters have as much right as their husbands to a voice in matters of conscience. Our sister-wife has perfect freedom in opening our letters, which is as it should be; in fact, we frankly admit, that, frequently, her judgment is superior to our own. You think it over.

SEVERAL. —Yes; we must be, and we intend to be, patient with “wobblers” open to receive evidence; but condoners of wrong doctrine, or those who are determined “do nothings” in a time of crisis. NO; never!

SUNDRY. —We hope shortly to compile a list of the Meeting Places of the brethren who have withdrawn from the Temperance Hall Ecclesia until it does the right thing with its members, and also cancels its withdrawal from those who stood aside as a protest against the Arranging Brethren’s unfaithfulness.

TO ALL. —Do not be too critical; keep in mind 1 Corinthians 1: 25-28. Magazine editing is no part of our living, but, just the reverse. We are simply brethren providing in the goodness and mercy of God a mouthpiece for those contending for the wisdom that is from above—James 3: 17.

W.J.L., Brantford. —Many thanks. Los Angeles duly wrote: we know brother Hill’s record. You have our full sympathy and help.

E.H., Toronto—The Berean is paying its way and we returned you your cheque. After due consideration we cannot publish your letter because we cannot see our way to give any help to false doctrine and your letter supports brother A.D. Strickler's views and is itself a betrayal of your own error.

A.M., Birmingham. —We are not surprised that the Arranging Brethren of your ecclesia laughed heartily at their recent meeting concerning the trouble they have created through their toleration of false doctrine. Their levity all through betrays their lack of understanding. You are at fault in letting them lead you into the same path of wickedness. May we remind you that a day is coming when "the Lord shall laugh."

P.A., Sheffield; J.B., Oldham; and others. —We have your letters of objection to the Berean. But we have not departed in any way from our object as set forth when we accepted the post of Editor. If you will turn to page 380 of December, 1919, you will see we said (and we had the present trouble in mind when we wrote it): —

1. —We shall stand for purity and strictness . . . definite and uncompromising, etc.

2. —We shall stand for a real compliance with the . . . moral obligations of the Truth. We shall unhesitatingly oppose lapses from the Scriptural position wherever such manifest themselves.

So it is not us that have changed but yourselves who cannot tolerate sound doctrine but can tolerate error.

G.F.L., N. London. —There is only one way to heal the present breach in the brotherhood and that is: Let Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia bring brother C.C.W. to account for his connivance at fellowship with false doctrine in America, Australia and this country, and also those like brother A. Davis who support him so thoroughly. Let me remind you that sister Davis recently wrote London brethren that brother Davis would answer no more questions and was acting on the advice of bro. C.C.W. and the Arranging brethren who had his case in hand. Remove the evil and the disease will be soon gone, the wound healed, and the body made healthy and whole. It is those like yourself who talk of the wickedness of false doctrine, and then covertly tolerate it, who cause the mischief. The Partial Inspiration meetings are more consistent for they do advocate dealing gently with Truth rejecters and leaving them to gradually drop off. You say, "Do not" tolerate, but yourself will not "move" to lift the burden.

C.B., Leicester. —We are not surprised to know that Mr. Mellows is collecting all the material he can about present troubles so as to be able to accuse us of uncharitableness. We would be thieves if we were "charitable" with that which belongs not to us—the Truth—of which we are Stewards. But Mr. Mellows will no doubt bring that position before those "who have authority over us" in the State, and when the next Conscription Act is passed, likely enough, like the Quakers in the last war, we shall all have to bear our individual burden. Those who now follow brother C.C. Walker and brother A. Davis will then be able to take up the form of service for which they have now no condemnation. Those who "stand fast" now will then in the Divine Providence be able to produce a clear record. When we appeared before the Wolverhampton Appeal Tribunal in 1917, just after brother C.C. Walker had been before the Smethwick Tribunal, we were asked by the Chairman "if we agreed with the views expressed by our leader, Mr. Walker, at Smethwick." When we said, "No," and repudiated his leadership, he said, "Then I will hear you." When several West Bromwich young brethren having been turned down at the Appeal Tribunal went to brother C.C. Walker for advice he said, "Join the R.A.M.C.," and assured them they would not be withdrawn from. They came straight to us to see if we agreed. We were filled with indignation, and determined from that day to root out this evil. None of those brethren took brother W.'s advice: all stood fast, and brother F.G. Jannaway with God's help found their deliverance. We wanted brother F.G.J. to open the present campaign against error then, but no doubt the patience and forbearance he and others showed (until brother A. Davis threw down the gauntlet in the spring of this year) was the better way.

C.F.F., Clapham. —Yes, we have seen brother F.W. Turner's attempt to reply to brother F.G.J.'s Lest we Forget. His circular is but a continuance of his deceitful work, and we are not surprised that he so evidently with deliberation misquotes you and misrepresents you.

A.C.—Will publish your advertisement when sent by you.

W.H.T.—Your timely article appears. Thanks.

J.H.B., Seattle. —Bro. F. Walker's address is 41 Stokes Croft, Bristol. Glad you are holding fast. We like the Strickler "twaddle" as little as you do.

W.J.—Re brother Walker's note in Christadelphian that he had not altered "Brixton" Intelligence and that our statement in August Berean was wrong. We have to point out that we did not say that intelligence sent by the Brixton ecclesia was altered. But the intelligence from Clapham duly contained the Amendment which the Brixton ecclesia determined upon as exhibiting their own standpoint, i.e., to give fellowship to John Bright Street. Brother Walker suppressed this, and so also did the Secretary of the Brixton meeting.

The remainder of brother Abbott's article on "The Kingdom of Men" will appear in next issue, matters of importance crowding it out this month.

H.L.—We have no sympathy with munition making. Yes: we know bro. Hill of Toronto and others made money at it. This is a sorrow to us.

THE BIRMINGHAM TROUBLE, 1917-1923.

This Pamphlet, which exposes the unfaithfulness of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, in regard to the trouble, will be sent free to any brethren or sisters who will undertake to distribute it in their meetings. The offer is made owing to the fact that many Secretaries and Arranging Brethren are suppressing the pamphlet and studiously arranging to keep their brethren and sisters in ignorance of all the facts of the dispute. It is a time for those who value and have the Truth at heart to speak out and spare not. A fatal principle—that of doctrinal laxity—is being insidiously and influentially introduced into the Brotherhood, and if not vigorously opposed will speedily lead to widespread apostasy. H. E. PURSER, (Sec.), on behalf of the Presiding and Managing Brethren, 6 Elms Road, Clapham Common, London, S.W.4.

Several articles in type are held over: —"Revelation 11," "Palestine," etc.

Several items of Ecclesial News and other matter have been crowded out this month for want of space.

Communications from the following will receive attention later; too late this month: —I. Collyer, H. Madeley, A. Geere, M. Rayner, H.W. Browne, J.W. Smith, E.A. Pegg, W. Davis and others.

THE BEREAN Christadelphian.

A Christadelphian Magazine devoted to the exposition and defence of the Faith
once delivered to the Saints; and opposed to the dogmas
of the Papal and Protestant Churches

“The entrance of Thy Word giveth light; it giveth
understanding to the simple”

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY

GEO. H. DENNEY, at 47 Birchington Road, Crouch End, London, N.8.

VOL. XI., No. 9 SEPTEMBER 15th 1923 FOURPENCE.

Dr. John Thomas.

GEMS FROM HIS WRITINGS.

CHURCH AND DISSENT.

Roman and Protestant Sectarianism is not Christianity. The aggregate of sects vaguely termed “The Church,” or the ecclesiastical system of Europe and America, is the “Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth.” Their abominations are “harlots,” styled “women” in Revelation 14: 4, with whom the Christ’s Virgins are not defiled. Every system or tradition that makes the Word of God of none effect is a harlot abomination, and proceeds from the “carnal mind,” that is, from the thinking of the flesh—ignorant of the Gospel of the Kingdom and the obedience it requires. This is the fountain and origin of all those heretical formulae which are incorporated in the Romish and Protestant sects, which are all of them “corrupters of the simplicity that is in Christ.” As a whole they are “the Apostasy” foretold by Daniel and Paul. Their clerical and ministerial orders preach “another Jesus,” are animated by another Spirit, and proclaim another Gospel than those ministered by the Apostles. From such a system of defilement it is imperative for every man who would be saved to separate himself, even if he stand alone—Matthew 15: 6-9; Romans 8: 6-7; 2 Corinthians 6: 15-18; 11: 1-4; 2 Thessalonians 2: 3; Revelation 17: 15. —DR. J. THOMAS.

* * *

FLABBY CHRISTADELPHIANS.

These accuse you of rudeness and reviling. They would have you adopt a style as if you were pleading a case in Court in which you had no more interest than the fee you had got through your otherwise irksome task. They would reduce you to the cold, unimpassioned style of a clerical reader of sermons, purchased in Paternoster Row at so much per dozen.

Whatever they may think, they dare not accuse Paul, Peter, John, Jude, and Christ of reviling; but they condemn their words in the mouths of Christ's brethren. "Oh," say they, "Christ was inspired and infallible, but you are not, and have no right to do as He did." But Peter exhorts us differently. He tells us that Christ left us an example, that we should follow his steps; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again. Now it is well to follow his steps, in speaking as well as in action. No better model for style than his can be found. —DR. J. THOMAS.

* * *

CHRIST'S MEANING OF REVILING.

Christ was a guileless enunciation of the Truth in word, tones, and gesture, which left his hearers unmistakably impressed with his meaning.

He has not left us to be the dictionary for the definition of the word "revile." Matthew 5: 11 clearly shows that to revile is "to say all manner of evil against a man falsely;" to say evil of a man or a body of men, truly is not reviling. All said against Jesus reproachfully was false, and therefore reviling; but all he said of his foes was true, and therefore not reviling, else to earnestly declare the Truth is reviling.

Now, it is not necessary to be inspired, nor infallible, to qualify for discerning the Truth in relation to modern teachers as surely as Jesus did in relation to the Scribes and Pharisees. When, therefore, men ascend a pulpit and proclaim themselves to be the "ministers of Christ," and "successors of the Apostles," we are as infallibly certain that they are the ministers of Satan as Jesus was that the Scribes and Pharisees were a generation of serpents, because they neither know the Gospel, nor have they obeyed it, and it is not reviling to proclaim this truth upon the housetops. —DR. J. THOMAS.

The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

No 99. —Why were there no written documents prepared by the Lord Jesus?

Outside the Truth there are many religious systems in the world and all of them had human founders. These pioneers of thought carefully prepared and set forth their views in written form in which they could be preserved and studied. Whether it be Zoroaster or Swedenborg, Mahomet or Athanasius, each and all left considerable written material composed by themselves and thoroughly setting forth their teachings. These documents became and have remained the standard of the faith of their adherents, and bear pre-eminence above all other writings supporting their line of thought.

But when one views the Truth of God and the Christian religion within its embrace, one is at once confronted with the fact that while "He spake as never yet man spake," and declared, "The words that I speak are the words of him that sent me," yet our Lord Jesus has left not a single line of written material.

When he would comfort Mary and Martha, he makes the journey to Bethany, but he sends no message. When he would rebuke the Pharisees, he does it vocally in the Temple.

There is not a line of his own handwriting in the world, nor the faintest trace of the existence of any such at any time. The fact stands out boldly when we remember the well-established fact that Peter wrote, John wrote, Paul wrote, and Jude wrote, and their writings have come down to us, but no written word of Jesus exists at all.

Yet it seems to be a reasonable and ordinary thing that Jesus should have written.

Do we not in our own day greatly value, and rightly so, the writings of brother J. Thomas and brother R. Roberts? Have they not, with the faithful among us, pre-eminence among the latter day writings of the Truth's circle? Others may write well but these keep first place.

For our knowledge of Christ's mission and work we depend upon the prophets of old. For a description of his character as manifested in his life on earth we rely upon the four Gospel narratives. For the true development of his system of doctrine and practice we depend upon his disciples, the Apostles.

There must be some explanation, and we suggest that the real elucidation of the problem of his written silence lies in one sentence—the Bible is wholly inspired of God. The Holy men who compiled it at different times and in divers manners wrote as they were moved by the Divine Spirit, but they were all frail men, suffering the disabilities of human flesh, erring and failing from time to time, seeking to do right, but always in need of God's help and forgiveness.

Examine the sixty-six books of the Bible, and while you may admire Moses and delight in Isaiah you cannot logically set one higher than the other. Paul is not to have pre-eminence over Matthew or John.

There is a true unity of the Scripture, but it is the "unity of the Spirit," and not a combination of great men's own thoughts. On the other hand you cannot give Amos the herdman a lower place than Daniel the great ruler, or Ezekiel, the dignified priest. All are one, and the teaching throughout is properly summed up in Paul's words to the Romans, "One Gospel" "from the beginning," "the power of God unto salvation to every man that believeth."

The wisdom of God's arrangement is manifest, and another illustration of the fact that "His thoughts are not man's thoughts, nor His ways man's ways." Jesus was the King of Men—the Son of Man—the greatest of all men. If then one passage or book in the Bible was of his authorship, inevitably (for such is human nature) a greater importance would have attached to that particular part than to the whole of the remainder of the Divine message. How could it be otherwise?

This would not have been good; it would have set up "degrees of inspiration," as some who have left us (to whom Paul's cloak at Troas was always so glad a boon) would have said. Could any of us have contended that Paul's writing was on a level with our Lord's? Our minds are filled with the feeling that Jesus is "the chief among ten thousand, the altogether lovely." How could we have divorced this quite proper conception of Him from our appreciation of his writings, if any such existed?

But God avoided all this. His Word is one and while it tells of Jesus it is not written by him. The Spirit that was in Jesus is the spirit that is in the Word of Truth, and unless a man has this spirit "he is none of his."

Hence we strongly claim that the fact that Jesus wrote no part of the Bible is a very great proof that God ordained it so in order that He Himself should in the first place be glorified, and in the second place, that faithful men might enter into the true spirit of holiness and obedience which Jesus fully possessed: "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God, in the volume of the book it is written of me."

Hence the constant appeal of our Lord to the Scriptures, They "cannot be broken;" "must be fulfilled;" "not a word shall fail."

By God's care, therefore, the Scriptures are first, and even Christ himself was second to their authority and submitted to them.

This care is an evidence of His wisdom, and its contrast with human practice exhibits it the more plainly.

G.H.D.

(To be continued.)

Editorial.

DRIFT (1). —THE CAMPBELLITE'S AUGUST CONFERENCE.

Dr. Thomas came from the community known at one time as the "Campbellites," from the name of Mr. Campbell, its founder. This sect is now known as "The Churches of Christ." It held its Annual Conference at Nottingham in the early part of August, under the presidency of Mr. Mander, B.A., of Glasgow.

In its early days this sect strongly believed in the Second Advent of our Lord Jesus, and in the absolute necessity of Baptism, by immersion, following upon belief, that entrance into Christ might be obtained. To speak personally, my own father, brother G.W.R. Denney, left the Campbellites in the early eighties to come into the fulness of the Truth, and he declared to me that these people "had nearly all the Truth."

Since that day there has been a steady drift. Some of the older men have been greatly agitated about it. My own uncle, Mr. George Harley of Edinburgh in my last talk with him before his death, two years ago (and he was a member of the sect to his death) assured me that one of his gravest troubles was this "loosening of the bonds of belief," as he put it, "the tendency of the times." To the Nottingham Conference several of the older stalwarts went determined to call the wandering minds back.

The Christian World remarked, "Some there were who went to Nottingham with fear and trembling. There were signs of dark clouds."

But the clouds were swept away. Speaker after speaker advocated freedom of thought, and the President was heartily cheered and expressed the mind of the conference when he said: —

"As a people we have been afraid of any new departure and were settling down as an over cautious community. And unwillingness to accept new light because it was not accepted by our fathers and the tendency to make the opinions and customs of our fathers a hindrance to further progress, an authority which must not be questioned, is wrong. Such an attitude of mind is out of harmony with our movement. I plead for both teachers and preachers that we give to them that freedom of thought without which they may never attain the highest ends. In a world which is intellectually free our men must be left free."

As the Christian World says, "There was no doubt as to how this utterance was received by the majority of the Conference." The utmost approval was extended, and the delegates went away happy to think that they now had "the utmost freedom of thought," or as their own official report expressed it, "Strong in their determination to be abreast of modern thought."

That is what happened in all Christian history. Drift sets in and as Paul said of the Church, but twenty years after our Lord's ascension, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work."

Shall the lesson be lost on ourselves? We would like to hear from some of our old brethren who once were Campbellites as to what they think about it.

DRIFT (2). —THE BAPTIST WORLD CONGRESS AT STOCKHOLM, AUGUST, 1923.

Here a “Declaration” was got up and finally approved, designed to set out the present-day position of the Baptist churches to all the world. One had only to compare it with the declaration of 1660 (which we recently reprinted), to see how the Baptists have drifted.

Dr. A. C. Dixon, for some time in London and now a prominent preacher in America, a strong believer in the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures, endeavoured to secure insertion of the following clause in the Declaration: —

“We confess our faith in the whole Christ and in the whole Bible for the whole world.”

After serious curtailment of his time for speaking, and many subterfuges, which the Doctor describes in the Christian World for August 9th, he was howled down. The newspaper report is, “as great a storm of noise as his opponents could possibly make.”

The Doctor has issued a statement saying that his object was to emphasise among other things that: —

“Christ was born of a virgin;” “Died and rose again from the dead;” “Obtained a glorious body,” and “Will some time return to this earth in that glorified body, according to his promise;”

“The whole Bible a revelation from God through human personalities. God breathed and inerrant as originally given: our supreme authority in faith and conduct.”

To his consternation Dr. Dixon found that hardly anybody was willing to even listen to him as he spoke in this strain. Yet only a few years ago the Baptists believed those very things, and the Doctor tried to remind them that it was so, and that some of their own Trust deeds still declared so.

Today, can we declare that our own community is not in danger of the same human tendency to drift?

CONSCRIPTION.

Those ecclesias which are adopting the “do nothing” policy in reference to “Birmingham Trouble” will do well to ponder the following from a leading London Daily Paper, and which is typical of what is appearing daily in all the leading papers: —

THE SHADOW OF CONSCRIPTION.

* * *

BREAK WITH FRANCE MEANS COMPULSORY SERVICE.

* * *

GRAVE WARNING TO THE NATION.

* * *

What will happen if Britain finally and irrevocably quarrels with France?
Can Britain really occupy a position of complete isolation?

* * *

In an article in the Sunday Pictorial Lord Rothermore warns the nation that the collapse of the Entente, which is inevitable if the Government persists in its present attitude, will mean an immense growth of armaments and a certainty of another great war.

Not only will our fighting forces have to be increased, at an enormous cost which the nation cannot afford at present, but the introduction of conscription will be inevitable. —London Evening News.

Do our brethren feel safe in following the lead of those in Birmingham who would in the last war crisis have sold them into slavery? No excuses about “circumstances of the times,” and being “caught unawares,” will do. If we are to follow a lead it must be a safe and Scriptural lead. Birmingham at that time lost all claim to leadership by its weakness, vacillation and abandonment of principle. How, then, can it be safe to follow its lead now, or at any time? Peace will soon be secured in our midst if all the ecclesias will rise up with one voice and say, “We will have no more of this equivocation.” It is this fear of division that causes division and that hardens the heart of those who have provided the *casus belli*.

“LEST WE FORGET.”

A very fine little book under the above title has been published by brother F.G. Jannaway. It sounds the note of warning in respect of present troubles and gives cogent reasons for viewing the present situation very seriously. Every brother should have one. Copies may be obtained free of charge on application to him at 99 Stockwell Park Road, Brixton, S.W.9.

A Personal Note.

Referring again to the Personal Note in the July Berean concerning my own physical disability and the advice of the medical specialist to “set my house in order,” I immediately acted upon the counsel given by Dr. Thomas to brother Roberts and “sought help of tried Christadelphians” as to the future of the Magazine, so as to preclude the possibility of suddenly closing down. This seemed to us to possess an added importance by reason of the fact that the Christadelphian is no longer the mouthpiece or representative organ of the brotherhood, but merely, as brother W.H. Boulton once said “a private concern,” with regard to which he, with others, “was getting alarmed.”

Recent experience has shown that the Christadelphian cannot be trusted when danger threatens.

When the Household was threatened by Conscription, so long foretold by those two faithful and valiant editors, Dr. Thomas and brother R. Roberts, to quote brother F.W. Turner, “Birmingham and the Christadelphian failed to do what it was their obvious duty to do.”

It was its present Editor who advised the distressed brethren to “join the R.A.M.C.,” and said he would see “that those who did so were not withdrawn from.” Today the Christadelphian refuses to help our brethren in America who are waging so strenuous a battle for the purity of the Truth. Let the indictment of bro. C.C. Walker in our pages this month be sufficient witness. How can any brother be a party to this desertion of our brethren in distress.

The Christadelphian winks at fellowship with those who hold the Bell, Ladson, and Strickler heresies. Little wonder, then, that it condemns faithful brethren in Birmingham, and upholds those who would traitorously sell the pass to the enemy, such as bro. A. Davis. No wonder the editor admits he is “bereft” on the question of fellowship. Well might our late and greatly beloved brother Gamble say, “I am very sorry about the Magazine.” Sadly we acknowledge that bro. W.H. Barker was right when he said, “A personal letter to bro. C.C. Walker is useless. “Nothing less than an appeal to the ecclesias can separate between those who seek good and those who are hypocrites.”

Bro. G.F. Lake not long ago said, “The Christadelphian is hopeless,” yet today for the sake of peace ostensibly we have temporarily had to part company in a struggle for the whole Truth.

I today, then, am more than ever determined that in some way a testimony shall be borne against the drift that has set in, both in our community and in our “leading” magazine. There must be a rallying point for those who are willing to row against the stream of human tendencies.

Our appeal for help was, therefore, not in vain. Our prayers were answered, and I am happy to say that bro. F.G. Jannaway has consented to help me to carry on the work, and with his unflinching comradeship and long experience, to improve and build up our magazine.

We purpose publishing, as from January issue, "The Life Dr. Thomas," and to make special features of "Answers to Correspondents," "Exhortations by bro. Roberts and others," "Signs of the Times," "Visits to Bible Lands (illustrated)," inserting Ecclesial News from all over the world, continuing "The Bible wholly Inspired" series, and as soon as space permits, "Pages for the little ones."

Needless to say, as heretofore, the Editorial and Publishing work—now a very considerable task—will be a labour of love. We pay our way now, and give away any surplus that accrues in free copies. Any brother or sister who is out of employment or in poor circumstances can still, as aforetime, have a monthly copy free, and as our circulation grows we shall increase the size.

The yearly subscription, post free, to any part of the world is 5/- per annum. Ecclesial parcels supplied at 4d. per copy and carriage, nett.

All subscribing now for 1924 will receive free copies of the remaining numbers for 1923.

G.H.D.

Why Halt Ye?

Possibly this copy of the Berean Christadelphian (as it will henceforth be termed) is sent to you free to read, and then pass on to some other Christadelphian who is determined to know more of matters of vital importance to the brotherhood in the crisis through which it is passing.

To all with "eyes to see," it is manifest that, the at-one-time "OUR MAGAZINE" (the Christadelphian), has developed into an "Editor's Magazine," the chief aim of which is, to live at peace with all, even with adversaries of the Truth. The September issue is evidence: —

1. —On page 399; the editor is "glad" at receiving a testimonial of "friendly and appreciative feelings," from an occupant of "the cage of every unclean and hateful bird," as the Lord terms the Papacy.
2. —On page 401; we have a picture of the editor sinking differences with a Suffolk Street leader, with whom bro. Roberts wrote, "we can have no company while things are on a footing that does not allow it." Whose footing has changed? and Why?
3. —On page 404; is evidence that a Temperance Hall brother is right in saying, "only a shadow divides the Temperance Hall and Suffolk Street Meetings."
4. —On page 397; a serious endeavour is made to belittle the Apostle James' inspired statement that, "the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable."
5. —The Christadelphian, for more than a year past, has been deceiving innocent visitors to South Australia, by directing them to a brother in Adelaide who is in open fellowship with Bell and Ladson, the clean-flesh heresy advocates.
6. —In addition, every few months, the Fraternal Visitor reports marriages at "Suffolk Street," of Temperance Hall members, at which the religious service is conducted by those out of fellowship. If that is not fellowship what is? The only excuse offered by the Christadelphian, is, the fear of "a split"—p. 319-320.
7. —On page 420; Intelligence is inserted from Bexhill, although the fact has been communicated, that, the few in the town have seceded to the Suffolk Street Fellowship.

No wonder that brethren Bamford, Barker, Bonds, Boulton, Davis, Elston, Gamble, Hemingray, Hill, Lake, Madeley, Mead, Norris, Pitt, Smith, Thompson, Turner, Williams and others, should have written what they have, more of which has yet to see the light of day. Some of these

brethren have already shown the courage of their convictions, some are now doing so; others are “wobbling,” fearful of consequences; while others, claim to be “watching developments.” One, at least, has been playing a double game, claiming to be an admirer of the editorship of the Christadelphian; whereas, behind the scenes, there has been no more relentless critic, or more ardent advocate for another magazine.

Coming to the year before last; a budget of papers was sent to me concerning a “Proposed Magazine,” in view of, as bro. F.W. Turner described it, “the need for a decisive voice in these days; a clear lead on questions of difficulty in both doctrine and practice.” I was requested to attend a meeting of the proposers, and did so, because, like the three other brethren who met, I was surely coming to see, that, the Christadelphian had lost its savour. The other three present, besides bro. Turner and myself, were brethren W.H. Barker, W.H. Boulton, and G.F. Lake. At that meeting I suggested we stay our hands until we had again pleaded with brother C.C. Walker, and we deputed bro. Barker to make a strong appeal to the editor. A draft of that appeal was sent me by bro. Barker: it was equally as drastic as the letter of bro. Turner, quoted on page 23 of *Lest we Forget*; but, more honourable, as it was sent to the one concerned, and not to a third party.

The foregoing brings us to the fact that now the Christadelphian has failed us, we have to seek a means of communication. God appears to have provided such in the Berean Christadelphian; and, as bro. Denney has acted on the advice of Dr. Thomas to bro. Roberts in a similar situation, and sought advice from tried Christadelphians as to the future of his magazine, so that it shall be our magazine, from the subscribers’ point of view, I have after prayerful consideration, and consultation with tried brethren, consented to do my little in helping to make the magazine worthy of its name. The writings of Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts, of sixty to thirty years ago, are to have premier place every month, and your help and support are wanted; so, as soon as you have read this, sit down and fill in the order form, and then get other brethren to do likewise.

Just one more word: this is the first time I have advocated a magazine in lieu of the Christadelphian; for nearly fifty years I have stood by that magazine and its editors. With brother Walker I have personally been on the best of terms—we have been affectionate fellow-travellers at home and abroad—never a wry word, until his advocacy of non-combatant service, which many of us could see, and can see, would break down the wall of partition between Christadelphians and the World. We entirely disagree with the departure from the old Christadelphian policy, of entire separateness from the world—clerical, political, military, and social; and, so long as the Berean Christadelphian maintains that policy of separateness, we ask you to help forward its works.

1st. September, 1923.

F.G.J.

“Lest we Forget.”

Brother F.W. Turner, in an “answer” to this book, shuts his eyes to the evidence it contains from Birmingham and other places; and he labours to show, by isolated and garbled extracts from *Without the Camp*, that the editor of the Christadelphian did yeoman work during the Military Crisis; whereas the editor was a continual source of trouble to the “London Standing Committee,” and brother Turner well knows it. We advise him to read again what brethren Ford, Hill, Gamble, Barker, Boulton and Lake have to say on the matter, as well as his own damaging observations—see pp. 14-22 of *Lest we Forget*.

Brother Turner omits to tell his readers that, in editing my MS. of *Without the Camp*, he wrote respecting my comments on Birmingham in relation to the question of the R.A.M.C.:

“You are treading on delicate ground in reference to the non-combatant corps, R.A.M.C., etc. You raise the C.C.W. difficulty immediately. As I have said before, don’t say anything that will cause friction: the story of the deliverance is supreme evidence of the divine opinion in the

matter. I should confine myself to this. Hence I suggest you omit all within the square brackets ([]).” (10th October, 1916).

I regret now that I allowed brother Turner to leave out facts that were included in the original writing, so that “ten years hence” readers would not be burdened with the “friction” of bygone days.

Maybe brother Turner will remember writing a letter containing the following sentence: —

“It is a splendid case of a writer being EDITED. Hand it to Dr. Driver or Professor Cheyne and ask them to furnish a Polychrome edition in which the writer (W), the editor (E), and one or two other helpers or REDACTORS (R¹ and R²) are set forth in different colours, to say nothing of a copyist’s error or two. I guess they would find it difficult enough to say which parts were to be attributed to F.G.J. and which to F.W.T.”

I have to admit the error on p. 33 of Without the Camp, that Birmingham signed the London Petition. Birmingham did NOT sign it. How brother Turner could have been partner with me in making this mistake (for he undertook to correct my MS.), I cannot imagine; but for him to seek now to make capital out of it is petty.

As to “how a Committee born in November could prepare a Petition presented to Parliament in the previous February. —When, on p. 14 of Lest we Forget, I said “London Standing Committee,” I should have said “London Committee,” which was formed in 1913, and did prepare and carry through the Petition.

The mind of brother F.W. Turner upon the differences between the editor of the Christadelphian and the London Standing Committee, is shown in what he wrote me on October 2, 1917: —

“The Christadelphian has been conspicuous by the absence of the advice it has offered during the crisis through which we have passed.”

That is the verdict of brother F.W. Turner, the present defender of the editor of the Christadelphian.

Brother Turner quotes brother Norris. Let me also quote brother Norris in a matter far more vital. On August 7th, 1923, brother Norris wrote to brother C.C. Walker: —

“It is fully a month ago, I wrote asking, if in the event of Conscription, you would stand by and support our established attitude of non-participation in any form of Army Service, whether combatant or non-combatant, and I have received no reply

“Kindly excuse my having misgivings caused by receiving no reply, but your position and that of the Christadelphian now overshadow that of brother Davis. A clear unequivocal word from you can settle the question.”

No reply has come to this important question. Surely the delay is significant. This is the matter in which we and brethren everywhere are concerned. What is to be the attitude of brother C.C. Walker if another war breaks out, which may happen at any time? The explanation for the editor’s silence I have suggested in Lest we Forget. I still maintain the brotherhood has ground for concern over what his leading would be.

As to brother Turner’s past dissatisfaction with brother C.C. Walker and the Christadelphian: such is seen in his decided mind so recently as the year before last, when he was one of five brethren * assembled to consider the need for, and founding of a Christadelphian Magazine, “To uphold a Scriptural standard of practice on all questions.”

* The proposal to found another magazine did not come from Clapham, but from another ecclesia supported by brethren F.W. TURNER, W.H. BOULTON, and W.H. BARKER. The suggestions in brother Turner's own handwriting are now before me.

In conclusion, let us ask a few questions bearing upon brother Turner's profession of grateful satisfaction with the Christadelphian since the editor, in 1915, consented to undertake certain clerical work in connection with the London Petition: —

Who was it the following year (on June 26, 1916), wrote, complaining of an article in the Christadelphian which suggested that the "Non-Combatant Corps" was "the divinely appointed way out," and bitterly lamenting that such "should come from our recognised mouthpiece"? — It was brother F.W. TURNER.

Who was it more than two years afterwards (on October 2, 1917) wrote, "the 'CHRISTADELPHIAN' has been conspicuous by the absence of the advice it has offered during the Crisis through which we have passed"? — It was brother F. W. TURNER.

Who was it nearly four years later (June 12, 1921) wrote, "There is need for a decisive voice in these days; a clear lead on questions of difficulty in both doctrine and practice"? — It was brother F. W. TURNER

The other points raised in brother Turner's circular are fully dealt with in Birmingham Trouble, 1917-1923, a supply of which was sent to every known ecclesia, but which, in many cases, have been withheld from the members. Send addressed wrapper for a copy to F.J. BUTTON, 22 Stockwell Park Crescent, London, S.W.9., and he will attend to same.

"The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy."

Sincerely yours,

F. G. JANNAWAY.

August 29, 1923.

P.S.—As to "Clause 7," the explanation of the framer was accepted to mean service outside the Army, but when we found it was used by prominent brethren to include work in the Army, such as R.A.M.C., then the Clause became infamous in the eyes of all who were determined to be outside the Army.

"A Review of recent Ecclesial Trouble."

A pamphlet, by brother I. Collyer, with the above title has been widely circulated during the past few weeks. It is described as "an attempt in the direction of peace and reason," but actually it is an attempt to "whitewash" those who have publicly admitted that they have withheld fellowship from brethren, while at the same time admitting that there is no Scriptural doctrine involved. It is deplorable that any man should embark on such a venture, and it is not surprising that the attempt should be characterised by special pleading, half truths, and omissions of material facts which are unfavourable to the author's views.

There is a time for peace and a time for war, and it has yet to be proved that this is a time for peace; on the contrary we are living in the "perilous times" foretold by the Apostle, when certain are "resisting the Truth," and with whom all faithful men will "earnestly contend."

Further, when disobedience to the Scriptures is being advocated, it is usually done under cover of an appeal to "reason," and what is described as the "Golden Rule."

The author of the pamphlet seems to think that if only “controversy” were discontinued, all would be well. It is a fallacy. There is no controversy among corpses, but there is certainly no life, except such as springs from corruption. Let it be proved that the corruption evidenced by the Temperance Hall Ecclesia’s own documents no longer exists, and the “clouds of destructive controversy will roll away like an ugly nightmare.”

The writer of the pamphlet says he has “heard all sides of this matter.” Bro. Viner Hall declares that the John Bright Street brethren’s “side” of the matter has never been examined by him. Therefore we are not surprised to read that “after living in Birmingham for three years, after conversing with all sides, and reading all that came to hand, including a good deal of matter to which the London brethren have not had access,” * he “would not venture to pass judgment as to whether the original separation and withdrawal were justified.” # Any average man who knew the teaching of the Scriptures and the facts of the case, would not be in this position; and his confession suggests (putting the matter charitably) that our author’s investigation has not been as yet so thorough as is represented.

* How does he know what the London brethren have or have not had access to? Further, if the Temperance Hall brethren have deliberately suppressed “a good deal of matter” bearing on the trouble, why have they done it? “Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.”

We note here an inconsistency with a later part of the pamphlet (pp. 7-8), where, referring to the separated brethren’s requiring a statement that they have been in the right and Temperance Hall wrong, the author says, “which I, for one, do not believe to be true.”

The pamphlet gives what are called “a few perfectly clear facts.” Among these “facts” we are told that “a most important fact to remember” is that there “was nothing in the settled convictions of the speakers (A.D. and T.E.P.) to warrant the extreme of cutting off. That the brethren of the John Bright Street came to recognise this fact is proved by their seeking to resume fellowship.” The fact is omitted that the John Bright Street brethren were not willing to resume fellowship till they had received what they understood to be an assurance that these brethren had abandoned their false views. If it were omitted purposely a “false balance” was used, but if it was omitted because it was not known to the writer, what becomes of his claim to have “heard all sides”?

In 1922 the author of the pamphlet urged the Temperance Hall authorities to withdraw all barriers to fellowshiping the minority. Did he do this because he believed that the ecclesia had acted unscripturally in disfellowshipping them, or was he urging that fellowship should be extended to brethren who had been withdrawn from scripturally? The answer is that he did not know which side was right, but that “for the sake of peace” he was willing to urge something without knowing whether or not it was in harmony with the Scriptures. He tells us “I am not biased in favour of Temperance Hall,” and doubtless believes this to be true, but the value of the assertion can be estimated by a comparison of the following statements: —

Bro. Collyer in a letter written August 20th, 1922 (when the event was fresh in his mind): —

“It has been a heart-breaking experience for those who have been labouring for peace to have all their work ruined by provocative speech or writing just when success seemed at hand. Both sides have been at fault in this.”

Bro. Collyer in “A Review,” etc., April 19th, 1923: —

“We had the heart-breaking experience of seeing success practically achieved, and then everything spoiled at the last moment through the effect of provocative action from the other side. After this the brethren of the Temperance Hall were unprepared to remove all barriers.”

Can anyone say that this is not a “false balance”?

We are told on page 7 of the Review that “justice compels a recognition of the fact that they (Temperance Hall) have made more advance in the direction of peace than the brethren of John Bright Street.” This statement is as utterly untrue as any statement could be. Anyone who has really examined the evidence on both sides will realise this. The John Bright Street brethren had made four previous attempts at reconciliation, all of which were callously and unscripturally rejected by Temperance Hall. Those attempts were as follows: —

- 1st. —25/9/19. Printed in One Master, p. 29.
- 2nd. —4/1/20. Printed in One Master, p. 40.
- 3rd. —1/2/20 Printed in One Master, p. 45.
- 4th. —11/11/20. Unpublished.

To suppress these facts and to pretend that the John Bright Street brethren were to blame for not meeting the Temperance Hall representatives, when they repeatedly expressed their willingness to do so, is as flagrant a case of the use of the “false balance” as could well be imagined. “Nations at war vilify each other, they exaggerate the faults of the enemy and suppress any facts that may redound to his credit. In controversy, the unenlightened man is no better, and his persistent use of the false balance is truly an abomination”—A Review, etc., p.3.

The pamphlet suggests on pp 7 and 8 that the Ilford brethren would be unable to answer a charge of inconsistency in withdrawing from all who fellowship Temperance Hall, but on p. 13 we find the following statement, “the Ilford resolution is the only logical end.” Perhaps the writer of the pamphlet is not altogether free from inconsistency. He says, “I cannot see the faintest reason for supposing it is disorderly walk to refuse support to the Ilford resolution.” Why should the spiritual blindness of one brother, or of 1,300 brethren and sisters, be sufficient grounds for disobedience to God on the part of those who can see? Could Laodicea see the faintest reason for supposing that it was not in a perfectly satisfactory condition? Shall we accept the offer of guidance of one who admits that he cannot see the reason for a position which is demonstrably Scriptural, a guide who tells us (p. 8) that he does “not presume to judge whether the words and conduct of the separated brethren amounted to disorderly walk,” while on the same page he calls them a “recalcitrant minority.” That is to say he cannot show where they can be condemned from the Scriptures, but is prepared to throw mud at them, perhaps to show that he is not biased in favour of Temperance Hall! And then, merely on the basis of an unprovable suggestion of his own he says, “It is difficult, therefore, to see how the sin of ‘rebellion’ can even be supposed to be proved.” This confession of blindness is presumably an appeal to reason!

Then follows a reference to the accusation of idolatry made against the Temperance Hall, which one can only call a deliberate misrepresentation. It shows the pitiable straits to which the apologists of Temperance Hall are reduced when a man of Islip Collyer’s intelligence is compelled to resort to such a subterfuge. The Ilford brethren accuse the Temperance Hall brethren of idolatry because they (Temperance Hall) regard the “constitutional issue” as of supreme importance. Something other than the Word of God has been put in the first place and used to justify disobedience to that Word. This is idolatry. There is nothing so shocking to conventional minds as the naked truth. And this accusation is whittled down to “the importance they attach to the constitution.” Again we are reminded of false balances.

On page 10 the trouble is referred to as “this local misunderstanding of different temperaments.” If this is all it is, the Temperance Hall Ecclesia has been guilty of refusing fellowship to a number of Christ’s brethren (and therefore to Christ himself) on a mere matter of “different temperaments.” And yet the sin of rebellion cannot “even be supposed to be proved.”

Towards the end of the pamphlet an attempt is made to “whitewash” A. Davis. We are told that “no charge can be brought (against him) except that he would not go so far as others in cutting off from fellowship certain offenders. There is no question of principle.” And yet, only about eight months before, the author of the Review wrote as follows: —

“So far as I am aware none of the prominent brethren here (Birmingham) have ever attempted to justify the speeches of which complaint is made.” . . . “All agreed, I understand, that wrong and challenging statements had been made.”

Oh, that false balance!

And in this connection let us not forget that bro. F.G. Ford, NEARLY TWO YEARS AFTER THE SPEECHES HAD BEEN MADE, and after all the discussion which had taken place, stated at the ecclesial business meeting that “if the views of brethren Davis and Pearce are followed, I could foresee the city being policed by brethren.”

The statement signed by A. Davis does not help matters. What the brethren desire to know is, Does he believe it is a sin to join the forces of the State? And if so, will he actively support withdrawal from those who join, and from those who are willing to fellowship such—regardless of the views of the majority of the ecclesia to which he belongs? When these questions are answered in the affirmative by A. Davis and his supporters we shall have made some progress in “removing the canker,” but even then, “the constitutional issue” would still remain to be dealt with. So long as the Temperance Hall Ecclesia clings to the God-dishonouring views advocated in the pamphlet Ecclesial Relationships, so long will it be impossible for faithful brethren to fellowship them. They have been guilty of persistent disobedience to God, and, like the Scribes and Pharisees, they attempt to justify their sin by the “Canon Law” which they have promulgated.

Our prayer is that they may be enabled to anoint their eyes with eyesalve that they may see.

Ilford.

W. H. TRAPP.

The “Strickler” Heresy.

On this subject we have received a budget of correspondence, including copies of that which the brethren in America have had the editor of the Christadelphian, making manifest that he is not prepared to cut the cables with those in fellowship who do not unreservedly accept our recognised Basis of Faith. What strikes us most is the fact that such an ecclesia as North London which passes ecclesial resolutions on the matter concerning individuals, should continue in fellowship with the Birmingham Ecclesia, whose mouthpiece (the Christadelphian) tacitly condemns the stand taken by North London.

The Los Angeles Ecclesia (the largest and most representative ecclesia in the U.S.A.) has, through its recording brother (bro. Edgar Round) now sent the following letter to the editor of the Christadelphian, but brother Walker will not publish it: —

July, 1923.

Dear Brother Walker, —Greeting. As those who are partakers with you in the glorious privileges, and the grave responsibilities of, the Truth of the Gospel in these last days of Gentile ascendancy, we desire to be duly mindful of the Apostolic warning in regard to all tendencies toward departure from the Faith once delivered to the Saints, and, in view of the perilous times that now obtain, it behoves all those whose burning desire is to be at all times on the Lord’s side, to look carefully to the sure foundations.

In the history of the Truth’s warfare it is evident that its greatest enemies have been those, who from within have sought to undermine the bulwarks. Some of those who have been most determined to affect such purposes, were open and frank in declaring themselves in opposition to what we believe to be fundamental principles of Faith; but a bold and determined stand on the part of those faithful pioneers, whose hearts were strong in the Lord, was, in the providence of God, successful in causing error and its advocates to be made manifest, hence separation from them because effectual.

It is a matter of Apostolic injunction that we withdraw from those who advocate error in doctrine—2 John 9-10; Titus 3: 10, and it is a duty which no true Christadelphian will shirk, however much sorrow may result from fulfilling it. In most cases where this painful duty has been necessary, the issue was clear, because those who assailed our foundation principles did so in unequivocal terms, by openly declaring themselves opposed to our Statement of Faith, and desired to have it changed to embrace the new tenets.

Times and seasons have changed, however, and in the latest assault upon the Truth's sure foundations, which has emanated from brother A.D. Strickler, of Buffalo, N.Y., in his pamphlet *Out of Darkness into Light*, a more insidious presentation of error is evinced, for while claiming allegiance to the Birmingham (Amended) Statement of Faith, he advocates error in relation to the atoning sacrifice of Christ, as shown on the enclosed copy of a Declaration of Christadelphian Ecclesias of the United States and Canada, repudiating current heresies regarding the Atoning Sacrifice of Christ."

The persistent determination of the author in disseminating these pernicious heresies is illustrated by the following extracts from an 8-page printed letter to a brother dated September 15th, 1921, viz.: —

"It is taking hold of the brethren in England, and there is rejoicing because of deliverance from darkness. I have sent my pamphlets to a lot of the leading lecturing brethren in London and other towns in England. We think no action is necessary at the present time, only as I say above, continue to bear testimony."

That the mind of the author has not changed up to the present is evident from statements made by him to representative brethren at a recent interview: —

"He (bro. Strickler) frankly admitted that he was wholly opposed to the teaching of Dr. Thomas on the 'Constitution of Sin,' as set forth in *Elpis Israel*, pages 113-115."

"When asked if he would withdraw his pamphlet from circulation, as a step toward reconciliation with the household of faith, he absolutely and consistently refused, claiming that his books contained the real light of God's Truth, sent out for the purpose of dispelling Christadelphian darkness."

The brethren and sisters of the Los Angeles Ecclesia, meeting at Benevolence Hall, Foresters' Building, unite with the principal ecclesias of the United States and Canada in repudiating the heresies of bro. Strickler, and will not fellowship any who teach, hold, countenance, or fellowship those who hold them, and in consequence of having taken this stand it is our desire to know if the Christadelphian Magazine, in harmony with its life-long policy, will refuse to give its support or countenance to those who fail to maintain inviolate the priceless heritage of God's saving Truth. The Magazine has throughout its existence proved a tower of strength to the faithful of Christ's flock, and the various articles which have appeared in its pages during the past two or three years, shows that it still maintains the Truth in relation to the doctrine of the One perfect Sacrifice for Sin. These articles clearly indicate that no place can be found for bro. Strickler's teaching amongst those who hold fast to the Birmingham (Amended) Basis.

For this reason it is our desire to clear the anomalous position that now obtains, wherein intelligence from ecclesias who countenance and fellowship these errors, appear in the same columns of the Magazine with ecclesias who take a determined stand against them and will have none of them.

In the onerous yet honourable position you occupy as Editor of that Magazine whose privilege it is to continue the noble work of Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts in maintaining the purity of that Truth, which God in His mercy saw fit to revive in these last days, we believe you cannot do other than support the position taken by this ecclesia, together with about forty others on this continent.

It is, therefore, our ardent hope that by receiving your support in a determined stand against this insidious presentation of error, we all together may be blessed in our endeavours to counteract the poisonous effects of this latest propaganda of heresy in the household ere it takes firm root, and bears fruit to the defection of many.

Examination of the documents we enclose will enable you to see what has been done by this ecclesia in its endeavours to be assured who the ecclesias are, who not only in word but also in deed, uphold and maintain the Birmingham (Amended) Statement of Faith in its entirety.

We thank God and take courage that even in the midst of all corruption and confusion of these perilous times, there will be a remnant found walking worthily and holding fast the simple saving elements of the One Faith when the Lord returns in power and glory.

May we be amongst that remnant is the hope and prayer of your fellow-pilgrims to the realms of Light.

THE CHRISTADELPHIAN ECCLESIA OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA.
EDGAR ROUND, Recording Brother.

P.S.—Copies of this letter, together with the Declaration, have been mailed to the Ecclesias of Britain, Australia, and New Zealand.

A LIST OF ECCLESIAS

who have taken a definite stand regarding fellowship of the heresies promulgated in the pamphlet “Out of Darkness into Light,” and have signified their willingness to support a Declaration to that effect.

No.	Ecclesia	Rec. Brother.	Address.
1.	Los Angeles	Edgar Round,	2028 La France Ave., So. Pasadena, Cal.
2.	Pomona	B.A. Warrender,	650 Grigsby Court, Pomona, Cal.
3.	Yucaipa	A. Walton,	Yucaipa, Cal., R.R. 1, Box 57.
4.	San Diego	J. Parker,	La Jolla, Cal. Box 53.
5.	Tacoma	W.H. Requa,	1172 So. 57 th St., Tacoma, Wash.
6.	Portland	Geo. H. Tilling,	96 E. 63 rd St., Portland Ore.
7.	Vancouver	W.W. Marshall,	1673 22 nd Ave. East, Vancouver, B.C.
8.	Victoria, B.C.	L. Bone,	2540 Roseberry Ave., Victoria, B.C.
9.	Onaway	W.G. Crawford,	Onaway, Alberta, Canada.
10.	Richard	T.W. Jones,	Richard, Sask., Canada
11.	London	W.D. Gwalchmai,	18 May Street, London, Ont., Canada.
12.	St. Catherine	W. Birch,	14 Canal Street, St. Catherine Hgts., Ont. Canada.
13.	Bracebridge	Ed. Nicholson,	Bracebridge, Ont., Canada.
14.	Brantford	W.J. Livermore,	23 Edward St., Brantford, Ont., Canada
15.	Toronto	Arthur Emeny,	263 Monarch Park Ave., Toronto, Canada.
16.	Hamilton	E. Allwood,	7 High St., Hamilton, Ont., Canada
17.	Montreal	J.V. Richmond,	701 Wellington Street, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
18.	St. Johns, N.B.	A.D. Duncan,	38 Charlotte St., St. Johns, N.B., Canada
19.	Moncton, N.B.	T. Townsend,	11 McAdam Street, Moncton, N.B., Canada.
20.	Worcester	J.H. Bissell,	25 Caro Street, Worcester, Mass.
21.	Jersey City	S.L. Van Akin,	80 Elliott Ave., Yonkers, N.Y.
22.	Newark	W.P. Brittle,	360 Wyoming Ave., Maplewood, N.J.
23.	Elizabeth	E.G. Twelves,	908 Grove St., Elizabeth, N.J.
24.	Buffalo	L.P. Robinson,	Ebenezer, N.Y. Box 153.
25.	Avoca	W.E. Jones,	Glendale, Avoca, Penn.
26.	Lakewood	Wm. Shaw,	1625 Wyandotte Ave., Lakewood, Ohio.
27.	Canton	P. Phillips,	943 Young Ave., N.E., Canton, Ohio.
28.	Lansing	A.P. Ruthen,	Lansing, Ohio. Box 128.
29.	Jasonville	Wm. Bickel,	Seventh Day Advent Hall, Jasonville, Ohio.

No.	Ecclesia	Rec. Brother.	Address.
30.	Detroit	Thos. Shaw,	4522 Belvedere St., Detroit, Mich.
31.	Chicago	A. McDonald,	5930 West Erie St., Austin, Ill.
32.	Denver	P. Dixon,	316 Irvington Place, Denver, Colo.
33.	Robert Lee	J.K. Magill,	Robert Lee, Texas.
34.	Seattle	H. Dugdale,	4022 Stevens Street, Seattle, Wash.
35.	Zanesville	J.P. Philips,	1520 Euclid Av., Zanesville, Ohio.
36.	Guelph	J. Hawkins,	9 Elizabeth St., Guelph, Ont.
37.	Hatfield Point	Jas. S. Ricketson,	Hatfield Point, Kings Co., N.B.
38.	Halifax, N.S.	Pauline Drysdale,	19 Yale St., Halifax, N.S.
39.	Scranton, Pa.	Thos. J. Llewellyn,	Smith Building, Mill Street, Peckville, Pa.
40.	Winnipeg	Wm. J. Turner,	108 Home St., Winnipeg, Canada.
41.	Hawley, Pa.	P.G. Cooper,	Hawley, Pa.
42.	Albany, N.Y.	A. MacKay,	142 Colony Street, Albany, N.Y.
43.	Lethbridge	J. Roper,	Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada.

We assure these brethren of our own hearty support and sympathy. Whatever the Christadelphian may do, we shall restrict our fellowship to those who have taken this definite stand.

EDITOR.

The J. Bell “Clean Flesh” Heresy.

We have given much space during the last two years to articles by bro. Fry and bro. Lake dealing in detail with this recrudescence of a bad old heresy.

This year, however, on bro. Atkinson’s initiative, we demonstrated how Bro. C.C. Walker actively instigated fellowship being extended to those who held this false doctrine.

We specifically instanced sister Minnie Adams, once of Crewe, now of Keswick, Perth, West Australia, who, while visiting this country last year, was given a special recommendation from Birmingham. The Crewe ecclesia defended her in our columns. This sister has now written us personally, and any brother who desires her complete letter can have a copy. We do not intend to give space to false teaching.

But to show the culpability of bro. C.C. Walker, we give certain extracts from her letter. “For many years I am sorry to say I was numbered among those who condemned bro. Bell.” “However, it became my pleasure to meet him in person, and I had to admit that I had misjudged him and his teaching. If my own chance of the Kingdom was as good as bro. Bell’s, I should feel happy.” Re bro. Bell’s “band.” “It is no more his than that of any other brother in the meeting. Would that we had a few more bands!”

She then enters upon a warm defence of bro. Bell, and finally says, “To separate the wheat from the tares is none of our business . . . it is expressly the work of the angels.” “If we try to pull up the tares now we shall pull up the wheat also.” “This is what is happening at present.”

“We in Perth recognise no man-made basis, whether amended or otherwise.” “May God fill our hearts with charity and love which covereth a multitude of sins.” “Leave it all to Him who knoweth best.”

This open advocacy of fellowship with bro. Bell, and this defence of his teaching meets with bro. Walker’s approval. Can we wonder that he defends bro. Davis? Once again we say: The disease is there—these are but symptoms—and any brother or sister who does not protest against this wickedness in the only effective way is a “traitor” to the Truth—2 Timothy 3: 3.

EDITOR.

“Fictions in Birmingham Frictions.”

Our readers will be interested to learn that in the next issue of the Berean Christadelphian will appear (D.V.) the first of a series of articles on Birmingham Fictions by bro. J.M. Evans, of London (Clapham).

Correspondence.

Correspondence for insertion in the current month must reach the Editor by the 25th of the month. Please write distinctly, and on one side of the paper only. Each letter must not exceed 200 words, or it will be liable to curtailment.

* * *

To the Editor of The Berean.

“LEST WE FORGET.”

Dear Bro. Denney, —In the pamphlet which is being circulated by bro. F.W. Turner as an “answer to bro. F.G. Jannaway’s Lest we Forget,” on page 7 I am accused of wickedness in these words, “—as wicked as that made by another of the supporters of the resolution of withdrawal against the Temperance Hall Ecclesia (bro. C.F. Ford, of Clapham), during the Essex Hall Meetings in London, to the effect that those who spoke against the resolution would be found, in the event of the outbreak of war ‘running round to 99 Stockwell Park Road and begging bro. Jannaway to get them exemption!’”

Inverted commas are used to imply an exact quotation. I was referring to the words of some of bro. Turner’s supporters, “Now is the time to get rid of the Jannaway influence,” and what I actually said was, “Where should we be if another war came? I know where some would be, —in the neighbourhood of 99 Stockwell Park Road, to see if any Jannaway influence was available.”

Compare these words with bro. Turner’s quotation, and you have an example of the misstatements and distortion of facts—the incurable sloppiness of the arguments of bro. Turner and his friends.

A “wicked” suggestion is a sinful suggestion. The dictionary defines wicked as “a deviation from the divine law.” I leave it to your readers to judge whether my words were untrue, and whether they merited this terrible condemnation.

But bro. Turner puts words in my mouth I did not use, and then consigns me to outer darkness (for most surely none who are wicked will be accepted by Christ).

And this is the brother who exhorts (pp. 9-10), “judge not;” “Charity . . . is kind;” “follow after the things which make for peace.”

On p. 3, bro. Turner says (in italics), “they (the Clapham Presiding and Managing Brethren) broke bread at Clapham on the very day following their hearing of the speech, with the author of that speech, and with brethren C.C. Walker and J.F. Smith.” In his speech at the Essex Hall, bro. Turner singled me out by name as having broken bread with bro. Davis at Clapham on the day following the Cosmo Hotel Meeting, and either he or one of his supporters publicly accused me of “selling the Truth” in doing so.

Had bro. Turner taken the slightest trouble to verify his “facts” he would have found I did not and never have broken bread with bro. Davis. On the Sunday following the Cosmo Hotel Meeting I was not at Clapham. I broke bread at Reading.

But had I been in London I should have broken bread at Clapham with bro. Davis, although I condemned his speech. My view is that before withdrawing from a brother he should be remonstrated with, his error pointed out to him, and time given him to repent.

Bro. Turner’s view appears to be that he ought to be withdrawn from immediately “on the very day following” [Birmingham’s automatic unscriptural withdrawal. —ED.].

Bro. Turner’s evidence produced “by the Birmingham Brethren” on p.2 is incomplete. Why does he not add, (e) But these speeches have not been withdrawn (ditto p. 46 (e), and they are approved by the Temperance Hall Ecclesia (ditto pp. 44-45).

With love in the Truth’s service,
Faithfully your brother in the narrow way,

C.F. FORD.

* * *

THE PRESENT CRISIS AND SIDE ISSUES.

(Copy of a letter addressed to the editor of the “Christadelphian”).

Dear Brother Walker. —Thanks for inserting bro. Fry’s letter as it enables me more widely to clear away side issues.

1. —Yes; we have a constable at Clapham, and it is not due to any virtue on the part of your Brixton colleagues that he is not in your fellowship. He was baptised after a satisfactory interview on the lines laid down in the Christadelphian, for fifty years past; but, as we now learn that he can be free, we have requested him to obtain his freedom—1 Corinthians 7: 21; and in the event of him not taking the necessary steps to that end, his case will be dealt with at the next business meeting of the ecclesia.
2. —It is not true that I go to law to recover debts by legal coercion. Many years ago, when I retired from business, I wiped out every debt (scores of them), rather than resort to legal coercion.
3. —Respecting the Strickler heresy: brother Fry says he has “proved from personal investigation, that, this is a mere bogey.” So much the worse for brother Fry’s ability to investigate. Forty-three ecclesias, who are, as it were, on the spot in Canada and the States, declare otherwise, and have withdrawn their fellowship from brethren Strickler and Company. That is quite in keeping with the contention of bro. Strickler himself, that his Basis is not the same as our Basis, in that his cleavage with Dr. Thomas is on the “Constitution of Sin”—see page 290 Berean.

But, after all, these three points are but part of a manifest device to divert the attention of the brotherhood from the real issue in the present crisis by mere side issues or personal matters. It won’t do.

Faithfully your brother,

September, 7th, 1923.

FRANK G. JANNAWAY.

Answers to Correspondence.

(For which in the main we are indebted to our beloved forerunners, Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts).

IMMORTALITY AFTER JUDGMENT.

A.T.—The change of the saints' bodily state is after they are judged, and before "judgment is given to them under the whole heaven." In this bodily change they ascend from that which is (call it nature, or what else) when it comes out of Sheol or Hades "to the Father," or to that which is to be, as in the example of Jesus. This the Father becomes in relation to what shall be in the words of Christ to Mary, "My Father and your Father, my Deity and your Deity"—God or Power. This changing from the bodily state, which is "a little lower than the angels," to equality with them, is the writing upon them the name of the Spirit's God, the New Name—Revelation 3: 12. This ascension transpires when the resurrected and approved are corporally quickened "in the twinkling of an eye," when "this corruptible puts on incorruption, and this mortal puts on immortality."

* * *

"VINDICTIVE PSALMS."

The Psalms of David suffer much in prose and verse by a practice followed by translators of rendering the Hebrew future by the imperative mood. One or two instances will suffice to exemplify the false ideas thus created and fostered. In the 69th Psalm, the Authorised Version gives the 27th and 28th verses as follows: "Add iniquity unto their iniquity; and let them not come into Thy righteousness. Let them be blotted out of the book of the living and not be written with the righteous." Now, these words are construed by the ignorant into expressions of vindictiveness; and certainly, as the words stand, there is an apparent ground for the charge: but when the proper grammar is supplied, the difficulty is at once removed. The word "let" should in every instance be read "shall" or "will;" and the Psalm is then converted into a song of warning from the Spirit to all who read it of the unchangeable principles on which the Deity acts: thus, verse 22, "Let their table become a snare," etc., out to read, "Their table shall become a snare," etc. Verse 23, "Let their eyes be darkened," etc.—"Their eyes shall be darkened," etc. Verse 24, "Pour out Thine indignation," etc.—"Thou shalt pour," etc. Verse 25, "Let their habitation be desolate," etc.—"Their habitation shall be desolate," etc.

* * *

THE UNDYING WORM.

J.E.—Mark 9: 46. Eternal torments derive no countenance from this passage. The undying worm, and the unquenchable fire, are rather to be interpreted as symbolical expressions of the opposite doctrine. The worm is an agent of corruption, ending in death and annihilation. Fire is a means to the same end, but by a more summary process. When, therefore, they are said to be unarrestable in their action, it must be taken to indicate that destruction will be accomplished without remedy. The expressions cannot mean immortal worms, and absolutely inextinguishable fire. A limited sense to an apparently absolute expression is frequently used throughout the Scriptures. In Jeremiah 7: 20 Jehovah says His anger should be poured out upon Jerusalem, and "should burn and should not be quenched." He also says in Jeremiah 17: 27, "I will kindle a fire in the gates of Jerusalem, and it shall burn the palaces thereof, and it shall not be quenched." This did not mean that the fire, with reference to itself, should never go out, but that in relation to the object of its operation, it should not be quenched till the operation was accomplished. A fire was kindled in Jerusalem, and only went out when Jerusalem was burnt to the ground. So also God's anger burned against Israel, until it burnt them out of the land driving them out of His sight, but Isaiah speaks of a time when God's anger will cease in the destruction of the enemy—chapter 10: 25. So the worm that preys upon the wicked will disappear from the face of the earth when the last enemy, death, is destroyed, and the fire that consumes their corrupt remains will die with the fuel it feeds on; but in relation to the wicked themselves, the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

THE PETITION FOR EXEMPTION FROM MILITARY SERVICE.

C.B.—The Two Christadelphian Petitions for Exemption from Military Service—for there were two prepared. (1) By bre. C.C. Walker and Dr. Young, of Cambridge, which included the famous “Clause 7.” This Petition was signed by the Birmingham Ecclesia but was shelved. (2) The Petition of the “London Standing Committee,” which the Birmingham Ecclesia did not sign; and consequently the only Petition which was presented to Parliament did not contain the seal or signature of the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia. The apparent contrary statements in Without the Camp are fully dealt with elsewhere in our pages, and clearly show the unwisdom of “toning down facts” even with the best of intentions. (The evidence for this answer will be found in the Christadelphian, 1914, pages 422, 470; and 1915, p. 33.) The only reason the editor of the Christadelphian gave for assisting the “London Standing Committee” with “Our Petition” is stated by him to be “expediency” not principle (Christadelphian, 1914, p. 470).

(We intend making these “Answers to Correspondents” a feature of our Magazine, but will ask correspondents to have patience until their questions are reached. —EDITOR.)

Ecclesial News.

Intelligence in this magazine is confined to those ecclesias in the United Kingdom that restrict their fellowship to those who unreservedly accept the Recognised Basis of Faith, currently known as the “Birmingham (Amended) Statement of Faith,” and are therefore standing aside from the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia until that ecclesia openly deals with those of its members who do not unreservedly accept such Basis.

As to Australia and New Zealand: Intelligence cannot be inserted from any ecclesia tolerating those who hold the “clean flesh” theories of brethren J. Bell and H. G. Ladson.

As to the United States and Canada: Intelligence will be only inserted from those ecclesias which have refused to give fellowship to those who tolerate the false doctrines of brother A. D. Strickler.

All Intelligence intended for insertion in the following month must be in our hands by the 25th of the previous month.

ARDROSSAN. —Lesser Town Hall. Breaking of Bread, 11.15 a.m. At a special meeting of the ecclesia, held on 12th August, 1923, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the ecclesia: —“That the ecclesia withdraw from the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia, and all who fellowship them in their error, until sufficient evidence is forthcoming that they have adopted a Scriptural attitude in this matter (The Birmingham Trouble), the cause of our withdrawal being as follows: —(1) Their unscriptural withdrawal from the John Bright Street ecclesia; (2) Their toleration of views contrary to the commandments of Christ; (3) The ecclesia allowing the arranging brethren to overrule their decision not to disfellowship the John Bright Street ecclesia; (4) The refusal of the arranging brethren to allow the speeches of brethren Pearce and Davis to be published so that all ecclesias may see whether the speeches were Scriptural or not; (5) For their attitude in regard to the Blackheath ecclesia; (6) The speeches of brethren White and Jannaway, in the pamphlet entitled The Birmingham Trouble, 1917-1923, abundantly prove that the Temperance Hall ecclesia have erred, and that they do not intend to repent of the grave mistakes they have made in this matter.” —JOHN HOLLAND, Rec. Bro.

CROYDON. —Gymnasium Hall, 117b High Street. At a series of special meetings held in June and July, 1923, in connection with the Birmingham trouble, the following proposition was placed before the Croydon (Ruskin House) ecclesia: —“That (a) We re-affirm our belief that the commandments of Christ require that his brethren and sisters should abstain from the joining of any State forces, such as

Military, Naval, Air, or Police; and (b) That any who so violate the commandments of Christ should, in the absence of repentance, be withdrawn from in the way prescribed by Christ—Matthew 18: 15-18; and (c) That we declare propositions (a) and (b) to be our definite grounds of fellowship regarding the Birmingham dispute—1917-1923; and (d) That whereas there are those in the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) ecclesia, as established by printed evidence, who are not prepared to make a definite stand and ground for fellowship, the joining of certain sections of the Army and Police Forces, whether under conscription or otherwise, we put into operation propositions (a), (b), and (c), and withhold fellowship from the brethren and sisters of the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) ecclesia, and all other brethren and sisters who have not and do not take the same definite stand.” The printed evidence referred to in the proposition was adduced at these meetings, and in the opinion of the undermentioned brethren and sisters this evidence was not disproved. After considerable discussion the majority of the Croydon (Ruskin House) ecclesia voted against the proposition, and consequently those left in the minority (names below) have been compelled, in faithfulness to Christ, to sorrowfully withdraw from the Croydon (Ruskin House) ecclesia, and also from all those continuing in fellowship with the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) ecclesia; and the said brethren and sisters further declare their intention of extending fellowship to the members of the John Bright Street ecclesia (whom they consider have adopted a faithful attitude in regard to military and constabulary service), and to all brethren and sisters who take the same stand. (Signed) A. J. RAMUS, Secretary, Croydon (Gymnasium Hall) Ecclesia. Signatories to the Proposition: —Brethren A.J. Ramus, E.F. Ramus, S.R. Ramus, W.J. Ramus, E. Revis, W.W. Roffey, M. Smith, J.S. Trapp; Sisters H. Brighton, E. Maplestone, E.F. Ramus, M.A. Ramus, M.A. Ramus, N. Ramus, W.J. Ramus, E.M.P. Revis, E. Revis, A. Roffey, F. Smith, J. Trapp, M.C. Trapp.

HEANOR. —The following letter has been sent to the majority meeting here: —“You are aware that an endeavour has been made by members of your ecclesia to obtain for full discussion of the Birmingham trouble. A special meeting was convened at the requisition of five brethren and sisters, at which a resolution was put before you by the arranging brethren, which brother A. Bowles sought to amend, but which you passed. In the midst of disorder, in the introducing of other business at a meeting called for the express purpose of considering the Birmingham trouble, and by the unconstitutional procedure, which resulted in a closure after the resolution and amendment had been put to the meeting, brother Bowles was allowed no opportunity to address you. This attitude is quite in keeping with the dictum of the arranging brethren which forms part of their resolution: —“The arranging brethren are unanimously agreed that no local brother or sister can form a sound judgment with regard to the present dispute.” Comment on the foregoing seems useless, but we are prepared to reason with you, and therefore invite your attention to the following: —(1) How can we maintain our separateness in Christ if we wink at the unscriptural and untruthful actions of ecclesias with whom we are in fellowship? (2) A lower standard in matters of doctrine and fellowship is gratifying to the flesh, but we have not so learned Christ, whose spirit must be in us, else we are none of his. (3) We need to be on our guard against the subtleties of error, lest we fall from our own steadfastness. (4) Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia, while professing diligence to Christ’s command, ‘Resist not evil,’ retains in fellowship a brother who would not uphold the ecclesial Constitution by withdrawing from any brother who joined the constabulary. However, this brother could support the ecclesia in casting out a faithful minority who protested against this unscriptural attitude. The Temperance Hall ecclesia still maintains this withdrawal, which is without justification, and aggravates the matter by putting what is called the ‘Constitutional issue’ before the Scriptural issue in their pamphlet Ecclesial Relationships. (5) Our loyalty to the Truth compels us to use all our power in its defence, and while desiring to exercise charity and forbearance, we are equally bound by the command to disassociate ourselves from all that is evil. (6) It is therefore with regret that we cease to be in fellowship with Heanor ecclesia, because of their condonation of the Temperance Hall attitude, with the Temperance Hall ecclesia, and all others in their fellowship, until assurance is forthcoming that their untenable position has been abandoned. We are, faithfully yours, ARTHUR BOWLES, Sister E. BOWLES, Senr., Sister E. BOWLES, 18 Church Street, Heanor, August 13th, 1923.”

SLAITHWAITE. —Having closely followed the trouble at Birmingham in all its developments, we, the undersigned, are bound in faithfulness to Christ to refuse all fellowship with the Birmingham

Temperance Hall ecclesia. We take our stand beside the brethren and sisters at Clapham and Ilford who refuse to recognise as brethren those who do not unreservedly accept our Basis of Faith, and further, we, in harmony with the Clapham and Ilford ecclesias, refuse to be a party to the excommunication of faithful brethren and sisters against whom no charge of being doctrinally unsound, or walking disorderly, can be, or has been, laid. Also we refuse to fellowship any brother or sister who are in fellowship with Temperance Hall, the Scriptural reason for this decision being that they by bidding Temperance Hall "God-speed" are thereby partakers in that ecclesia's evil deeds. We are in isolation at present. We meet at our home, 12 Union Street, Hill Top, Slaithwaite, nr. Huddersfield, to Break Bread every Sunday afternoon at 3 o'clock. Any brother or sister, in fellowship with Clapham, Ilford, or John Bright Street Meetings, who are passing this way, or removes into this district will be given a hearty welcome. —Brother W.F. BRADFORD, sister B. BRADFORD.

SOUTHEND AND WESTCLIFF-ON-SEA. —Christadelphian Hall, Westbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11; Lecture, 6.30. We are glad to be able to report satisfactory progress down here, one of the members of the Gymnasium Hall having been led to see the necessity of taking stern and faithful action regarding Temperance Hall, Birmingham, and has signified his approval of our position and joined our meeting (brother Bowman). We rejoice with him, and hope and pray others may yet see the necessity of "coming out" and being "separate." It may interest brethren generally to know the powerful effect such faithful witness as is contained in the July Master's Household and other publications, is having down here and elsewhere. It is an encouragement to persevere and we hope the Berean will press on and faithfully witness for the Truth in the midst of a perverse and wicked generation. Since we took our decision we have been helped in the work of the Truth by brethren Beere, of Clapton Ecclesia, and S.W. Thornton, of Ilford Ecclesia. We extend a welcome to all of like precious faith.

Further to my previous report I am pleased to say that brother A.R. Jackson, who has been absent from our midst about four years, has reapplied for fellowship and having seen him and satisfactorily assured ourselves we have gladly welcomed him back and pray God he may be a help and blessing to our small ecclesia and we a help to him. We have also had the pleasure of brethren and sisters company at the Table from the following ecclesias: —Ilford, Clapham, Bexley Heath, Nottingham (Corn Exchange), and Margate. This has been a great encouragement and help to us. —WM. LESLIE WILLE, Secretary.

LONDON, CLAPTON, E. —Downs Park Hall, 41 Pembury Road, Clapton, E.5. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11.0 a.m., Lecture, 6.30 p.m.; Thursdays, Eureka Class, 8.0 p.m. Since our last report we have been pleased to welcome into our fellowship brother Dunkley and brother and sister Woolvett. Our membership is accordingly increased to thirty-one. We have now arranged for the delivery of lectures at the above-mentioned Hall, commencing the first Sunday in September, and pray for our Heavenly Father's blessing on our efforts in this connection. The series for the first month deals with the second coming of Christ under the general heading of "Christ is coming—soon." We have had the company of the following visiting brethren and sisters around the Table of the Lord: —Brother Williamson and sister Thornton, Bristol Street, Birmingham; brother and sister F.F. Jackson, Westcliff-on-Sea; sister Hutley, Gunnersbury; and brother Whelan, Ilford. Brethren Williamson and Jackson kindly gave the word of exhortation. —C.C. REDMILL, Secretary.

LONDON. —Gunnersbury Christadelphian Ecclesia, Ivy Hall (corner of Cambridge Road and Wellesley Road), Chiswick High Road, W. Sundays, 11 and 6.30; Wednesdays, 8. We are starting Sunday evening lectures in September if the Lord will, and invite any who can attend. We have had the pleasure of the company of brother and sister Dyer, of Clapton, also brother T. Wilson, of Clapham, who helped us by a Sunday evening address. It is with regret that we have to report that brother E.H. Bath has resigned his membership of our ecclesia and given up fellowship with us. —W.E. EUSTACE, Recording Brother, 21 Chelverton Road, Putney, S.W.15.

LONDON (SOUTH) —Avondale Hall, Landor Road, Clapham, S.W.9. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; M.I.C., 9.10 a.m. Raleigh Hall, Brixton, S.W., Thursdays, 8 p.m.; Tuesdays, M.I.C. (alternately

with Eureka Class), 8 p.m. We have pleasure in recording the following baptisms: —May 20th, Mr. Albert Edward Aplin (formerly Church of England), Miss Vera Annie Westley (Neutral), Daughter of our brother F.J. Westley. June 24th, Miss Mary Fletcher (Baptist). We also add to our number and are pleased to welcome brother and sister H. Southgate, brother and sister W. Mitchell, brother H.C. Rivers and brother W.R. Jeacock from Tulse Hill, sister L.M. Speakman from Croydon, sister A.D. Crumplen from Margate. Our losses by removal are brother F. Kirby to Bexley Heath, brother and sister P.L. Hone to Croydon. With regret we record the death on May 23rd of our brother, Stephen Henry Crosskey, June 14th, sister Ellen G. Medicott, June 28th, brother J. Lovell, and July 14th, sister May Elizabeth Wilkins. —F. J. BUTTON.

LATER.

I shall be glad if you will kindly make the following announcement on behalf of the Clapham Ecclesia in the next issue of The Berean. Thanking you in anticipation, Faithfully your brother, HENRY E. PURSER, Secretary. “That the Clapham Ecclesia does not extend fellowship to any brethren and sisters who have come to a decision to remain in fellowship with the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia. Brethren and sisters who are considering, or intend to consider, the question of their duty in regard to fellowship, will, until a reasonable time has expired, be welcomed at the Breaking of Bread (subject, of course, to an interview with the Examining brethren).

U.S.A.

WORCESTER, MASS. —Brother Bissell has removed to Seattle, and the mantle of his office as Rec. Brother has fallen upon brother A. Marshall, 65 Amos Avenue, Rutherford, N.Y.