

Price 4d

December, 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.,

Assisted by F. G. JANNAWAY.

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

CONTENTS	Page
Dr. John Thomas.....	365
The Bible Wholly Inspired and Infallible— No. 102. — Divine Retribution	369
Editorial	372
The Birmingham Petition	374
Questions for Christadelphians.....	379
“Birmingham Frictions”.....	383
The Bible True! .....	385
Debate with brother H. Fry, of Bournemouth .....	387
The Good of Evil ... ..	388
Correspondence .....	389
Ecclesial News. ....	393

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

## Notes.

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. It is time for those who value and have the Truth at heart to speak out and spare not.

### NOW READY.

#### A REJOINDER

To the misleading and incorrect statements, and unscriptural counsel, contained in the Brixton pamphlet,

#### AN UNJUST BALANCE.

Together with an Earnest Appeal to all lovers of Truth to stand by those, who in this grave crisis are strenuously contending for purity of doctrine. The writers are brethren W.J. White and A.T. Jannaway. Post free from H.E. Purser (Sec.), 6 Elms Road, Clapham Common, London, S.W.4.

---

The Serial Story of the Life of Dr. Thomas will begin, God willing, next month.

The subscription for the Berean Christadelphian is the same for any part of the world: 1 copy, 5/-; 2 copies, 10/-; 3 copies, 15/-; all post free. Ecclesial parcels, carriage paid, 4d. per copy. Will every reader try and obtain another subscriber for the Berean Christadelphian for 1924? It is the only source from which reliable information concerning the present crisis can be obtained. (Order Form enclosed).

EDITOR OF The Christadelphian. —As the successor of bro. Roberts, you ought to commend, not reproach, bro. Denney for having left the Suffolk Street folk—unless, as many believe, you agree with bro. A. Davis, that the Inspiration Division is not now warranted—Bro. Denney has never forsaken the Truth. As a lad of sixteen years, of a Christadelphian family who sided with Suffolk St., he was baptized thirty-three years ago, but nearly twenty years ago he manifested the courage of his convictions by joining our fellowship. And, that you call “a few years ago!” To our mind his record compares favourably with your own, for we remember you had only been five years in the Master’s service when you essayed to assist bro. Roberts in magazine work. Kindly be just, if you cannot be generous. We know editorial work is no part of his living. He would be better off financially without it. Again; of over 400 eligible brethren in Birmingham and districts—between the ages of 18 and 41—bro. Denney headed the list as the one who had been a Christadelphian longer than any other; and, who rather than make more money by munitions, became a railway labourer. (This is written without bro. Denney’s knowledge. His mind I know—“too ‘below the belt’ to notice;” but, my mind is, “too bad to overlook.”—F.G.J.)

MARANATHA PRESS—Yes; we here and now inform our readers that the “. . .” in the letter of our sis. Lasius, reproduced by bro. Walker in December Christadelphian, represented in her own words: “It will be more practicable for me to pay for them through bro. Walker, as we always keep a book account in the close of the year.” Bro. C.C. Walker omitted that, and substituted three dots. Instead of “keeping covenant,” he told our dear old sister to “write to the senders and inform them that they can have them returned on sending the necessary postage!” This counsel to break faith, affords another lesson that if brethren (and sisters) want to know the whole truth, they must subscribe for the Berean Christadelphian. Five shillings now sent will mean a copy, post free, every month to any part of the world. Our motto is, “The Birmingham Amended Basis of Faith—the whole Basis—and nothing short of the Basis—for purposes of Fellowship.

BRO. O. G. BEERE has removed to 122 Westmount Road, Eltham Park, S.E.9.

J. E. FRANKLIN. —You ask what we think of bro. G.F. Lake's latest circular. You will know just what we think, when we tell you that bro. J.M. Evans, of Clapham, at once requested bro. Lake to give the names of the brethren who acted "exactly as described" in his circular. Bro. Lake gives the names of two brethren, one who was withdrawn from by the Clapham Ecclesia in due course, and the other of a brother long since dead, and who did not agree with the withdrawn from!

N.L.—The prominent and "level-headed" "Arranging Brother" never objected to letters being quoted until he was faced with his own letters; in fact, we now have before us a letter, written only a short time since, in which he says: "I notice that you publish extracts from personal and private letters. You have perfect right to do so if you think well." Consistency is indeed a jewel. "Conscience makes cowards of us all."

WANTED, —To complete a set: Christadelphians for 1870 and 1872, bound, unbound, or any odd parts. —Chas. Davis, 33 Vere Street, Birmingham.

ANONYMOUS. —Although the ex-Christadelphian referred to has been designated "Rev," we are informed he has not been "duly ordained." He has, however, obtained the degree of "Doctor of Divinity" (D.D.), as well as possessing the degrees of LL.D. and F.A.S. (see Who's Who for this year).

BRO. E. H. BATH has removed to 10 Chapel Road, London, W.13.

A.J.—We do endeavour to use moderate terms and at the same time to make our meaning perfectly clear in the spirit of Isaiah 58: 1. Our expressions are often called "harsh" and we will keep in mind your brotherly exhortation to mildness and tenderness. In avoiding any countenancing of error, and any giving way to the flesh, we are liable to go too near the other extreme. But we have not yet stooped to such low tactics as the brother who has been sending post-cards around the country saying that his opponents in a just cause are purveying "tissues of lies." We hope we never shall.

K.M.—We have seen bro. Lake's attack on an esteemed Clapham bro. now deceased. Bro. Lake misses the point. It is not whether a brother voted against disfellowship in a particular case in the hope of the offender's repentance; but whether a brother who openly says that he "could not take the responsibility of disfellowshipping a brother who joined the Police Force" should be tolerated, and, whether a meeting that "never asks him to withdraw his speech" setting forth such error should be left unrebuked.

S.W.R.—The "re-assuring letters" containing assurances that the condition of the brotherhood today is "as sound as it was twenty years ago" will only deceive the blind and the simple. Every thoughtful brother has during the past few years observed with pain and alarm the clerical tendencies and declension in what bro. Newman aptly designates "the recognised centre of Christadelphianism." The responsible brethren now seek to divert the attention of the brotherhood by talking about the unfounded suspicion on the part of two or three brethren in London. That is why we are reproducing month by month, evidence to the contrary from the pens of brethren of repute all over the country.

C.B., (New Zealand). —We much appreciate your kind offer to contribute towards expenses incurred in the way of literature, etc., during the crisis through which we are passing—but we are glad to be able to say the balance financially is still being maintained on the right side, thanks to the Consciences being pocket-deep. As you so truly say concerning what is happening in the brotherhood: "There was a wholesale apostasy in the time of the Apostles and after, and human nature is made of the same stuff still." Truly a sign of the time of the End.

J.D.B. (Canada). —We agree with you that a more appropriate title than Out of Darkness into Light would be Out of Light into Darkness. We sympathise with you and your sister ecclesias in Canada in your lament that "while bro. Strickler and his sympathizers are heard and given a loud voice in the Intelligence columns of the Christadelphian, that from you holding rigidly to the Basis, is over and over again rejected." We thank you for your encouraging words.

FRATERNAL GATHERING IN LONDON. —As announced last month, arrangements are being made, and the large Essex Hall, Strand, has been engaged. The meeting has been timed for 6.30, Saturday, 29<sup>th</sup> December. Programmes can be had on application to bro. Button, 22 Stockwell Park Crescent, London, S.W.9. An affectionate welcome is extended to all in fellowship. Will any who propose spending the week-end, kindly intimate same to bro. Button.

A BROTHER. —Neither of your letters were marked “private,” “personal,” or “confidential;” although, had you so marked them as such, seeing they slandered a third party behind his back! Nor do we ever regard as “private” letters containing information affecting the brotherhood; in such matters we try to follow Paul, however painful to ourselves, as it must have been to Paul—see Galatians 2: 11-14. To our mind, it is wicked to write to one brother denouncing another as an “unscrupulous liar,” and then claim privacy. We feel sure you will repent of such correspondence, and therefore refrain even using your initials.

“IN ISOLATION.”—Yes, we sympathise with you. We have been “snowed under” with correspondence and “calls to action” from professed old-time Christadelphians, who have not only claimed to be Daniels, but have “dared to have a purpose firm” and “dare to make it known”—but when it comes finally to act out line for line—“And dare to stand alone”—that has been another matter altogether. They then begin to talk of consequences, and count the cost, with the result that they look around for an easy way out; many of them have found it, one joined “the multitude to do evil.”

W.J.S.—Your sentiments on shell-making and similar munitions of war are ours, and always were. The London Standing Committee was also adverse to such occupations as bringing the Truth into reproach. Birmingham, however—not London—was the hot-bed of the work; in fact, one of the Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren wrote “some of the best of our brethren are engaged in munition-making.” We think, however, to confound work in civil life with work in the Army is wrong. Read bro. Newman’s address in this month’s Berean Christadelphian. To our mind the work is so repulsive we wish we could find a “thus saith the Lord” prohibiting it, but until we can, we hesitate to make it a matter of fellowship.

C.A.B.—We are considering the request of yourself and others that “Palestine Revisited” letters, cut short elsewhere, should see daylight in the Berean Christadelphian, but are sure you will appreciate how preoccupied we are for the moment with more important matter. We appreciate your appreciation.

J.B. and others. —You will see we have reproduced one letter of protest (an ecclesial one) to the Temp. Hall Ecclesia for allowing “that disgraceful blasphemous observance of the two-minutes’ silence to honour the glorious dead” to interfere with its meeting for Breaking of Bread, which our Lord said, “Do in remembrance of me.”

Further Seasons of Comfort. We are glad to announce that this grand production of our late bro. Roberts is again in print. It can be obtained from bro. C.C. Walker, 21 Hendon Road, Sparkhill, Birmingham, for Six Shillings.

A BROTHER, 45, would like to hear of a berth in any of the following capacities—Traveller, Caretaker, Manager of small restaurant or café, Head Waiter in restaurant or with firm doing outside catering, well up in waiting, public and private, also two years’ travelling experience. Reply to T.W., c/o Editor.

APARTMENTS. —Comfortable furnished rooms to let—suitable for a married couple or two sisters or brothers. Every convenience and good, near main road, position. Terms: moderate Sis. Kellard, 2a Cato Rd., Clapham, S.W.4.

# 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.  
Assisted by F. G. JANNAWAY.

VOL. XI., No. 12      DECEMBER 15<sup>th</sup> 1923      FOURPENCE

### Dr. John Thomas

GEMS FROM HIS WRITINGS.

#### CLEAN FLESH AND SUBSTITUTION HERESIES.

(Continued from page 337.)

“The character of Jesus was holy, harmless, undefiled, without spot or blemish, or any such thing; but his flesh was like our flesh in all its points—weak, emotional and unclean. Had his flesh been like that of Angel-Elohim which is consubstantial with the Eternal Spirit, it would have been unfit for the purpose of the Deity in His manifestation. Sin, whose wages is death, had to be condemned in the nature that had transgressed; a necessity that could only be accomplished by the Word becoming Adamic flesh, and not Elohistic. For this cause ‘Jesus was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, . . . that he, by the grace of the Deity, might taste death for every man.’ For this cause, and forasmuch also ‘as the children (of the Deity) are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy that having the power of death, that is the diabolos,’ or elements of corruption in our nature, inciting it to transgression, and therefore called ‘sin working death in us’—Romans 7: 13; Hebrews 2: 9, 14.”—Eureka, 1, 106.

\* \* \*

“Jesus has been appointed Captain of Salvation in the bringing of many sons to glory. Now these sons, in the accident of birth, are all ‘subject to vanity,’ with inveterate propensities and relative enticements, inciting them and tempting them to sin. A Captain, therefore, whose nature was primarily con-substantial with the Deity, could not be touched with the feeling of their infirmities. He would be essential holy and impeccable, and of necessity good. But a necessitated holiness and perfection are not the basis of exaltation to the glories of the Apocalypse. These are to be obtained only by conquest of self under trial from without, by which ‘they come out of great tribulation’—Apocalypse 7: 14. Its promises are to those who overcome, as their Captain has overcome, when it can be said his victory is Apocalyptically complete—Apocalypse 3: 21; 11: 15. Hence, then, ‘it became the Deity to make the Captain of the Salvation of His many sons perfect through sufferings,’ and to effect this, he must be of their primary nature, that when the Great Captain and his associates shall rejoice together in the consubstantiality of the Deity, they may all have attained to it upon the principle of voluntary obedience, motivated by faith, and maintained in opposition to incitements within, and enticements

and pressure from without. The flesh is, therefore, a necessary basis for this; and making it possible for him to be tempted in all points according to the flesh-likeness without sin. Hence, though the son of the Deity, and heir of all things, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and being MADE PERFECT he became the author of aion-salvation unto all them that obey him’—Hebrews 4: 15; 5: 8.”—Eureka, 1, 107.

\* \* \*

“The germ which in after ages was fully developed into the Anti-Christ was the denying the Father and the Son—1 John 2: 22. This denial was in the sense of not confessing that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh—2 John 7. All who hold this damnable tradition (which in our time is an article of ‘orthodoxy’ so called) forsook the fellowship of the Apostles, and were thus manifested as Anti-Christ. ‘Ye have heard,’ says John, ‘that the Ant-Christ comes; even now are there many Anti-Christ. They went out from us, but they were not of us.’ These were ‘false prophets,’ or teachers, whose doctrine was ‘that of the Anti-Christ that should come, and even now already,’ says John, ‘is in the world’—1 John 4: 3. They confessed not, that he whom they called Jesus Christ was a man in the flesh common to all mankind, which is (sarx hamartias) sin’s flesh—Romans 8: 3. They maintained that he had another kind of flesh, which was pure, holy, and immaculate. They confounded his immaculate or spotless character with his maculate flesh. This was a fatal heresy; for if Jesus was not crucified in the flesh common to us all, then ‘sin was’ not ‘condemned in the flesh,’ as all the Apostles taught, and there has been as yet no sacrifice for sin, and consequently there are no means or remission of sins extant . . .

“The immaculate nature of Jesus, however, involved ‘the Father,’ and their ‘Father of the Fathers’—Pateer Pateron—in the necessity of transforming the mother of Jesus into an immaculate virgin—goddess—immaculate in her conception, and therefore not of the common flesh of Jewish nature. The Deity of the Apostasy was bound to decree this to avoid the inconvenient questions, ‘Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?’—Job 14: 4; and ‘How can he be clean that is born of a woman?’—Job 25: 4. Job says ‘Not one’ can do this. But this paragon of patience knew nothing of the Pope! He undertook to accomplish Job’s impossibility; for nothing is impossible with the Great Blasphemer of the Deity of the heavens! He decreed that the woman Mary was of clean and holy flesh, and therefore the thing born of her was ‘a thing,’ spotless flesh untainted of Adam’s sin, though (Eph’ho Pantēs Emarton), in him all sinned, which an unsophisticated mind would suppose included all liable to death; Eli, Mary, her mother, and Jesus, all died, and must necessarily have been included federally in Adam. But these considerations are no difficulty with the Chief Sorcerer of ‘Christendom.’ His magic wand, ‘Thus I decree,’ transforms all lies into divine truths, and the grossest absurdities into the sublimest and most adorable mysteries.”—Eureka 2, 624.

\* \* \*

#### THE DOCTOR’S MIND A YEAR BEFORE HIS DEATH.

“Christadelphians mean to say neither more nor less than Paul saith. This unsurpassed teacher of the truth says that God sent His own Son in the likeness of sin’s flesh, which he declares was the same as ours. Compare Romans 8: 3 with Hebrews 2: 14-17. And he says, too, in Hebrews 7: 27: ‘He offered for his own sins and the people’s when he once offered up himself.’ But what is to be understood by ‘his own sins’? The sins committed by others and bore in his own body on the cross, as testified in 1 Peter 2: 24, saying ‘who his own self bare our sins in his own body to the tree,’ upon which ‘he became a curse for us.’ In the Mosaic and Christian systems, the un sinning victim is regarded as the sinner, in the sense of being the sin-bearer. Personally, Jesus was ‘holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;’ if he had not been so, he would have not been fit for the sin-bearer of the world; the purpose of God being the condemnation of sin in the nature that transgressed in Eden, in the person of one who had himself committed no sin.”—Letter to The Rock, January 27<sup>th</sup>, 1870.

\* \* \*

## BRO. ROBERT ROBERTS ON THE HERESY.

“And now we are asked to believe that in all this the Dr. was mistaken. We altogether reject the suggestion, not because we have confidence in Dr. Thomas’ judgment (though we have that greatly); but because on the merits of the question itself, the scripturalness and necessity of his view of the matter are abundantly evident. Least of all are we likely to consent to the suggestion at the bidding of a pen which writes its renunciation within a week of its owner’s easy perversion, under influences not difficult to be understood by such as look below the surface. We stand or fall with Dr. Thomas in the sense stated.”—Christadelphian, 1873, p. 365.

\* \* \*

### NO COMPROMISE.

Do what is right, be valiant for the Truth, teach it without compromise, and all lovers of the Truth will approve you; for all others you need not care a rush. —Ambassador, 3. p. 34.

---

## The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

### No 102. — DIVINE RETRIBUTION.

It is a Scripture principle that God punishes and will punish those who disobey His commandments. What are called for convenience “natural laws,” but which are God’s laws nevertheless, illustrate the matter. His order is never broken with immunity.

From Eden onwards God has set forth His will, and just as disobedience brought banishment at once and death at last to Adam, so all subsequent sins have received condemnation and punishment. While therefore it is true to say that sin brings punishment in this life, there is also for those who know God’s will as revealed in the Scriptures and who do it not, a certain “fearful looking forward to judgment.” The day will come when the “enlightened rejector” as he has been termed, will be brought to judgment, after resurrection in the case of such as are deceased.

In that day enlightened Pharisees who rejected and crucified our Lord Jesus “will see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of God, and they themselves thrust out.”

The same fate awaits the same class of people in our day. It is a first principle of the Truth that knowledge brings responsibility, and it is also an axiom of human experience.

### MERCY.

At the same time, however, God is merciful and longsuffering. An outstanding instance is seen just before the flood. Not only was the ark to be built, but the commission to Noah entailed a long time of witnessing, both in word and practice, while the building of the ark proceeded. The Greek noun with the primary meaning, “long forbearance,” is translated “long-suffering” in 1 Peter 3: 20, “The long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing.”

We may safely conclude any survey of God’s dealings with men with the observation that the Lord is “slow to anger and plenteous in mercy,” and that He is always ready and anxious to forgive the repentant sinner who comes to Him in the appointed way.

### JUSTICE.

At the same time God is the fount of Justice. There is no variableness, no partiality with Him. He is not mocked, and “whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.”

His swift condemnation of Adam's sin and His eight centuries of mercy to our first father after illustrate this.

His condemnation and punishment of Israel, and the many occasions on which He forgave His people and gave them renewed opportunities to do righteously, is a further case in point.

#### THE CRITIC'S OBJECTION.

While all these considerations are plainly evident from a study of the Scriptures; yet many critics have fastened upon and strongly criticised a passage to be found in Exodus 34: 7, where after the declaration, "The Lord God is merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin," we have the apparently contradictory statement "that will by no means clear the guilty: visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation."

One critic said, "How can this God of the Hebrews claim to be merciful who will not clear the guilty, and will punish unborn generations in advance for their father's sins?" Similar passages occur in Numbers 14: 18, and in Nahum 1: 3.

#### MODERN JEWISH EXPLANATIONS.

There is undoubtedly a considerable difficulty here, but we have recently read with interest the conclusions set forth by present-day leading Jewish scholars upon the point.

These conclusions we feel are correct, and we submit them as an effective explanation of the difficulty, and a full answer to the critics. While it is admitted that the Scriptures set forth the stern justice of God, yet the gist of the message to Moses was a stressing of the "merciful side of the Divine nature—God's long-suffering, patience and forgiveness."

The Midrash offered a solution by rendering the passage, "God absolveth the penitent, but will by no means absolve the impenitent." This, however, somewhat strains the text.

Modern Jewish scholarship offers a better solution. A clue is found in Jeremiah 30: 11. Here we have, "Though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee, but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished." The root verb rendered "clear," i.e., "clear the guilty," is often used. One instance is in the third commandment, "The Lord will not hold him guiltless," i.e., "clear," etc. Other instances, however, occur, for instance, "clearing the ashes." The verb is regularly used to denote "clear away," or "remove."

In the English use of the verb "clear," we have a similar double use. We may refuse to clear the guilty, but we also speak of "clearing the table," meaning to clear away or remove.

We may adduce the use of the verb in 2 Samuel 16: 6. Here Shimei stoned or "cleared stones" at David. Yet in Isaiah 5: 2 we have the Piel used to denote the removal of the stones: "gathered out the stones" is exactly the same as "stoned" in the story of Shimei.

We are therefore led to the "conclusion that the expression in question means not to hold innocent or to leave unpunished, but to remove utterly, to make a clean sweep of, to wipe out, and it will be found that in all the verses referred to this is just the sense which develops the thought, and gives completion to the ideas which the Divine Author is desirous of conveying."

How Jeremiah 30: 11 gains expression by this rendering, “For I am with thee to save thee. For I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have scattered thee. But I will not make a full end of thee. But I will chastise thee in measure, and I will not utterly wipe thee out.” The Targum anticipated this view and gives the passage thus, “But I will not utterly blot thee out.”

Maimonides saw this probable use of the Piel of the verb. He states (Moseh Nebuchim, 1-54), “The meaning of the expression clear the guilty is, He will by no means extirpate the guilty.” Another great Jewish Commentator (Nachmanides) sets out the same conclusion.

Hence we have this climax, and we claim it to be in accord with the text, and a true and just explanation.

“The Lord, the Lord, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgressions and sin, and that will by no means at once blot out the guilty.”

In our next number we propose furnishing an explanation of the remainder of the passage as to “visiting the iniquity,” etc., pressure on our space preventing its insertion in this issue. —G.H.D.

---

## Editorial.

### DRIFT (1). —AMONG THE JEWS.

The faithfulness of the Jews ever since the dispersion to the tenets and practices of their religion is well known to all men. In these days, however, of drift away from religion altogether the Jews have not escaped contagion. The Jewish Guardian for November 16<sup>th</sup>, lamenting this says under the heading,

#### IS JUDAISM ON THE WANE?

“That Judaism is today on the decline is patent to all who have their eyes open. Apart from the two or three great days in the year there are enormous numbers who do not attend our services, and in spite of the efforts of our religious and educational organizations the word ‘Pagan’ may be applied to certain Jewish districts in London.”

\* \* \*

### DRIFT (2). —AT THE TEMPERANCE HALL, BIRMINGHAM.

On November 11<sup>th</sup>, the Temperance Hall Ecclesia gave further proof of its drift back to the world by “solemnly” observing the two minutes’ silence. We were not surprised, having received letters prior to that day from Birmingham brethren asking our opinion as to whether it should be observed. The following timely protest has since been sent to the Arranging Brethren by an Ecclesia which knows better: —

“Dear Brethren, —It has been reported (and confirmed) that you formally agreed to observe the ‘two minutes’ silence’ on Sunday morning last, out of deference to the wish of the Gentiles that ‘the sacrifice of their glorious dead’ should thus be recognised and shown forth.

“In accordance with this, at the meeting devoted to the memory of Christ, to show forth his death, you made a break in the worship of God (the whole ecclesia standing) in order to memorialise the sacrifice of soldiers—of human flesh and blood—on the field of battle. You memorialised that which Christ expressly forbade his servants to do, on pain of exclusion from his kingdom, when you should have testified against it in the Name of Christ, because those who died claim to be ‘Christians.’

“Besides identifying yourselves with the apostate churches, who were then proclaiming their belief that the dead were not dead, by this act of idolatry—the veneration of dead soldiers, men upon whom God had executed His judgments—at a meeting of Christ, you have ‘profaned the Temple of God,’ and by your celebration of this act at the table of the Lord, you have ‘profaned the offering of the Lord.’

“Therefore, out of duty to Christ and in love to you, as his brethren, and in his Name, we formally and solemnly protest against what you have done, and in meeting assembled as Christadelphians we publicly disown and repudiate your unscriptural action on Sunday last, and as servants of Christ, we call on you, as representatives of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, to honour Christ by publicly retracting and repudiating your sin, in order that Christ may not finally cast you off, as according to his revealed principles he will do, unless you repent.”

\* \* \*

Think of it! Breaking the Memorial Service of “Him who was dead, but alive for evermore” to adopt the Christadelphian public attitudes of prayer (standing) in order to show respect to the King’s edict to have two minutes’ silent prayer for the glorious dead; and the depth of the deception to those within and without was such that the Editor of the Christadelphian had the effrontery to preface the two minutes’ silence, by calling upon the meeting to sing “Let all the earth keep silence before Him,” when he knew the earth was really doing nothing of the sort. The Temperance Hall leaders are surely and fast leading their 13 hundred dupes back to “Christian England.” What a contrast to our late and beloved leaders, Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts.

---

## The Birmingham Petition.

### Amendment and speech by Brother E. W. NEWMAN.

In the Unjust Balance the producer so manipulated the weights as to deceive his audience and lead them to think that the thousand or more in the Temperance Hall Ecclesia had no desire to retain their original Petition: or, if they had, it was because its “Clause 7” simply meant work of a civil character, outside the army. If any further evidence of the guilt of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia were required, it has come to light in the form of a transcript—word for word—of a speech made by bro. E. W. Newman, on November 18, 1914, in Birmingham, when he moved an amendment to reject the famous—but now infamous—“Clause 7.”

Bro. Newman, in support of his Amendment, said: —

“It is necessary, in order that you may understand the Amendment, that you should know why it has been brought forward this evening as a counter Resolution to that which has been submitted to you by the Presiding Brother. (That is—bro. C.C. Walker, Editor of the Christadelphian.) Very briefly it is this: it is evident from enquiries pursued by those responsible for the Amending Resolution that a considerable revulsion of feeling has taken place amongst the brethren in regard to “Clause 7” of the Petition which was passed on the 13<sup>th</sup> of August. That clause reads as follows: —

‘That the conscientious objection of your petitioners does not extend to strictly non-combatant branches of National Service, but only to those which involve the bearing of arms or resort to force.’

“It is not necessary for me to recount the circumstances in which this Clause came into being; but it is sufficient, perhaps, to say that a number of brethren, having had time to reflect upon the real nature of that Clause, and to perceive the many pitfalls which it would inevitably introduce to our young brethren, are anxious for the opportunity of recording their conviction that such a policy as that to which the clause commits us is a mistaken one. They have observed also the unsettling effect which it has had upon the minds of many young men both in Birmingham and up and down the country, and consider it a matter of particular regret that Birmingham, which has always been (and I suppose still

is) the recognised centre of Christadelphian activity, should have committed itself to a policy which provides such a weak and uncertain source of strength to those who habitually look to our ecclesia for guidance.

“I understand that 140 out of 160 Ecclesias in the country have signed the abbreviated London Petition, and though it is only fair to say that the London Petition was in the field some fortnight or so before the drafting of the Birmingham Petition, yet we can perceive that to the brethren throughout the country our attitude has not been acceptable.

“Now with regard to our Amendment, we are all agreed that the bearing of arms and blood-shedding is contrary to the Law of Christ, and I conclude that if ‘Clause 7’ freed us from these two things we should all be satisfied. But there are two ways in which we may be freed; the one is by observing the letter of the Law of Christ, and the other is by observing the Law both in the spirit and in the letter. In our opinion ‘Clause 7’ sanctions the first of these courses. It permits us to do everything short of bearing arms and actual shedding of blood.

“When we review the complex of a modern army the difficulty is to decide what is combatant and what is non-combatant, and I think if we are honest with ourselves we must inevitably come to the conclusion that whether combatant or non-combatant we are all accomplices of that in which the Law of Christ forbids to engage, and as accomplices, we incur the moral responsibility which attaches to the act of blood-shedding itself.

“Bro. Walker the other night in indicating the chief difference between our own Petition and that adopted by the London brethren, referred to the substitution of the words ‘bearing of arms,’ which was a feature of our Petition by the extremely elastic term ‘compulsory military service.’ I would suggest to him that though the latter term ‘compulsory military service’ is more elastic, yet its elasticity is in our favour, whereas the phrase ‘bearing of arms’ although more definite, is wide enough to include all sorts of military duties which would amount to a palpable evasion and violation of the spirit of Christ.

“Let us remember, brethren, before we place this cue in the hands of the authorities, that many legislative Acts contain concessions which are made to disappear in their administration. A man, once he is a soldier, is not allowed to pick and choose his duties. That is done for him, and done in the vast majority of cases with an absolute disregard of the conscientious scruples of the individual. Let us remember that once in the Army (no matter what section), a man may be required to do any service which in the opinion of his superior officer, the exigencies of the situation demand. Now let every young brother here put himself in that position. You are surrounded with people who are quite out of sympathy with your scruples, and you are commanded to perform an act which your conscience forbids and are threatened with the penalties of disobedience. Can you imagine a situation more calculated to undo you?

“We have come to the conclusion, brethren, that non-combatant service such as you had in your mind when you voted for the \*Birmingham Petition does not exist. \*(Drafted and framed by bro. C.C. Walker, Editor of the Christadelphian.) It is said that we must only accept these services under compulsion. What is there in the Petition to indicate that? There is nothing at all, and we have no guarantee that the mental reservations which may exist in the minds of our Arranging Brethren will ever be conveyed to the Members of the House of Commons; many of whom as you know are lawyers and accustomed to indulge in severe and clear thinking, to take things as they are, not as they were meant to be.

But is there any ground for believing that what we cannot do voluntarily we are permitted to do under compulsion? To our mind is a very mischievous doctrine. The righteousness or unrighteousness of our conduct cannot be affected in the least degree by the application of compulsion. It would be no answer to the Lord Jesus to say, ‘THEY MADE ME DO IT.’ That was what Saul said to the prophet Samuel—‘I feared the people and obeyed their voice.’ Dr. Young, a

brother at Cambridge, stated recently in the Christadelphian, that he thought that what we can do voluntarily we may do under compulsion. That is true, and so is the inverse of this—That what is permissible under compulsion we may do voluntarily; and therefore, brethren, however much this statement may be objected to, our Petition provides justification to those of us who have joined non-combatant service in the Army, and we have, therefore no reasonable ground of action against them while our Petition remains where it is. I would urge you all to wash your hands of this matter by voting for the Amendment, which I will read again: —

‘That having further considered the Petition previously passed and realising the dangers attaching to Clause 7, the terms of which are a virtual approval of military service of a non-combatant nature, we, the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia renounce the principle which Clause 7 contains; and earnestly desiring unanimity of action throughout the brotherhood upon this important matter, approve of the London Petition, and request our Recording Brother to sign it on our behalf’.

\* \* \*

#### NOTES ON THE FOREGOING.

Brethren and sisters outside Birmingham will scarcely realise that the godly appeal of bro. Newman fell on deaf ears, and that his Amendment was overwhelmingly defeated, and their Recording Brother had to sign the Petition containing Clause 7.

The only Petition presented to Parliament was the London Petition, which was not signed by the Temperance Hall Ecclesia.

In view of bro. Newman’s Amendment Address we can well understand the bitter taunt of bro. A. Davis to brethren C.C. Walker, F.G. Ford, and the others who condemned the Davis-Pearce speeches—“Remember Clause 7!”

When a few faithful brethren insisted on carrying out the principle, so cogently elaborated by bro. Newman, they were regarded as disturbers of the peace, and withdrawn from. To such a wicked device true soldiers of our King can be no party; and this is why Berean Christadelphians have withdrawn from the Temperance Hall Ecclesia until they unconditionally right the matter.

Meanwhile our late co-workers at the Temperance Hall in marching under the banner of the Christadelphian are living in a fool’s paradise, for on that banner is inscribed the Editor’s dictum, “the matter is now finally closed.” Yes; its editor is terribly to blame for the present slip in the household, for if he had faithfully followed the lead of his predecessors, Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts, the speeches of brethren Davis and Pearce would never have been tolerated; he would never have prostituted the pages of the Christadelphian with articles condoning non-combatant military service, while excluding such faithful addresses as those from the pens of brethren Boulton, Newman, and others.

The editor of the Christadelphian may possibly keep up the circulation of his magazine by now paying court to those his magazine once denounced as “pernicious teachers” and “Bible nullifiers”—those holding those views which up till now, he has described as “the clean flesh” and “substitution” “heresies,” but by so doing he is only adding to his crime and responsibility.

And how about those brethren who have led or are leading their ecclesias to take sides with the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, or else to look on and beat time? Although, as we intend to make manifest in the articles begun in this month’s Berean Christadelphian, many of these leaders have foreseen the declension fostered in Christadelphian high places.

Wake, brethren, wake, and retrace your steps.

The latest excuse for doing nothing, and “not disfellowshipping Birmingham,” is that it is “less trouble than bringing about a division in our ecclesia, and possibly others”—Read Ezekiel 13: 10-16.

\* \* \*

A copy of his speech was sent to brother Newman for any correction he might wish to make, and it is printed as “amended” by him. He says: “You have neither asked nor received my sanction to publish the speech.” True; neither do we require it. His own code of honour does not require it. Months ago, we wrote him a purely personal letter, which the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia quoted in Final Statement, and sent forth broadcast, not only without having either “asked or received our sanction,” but without any intimation to us of their intention. Not that we complain; for bro. Newman, or any other brother, has perfect freedom to use, for the good of the brotherhood, anything from our pen. The anomaly is, that, while he without permission may quote a personal letter, he forbids his brother quoting a deliberately prepared speech publicly delivered before 1,000 people! —F.G.J.

---

## Questions for Christadelphians.

### Impending Wholesale Declension in the Brotherhood.

(Continued from page 346).

#### SECTION 2

From the last literary effort of the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Arranging Brethren, entitled Final Words, the readers are asked to believe that the Birmingham Trouble is entirely due to ill-founded suspicions on the part of certain brethren at Clapham; and, that, but for their charges, the present Crisis would never have occurred. The fact of the matter is, the Temperance Hall leaders, not possessing sufficient moral courage to own up, and accept the blame for, their own cumulative misdoings, have looked round for a scape-goat, with the result, that, some of their misled brethren are rightly and candidly telling them—“Don’t blame Clapham, blame yourselves!”

But, they prefer to go on blaming Clapham: and they have got Clapham on their minds to such an extent, that, in the “Introduction” alone to their Final Words, CLAPHAM is mentioned no less than seventy-five (75) times! Such reiteration could be dismissed as babyish were it not for the fact that the pamphlet represents the collective wisdom of the appointed leaders of the nominally thirteen hundred (1300) Christadelphians in the Temperance Hall.

Keeping in mind the facts set out in SECTION 1 in last month’s Berean Christadelphian, let us now produce further evidence (not hearsay, gossip, or mere tittle-tattle, but documentary evidence) that the declension rooted in the Temperance Hall and the Christadelphian, has been foreseen during the past few years, by brethren of repute, in all parts of the country—brethren, who, for reasons known to themselves, have made known their fears and doubts to the writer of these lines, who is also in possession of their anguished communications to the Editor of the Christadelphian. Their reason for communication such to us may have been because of the position we were forced into during the Conscriptio trouble; but more probably because they knew we had the same fears and doubts; which we still have, and which, we believe, most, if not all of them, still have and which it is to be hoped, for their own sakes and the sake of their followers, they will, ere it is too late, show the courage of; for conviction without courage is as worthless as faith without works. When it was becoming known that these articles were contemplated, in one day we received no less than four letters forbidding us to reproduce anything written by the writers thereof! Why this fear of daylight? Our readers will see why during the next few months; meanwhile, to one and all, our reply to their edict is to be found in Acts 4: 20.

The evidence to be adduced in this Section is from four brethren—two of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, one of the Leeds Ecclesia, and one of Leicester. The evidence shows conclusively that a canker existed, and was gnawing at the very vitals of the largest ecclesia in the world—the Temperance Hall Ecclesia. The evidence also goes to show what an unrighteous charge has been made by the writers of *Final Words*, and *An Unjust Balance*, against Clapham, as being the cause of the Birmingham Trouble.

4. —As the fourth item of evidence we produce the written lament of a brother who is a member of, and knows the inner workings of, the Temperance Hall Ecclesia as well as anyone, brother W.H. Hill, known all through the British ecclesias as the Secretary of the Birmingham Auxiliary Lecturing Society. Not only so; he was elected by the Birmingham brethren with four others to form a Committee—C.C. Walker, F.G. Ford, F. Smith, and E.W. Newman—to look after the interests of, and protect from Military Service, eligibles in their ecclesia. We did not in any way solicit, or court, the evidence furnished by bro. Hill. He sent it unasked, bearing date “May 30, 1916.” When the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, above all others, ought to have been clear and united on the question of not being “of the world”—(and it would have been had bro. Roberts been in its midst)—here is what bro. Hill was moved to write eighteen months after the London Petition had been presented to, and accepted by, Parliament: —

“It has been an abortion in Birmingham, a mixed up medley; and we have been brought out of the morass by outside pressure, for which we are truly thankful.”

Think of it, brethren and sisters. In the world-renowned Temperance Hall Ecclesia—the birthplace and headquarters of the *Christadelphian* and the home of its Editor; and, eighteen months after the alleged coming into line with the London Petition—what existed?

“An abortion:” “A mixed-up medley:” “A morass.”

And the witness, not a Clapham brother, but a prominent and an appointed representative of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia.

5. —Now let us turn to our late bro. T.W. Gamble, a beloved and constant fellow-labourer at Leicester, whom the author of the *Unjust Balance* thinks he knows the mind of concerning Birmingham and the *Christadelphian*. Fortunately bro. Gamble has not left us to think, or imagine, his mind. He has left it on record in his own handwriting. Our brother had been to Birmingham, and what he saw there, and heard, so moved him that, on his return to Leicester, in a letter dated May 31<sup>st</sup>, 1916, this is what he says: —

“I am very sorry about the (“*Christadelphian*”) Magazine. It seems so very unfortunate. I found the other four members of the “Birmingham Committee” very much concerned about it. No doubt you have heard from them.”

Yes, we had. The letter previously quoted from bro. Hill, it will be noticed, was written the same week.

We now ask, Why blame Clapham? Bro. Gamble was in no way connected with Clapham—he was not blaming Clapham. He was, however, writing Clapham with a view to assistance in mending in Birmingham what he was so “very sorry” about.

6. —Now let us hear a brother to whom Birmingham owes so much for his valiant fight at the Appeal Tribunals—bro. F.G. Ford. In a letter dated “9/6/16,” he wrote this: —

“Although he (the Editor of the “*Christadelphian*”), said our case was a matter of expediency, he failed to see that term applied to his position, not ours; I made that point

as strong as possible. We just had it hot. I pray to God further trouble may be avoided. . . . It would be dreadful to have to split the household in these days.”

“Further Trouble! “A split in the household!” Whatever caused bro. Ford to contemplate such a calamity? At Clapham, and the other London ecclesias, not a dissentient voice was heard—they were as one man. Well may bro. Roland Smith exclaim to his own Temperance Hall brethren, “Don’t blame Clapham; blame yourselves.”

7. —On 9/6/’16, our brother also wrote this: —

“We had a Committee meeting last night (Thursday) Bro. C.C. Walker seldom comes, but he came that time. . . .How can I tell the tale? Better to say little. Can talk better at some future time.”

In view of such revelation concerning the morass in Birmingham, how unjust to seek to blame Clapham. Is it not evident that peace was obtained in Birmingham at the expense of purity?

8. —We will conclude this section with documentary evidence from the pen of the author of the Unjust Balance, who, however incredible it may appear, has furnished overwhelming evidence that the Birmingham Trouble is to be traced to a hankering after some kind of service, in H.M. Forces, on the part of some in Birmingham, and the Christadelphian in particular. This is what bro. F.W. Turner wrote on “June 26<sup>th</sup>, 1916”: —

“It is greatly to be regretted that diverse opinions should come from our recognised mouthpiece in this period of the Truth’s history, when clear judgment, and united policy, are of paramount importance.”

And, yet, the writer of those words professes to believe that the root of the Trouble was at Clapham and not Birmingham. It is impossible to harmonise the above cited evidence of brethren Gamble, Ford, Hill, and Turner with the allegation that Clapham is to blame. Is it not patent that the trouble has sprung from the Temperance Hall sheltering brethren with wrong views as to H.M. Forces?

Next month, God willing, we shall furnish further evidence from bro. F.W. Turner, as well as from brethren Boulton and Lake. —(F.G.J.)

(To be continued.)

\* \* \*

[The main object of these articles is: —To make manifest the unrighteousness of the Temperance Hall Report’s contention that the Birmingham Trouble has arisen from Clapham suspicions; and to show that prominent brethren who, till now, have been incessant with their warning of impending apostasy on the part of “Birmingham and the Christadelphian,” have pro tem ceased their warnings, and are, passively or actively, siding with those whom they have denounced as unfaithful to the Truth contended for by Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts. One of them recently wrote, “Clapham took action too soon!”—F.G.J.]

---

## “Birmingham Frictions.”

No. 3

Of a series of articles by J. M. EVANS, of London.

Before considering bro. Pearce's speech let us keep in mind the statement of the Birmingham Arranging Brethren, page 46:

"These brethren (Davis and Pearce) have not withdrawn their speeches."

also an extract from the Turner-Evans' Joint Report, August 20<sup>th</sup>, 1921, page 5: —

"In answer to a specific question by bro. F.W. Turner, 'Have these brethren changed their views since 1917,' the Arranging Brethren emphatically replied, 'They have not changed their views.'"

The copy of bro. Pearce's speech contains twenty-seven paragraphs. The digest that follows is confined to fifteen only of these paragraphs. In Birmingham Frictions it is suggested that parts of it were never delivered. I have confined myself to those portions which are corroborated by independent witnesses, viz., the two pamphlets, Our Appeal and An Open Letter. When we quoted certain paragraphs from these publications purporting to summarise the contents of the two speeches, and asked the Birmingham Arranging Brethren if they were true, they replied that they were absolutely wrong and incorrect. On page 46 of the Unjust Balance, there appears a letter of mine to bro. Turner, and this is what is said: —

"Some of the A.B. statements were flat denials of bro. V.H's allegations, and in many cases I am not able to decide who is speaking the truth. This also seems to have been your mind as I note you have interpolated in more than one place the words "if accepted." This is right. We must not lay ourselves under the charge of accepting statements without corroborative evidence."

This was our dilemma. The two witnesses, the John Bright Street brethren on the one hand and the Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren on the other flatly contradicted each other.

Had we known it there was a third witness (perhaps even hidden away in the same room) who could have confirmed the accuracy of the version of the speeches appearing in Our Appeal and An Open Letter. We refer to the MSS. of the speeches mysteriously suppressed until this day. There was, however, one Birmingham Arranging brother in whom there existed a sense of justice and a desire for the truth to be known, and he supplied us later with a copy of bro. Pearce's speech. In a flash we saw that the John Bright Street account was substantially correct and that the version of the Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren was contradicted by the speech itself. The witness of two men is true. When the copy of the speech of bro. Pearce was compared with the published extracts of those who had actually heard the speeches and had set down their comparisons, it was found that in substance there was almost complete correspondence.

We submit, then, without hesitation, that the following may be relied upon as a correct summary of some of the views and arguments put forth by bro. Pearce on October 25<sup>th</sup>, 1917.

Points from bro Pearce's speech: —

(The numbers correspond to the paragraphs in the speech).

1. —Reasons why we should not make the question of police duty a matter of withdrawal.
2. —Christ's commands proverbial and must not be carried to unjustifiable extremes.
- 4-8. —Certain of Christ's commands from the Sermon on the Mount which are not kept literally.
9. —Therefore it may be justifiable to use force and not violate the spirit of Christ's commands.

10. —It is justifiable to whip our children.

11. —The city or state is an enlarged family and morally no difference between a father's rod and a policeman's baton. Both equally good and necessary.

12. —Therefore we ought not to shirk the unpleasant task of whipping the unruly children of the city.

14. —To insist upon such absurd literal interpretation of the proverbial expression regarding the resistance of evil was to make us parasites on the community and a menace to our neighbours.

20. —Don't withdraw from those who interpret Christ's commands differently from you.

22. —It is justifiable in the interests of the community to use coercive measures at times.

27. —Don't eject those whose interpretations of Christ's commands differ from yours.

There is much more in the speech which comes perilously near blasphemy, but as we are informed that some parts of it were withdrawn we can only hope for bro. Pearce's sake that these outrageous remarks were those retracted.

The brotherhood will now understand the consternation that this Christ-dishonouring speech produced, and will appreciate bro. C.C. Walker's comment that never had he heard Christ's commands called in question in that manner before, and, they will agree with bro. F.G. Ford that there had been a departure from the elements of the Faith. How extraordinary, then, is the later verdict of these same brethren. Turn to pages 8, 9, and 10 of Birmingham Frictions in which the Arranging Brethren aver that the two brethren in question—

“Have never argued for the legitimacy of brethren joining the constabulary and using force.

“They did not actually oppose withdrawal.”

The Arranging Brethren declare that the two brethren have argued that the circumstances of each case should be taken into account before the nature of the penalty is determined and that this constitutes their reservation to the Ecclesial Basis.

Now compare these statements with the speech of bro. Pearce summarised above. Could there be a more astounding discrepancy? —(J. M. EVANS).

(To be continued).

[We are sorry at thus having to divide this contribution, but are pressed for space. We have also had to hold over, till next month, a stirring exhortation by bro. Roberts, delivered just half a century ago to the Birmingham Ecclesia, and quite as much needed today. —EDITORS.]

---

CLEAN FLESH!

“Human Nature is the Devil; and if ignorant and uncontrolled by the Truth, will act devilishly. Nothing good is to be expected from it, for there is in it ‘no good thing’.”—(DR. THOMAS, Ambassador, 3, Page 26).

---

## The Bible True!

### Some of the Evidence.

1. —The Destruction of Sennacherib's Army and his death at the hands of his sons—2 Kings 19: 35-37.

“A most valuable version of the Bible story has been unearthed in recent excavations between Nineveh and Babylon, and has been acquired by the University of Chicago. The story is inscribed on six great tablets, and it tells of the incidents of the great western campaign which Sennacherib waged over Edom, Moab, and Philistia, reaching Tyre and Sidon, but stopping short of Jerusalem, where a whole wing of the great army was stricken and perished.”—Children's Newspaper, 25/12/'20.

On a tablet of unbaked clay. . . is inscribed on both sides an account of Babylonian affairs immediately following the year B.C. 747. In the third column we read: “In the month Tebet (January-February), day 20, Sennacherib, King of Assyria, his son, in a revolt, killed him. . . In the month of Adar (March-April), day 18, Esarhaddon, his son, in the land of Assyria, upon the throne sat.”—Marturia, p. 90.

2. —Pharaoh-necho's fight with Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish (the Hittite capital)—2 Chronicles 35: 20; Jeremiah 46: 2-12.

“In the outer town, however, a few private houses dating from the last days of Carchemish have been excavated, and throw an interesting light on the life of the ordinary people. The best of these also bore dramatic witness to a known historical event. It was a large villa with steps going up to its front door and a small railed-in porch which gave it a curiously modern and suburban air; it had good-sized rooms looking on to a central court, a staircase going to the upper storey, and by this a long passage like a cloak-room with a small closet below the turn of the stairs.

The house had been destroyed by fire, and the rooms were littered with arrow-heads and broken weapons, showing that a fierce room-to room struggle had taken place here at the moment of its destruction; the objects found in the ashes included an Assyrian inscribed tablet, bronze statuettes of Egyptian gods, a ring with the cartouche of Psammetichus I, and clay seal impressions bearing the name of Pharaoh-Necho.

Here was the whole history of the last days of Carchemish. Its rulers, vassals of Assyria, had long been carrying on intrigues with the kings of Egypt, and at last, reinforced by Egyptian armies, had risen in open revolt only to meet disaster; the battle in which this house—and all the city—was destroyed by fire was that of 604 B.C., when, as the prophet Isaiah [Jeremiah] records, Pharaoh-Necho came up and fought with Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish which is by the Euphrates.”—Wonders of the Past, p. 646-7. —(D. MORRISON). Bristol.

---

### OUR WORST ENEMIES.

The greatest and most dangerous enemies to Christ are those who pretend to be his friends but are not faithful to his doctrine; and they are unfaithful who, from any motives of personal interest would weaken the point of doctrine, or soften it for the gratification of their natural feelings, or for fear of hurting the feelings of the enemy, and so affecting their popularity with him. —(DR. THOMAS, Ambassador, 6. 156).

---

### PRAYING FOR OTHERS.

Paul says he “thanked God, making mention of Philemon always in his prayers.” In this frank allusion to the subject-matter of his private petitions, we have an insight into another feature, which deserves our notice and imitation. Paul was not above thanking God for a worthy fellow-labourer, and

letting him know it. In our dry, democratic days, this fruit of the Spirit is nearly as extinct as the tree of life. A universal self-esteem kills generous gratitude in the birth, and fears to lose its own exaltation by even implied appreciation of another's worth. This is an obstinate shrub of the desert, which must be cut down to make way for the lovely flowers of Eden, which delight the eye and regale the senses with their fragrance. But when the cutting down be? Well, in some cases it will take place now, under the exhortation to "mortify" and "crucify" all the characteristics of the old man of the flesh. It is better to apply the knife ourselves. "If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged."—(R. ROBERTS.)

---

## Debate with brother H. Fry of Bournemouth.

We were lately informed by bro. A.D. Strickler that bro. Fry agreed with his views.

We also heard from bro. Fry recently to the effect that bro. Strickler was misunderstood, and he was prepared to demonstrate that bro. Strickler was sound in the faith.

By the courtesy of bro. J.B. Handley, of Southsea, a meeting was arranged of a "conversational" character (in view of our weakness in the flesh) for Saturday, November 17<sup>th</sup>, at Southsea.

The meeting was attended by sister Graham who is with us, and a number of members of the Portsmouth ecclesia.

We personally invited bro. Corder of the Marmion Terrace meeting to attend, but two members of that meeting were refused admission by bro. Handley on the ground that sister Corder had been withdrawn from for breaking the commandments of Christ some little time ago, and these supported her. We think they should have been admitted; no harm could have resulted, but probably good.

Bro. Fry's main contention was for liberty of thought and expression. He maintained that bro. Strickler's views were not such as to merit withdrawal from him.

When we produced evidence of gross unsoundness from bro. Strickler's books, A Defence, and Out of Darkness into Light, bro. Fry, again and again, admitted that he could not defend such views.

Finally, the discussion resolved itself into the very simple question—Should brethren who hold unsound views be continued in fellowship? We answered, No! Bro. Fry answered, Yes.

Lovers of the Truth will therefore give a wide berth to the Bournemouth "open-door" Ecclesia at Alma Road, and seek the fellowship of bro. Wilkinson. —(G.H.D.)

---

### BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIANS.

The difference between a Christadelphian Ecclesia and a Berean Christadelphian Ecclesia is that whereas the former tolerates in fellowship brethren who do not wholeheartedly and unreservedly accept and adhere to the recognised Christadelphian Basis of Faith, the latter will not knowingly fellowship any brother or sister who has reservations on any First Principle.

---

## The Good of Evil.

A FIFTY-YEAR-AGO MESSAGE FROM BROTHER ROBERTS.

“He that endureth to the end shall be saved.” The Truth remains the precious, sweet and beautiful thing that it was when breathed from the lips of the Son of Man. Nothing can change it. The world has reeked with blood since he spoke the invitation of Eternal Wisdom to the sons of men; and multitudes with the name of Christ on their lips, have since filled the air with their curses. But like the sun, through all storms, the word of life has lasted unchanged in its glory; and divine love, as disclosed in the Gospel, is unweakened in its power to bless. Evil is permitted that we may be tried. For how should a man know whether he is holding on to God or man, unless he were put to the proof? When the way of Truth is hedged with thorns, we are exercised with the result of either greater strength or the snap that takes the fruitless branch from the tree. In this respect, evil from the hand of the Lord subserves the highest purpose; and if we could hear the Shepherd’s voice, he would say “Be of good cheer;” “Be not overcome of evil;” Hold fast that which thou hast; let no man take thy crown.”—(R. ROBERTS).

---

## Correspondence.

Correspondence for insertion in the current month must reach the Editor by the 25<sup>th</sup> 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.

### CONSCRIPTION IN FRANCE. (A letter from Paris).

21<sup>st</sup> November, 1923.

To the Editors of The Berean Christadelphian.

Dear Brother Jannaway, —Many thanks, etc. French law allows for no exemptions except physical unfitness. Priests and ministers of religion must serve and bear arms if physically fit. They are not allowed to choose service in the Army Medical Corps or any other non-combatant corps.

At the age of twenty, if physically fit, Frenchmen pass automatically under military authority, and after the first military training in active service remain in the Reserve until fifty years of age, liable to be called up whenever wanted.

A man who does not present himself for medical examination at the time indicated (that is, when he is about twenty years of age or a few months before the mobilization of his class) is declared fit for active service; should he refuse to comply with the mobilization order he is considered a deserter, arrested by the military authorities, court-martialled and liable to be sentenced to five years’ imprisonment. After the term of imprisonment he would be sent to Africa to do his military service in the Rebel Battalion, where the discipline is exceptionally severe; should he still refuse he would be liable to further imprisonment or even sentenced to death. Anyone refusing to comply with mobilization orders in time of war would be court-martialled for desertion in the face of the enemy, and sentenced to be shot.

Those who are not physically fit to bear arms and support training as an ordinary fighting soldier are passed into the auxiliary services or non-combatant corps, but still as soldiers.

Anyone inciting others to disobey or to refuse to do their military service, would be arrested for anti-military propaganda, and be liable to imprisonment. In time of war such person would be considered a traitor and sentenced to be shot.

Now in the face of such laws, which have been, and would be, strictly enforced, what advice would you give to a Frenchman with a wife and family who desired to obey the Truth? What would you consider the right attitude to adopt? Perhaps next time Conscription is enforced in England it may assume the Continental form which certainly would be far more serious for the brethren. May God grant us a way of escape. Yours fraternally, G. BAIN, Paris.

[Terrible reading some of the foregoing facts. What privileges, and what a marvelous deliverance we have enjoyed in Great Britain in the goodness and mercy of God. Read this communication in the light of the address of bro. Newman printed in our pages this month, and it will be seen it is a question of “in the Army” or “out of the Army,” no “happy medium” in the form of “non-combatant corps.”

As to the interested married friend of our brother, there can be no question as to his duty—Believe and Obey the Truth, regardless of consequences, and we doubt not that God will provide the way of escape. Such was the mind of Daniel, the man greatly beloved: consequences, or even fear of consequences, did not weigh with him, having once “purposed in his heart.” When in a much more terrible plight, this is what he said: “If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and He will deliver us out of thine hand, O King. But if not, be it known unto thee, O King, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.”

Such a severe test, however, may never come. Christ, our King, is at the door, and may put in an appearance and bring the required relief: “Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.”—F.G.J.]

\* \* \*

### THE TIME HAS COME FOR PLAIN SPEECH.

To the Editors of The Berean Christadelphian.

Dear Brother Denney, —There is a danger during the present controversy of raising up issues which tend to obscure the original point, the genesis of the trouble. I think, personally, that the more we confine ourselves to the original question, the better we shall appreciate the necessity of removing the original cause, and much of the other trouble would automatically vanish.

While I regret that bro. C.C. Walker should have given benediction to brethren Strickler and Bell, I look upon it more as an error of judgment than an endeavour to uphold them in what is generally recognised as their error. Considering the position he holds, and the fact that their language is so obviously impossible to recognise as being in accordance with our recognised beliefs, he would have been far wiser to have said nothing. Brethren who cannot clothe their ideas in definite and clear language should be allowed to remain in obscurity until they have achieved the gift of clarity. . . . .

For my own part I deny the right of a brother to say more than yea or nay where a matter of doctrine is concerned, and if he upholds wrong doctrine then he must be dealt with on Scriptural lines.

This brings us to the original point. My position is that the brethren in the Temperance Hall Ecclesia who were withdrawn from were contending against a very salient deviation from one of Christ’s commands, and that it was manifestly wrong to withdraw from them while the cause of their grievance still existed. In spite of all attempts to gloss over this matter, and in spite of the Jesuitical twistings of language which have taken place on this point, it emerges quite clearly that brethren Davis and Pearce did assert things not in accordance with Christ’s commands, and it is an undoubted fact that bro. C.C. Walker and other of the Temperance Hall arranging brethren did call them in question at the time. Nothing has occurred since to modify their language, which they (or, at least, one of them) maintains to this present day. That, I say, is an incontrovertible fact. . . . .

It is an unfortunate fact that the Temperance Hall Ecclesia (or I should rather say some of the ecclesia) took up a very peculiar attitude at the time of the conscription trouble. I remember myself, along with many others in the Midlands, calling attention to these things at the time, and we thanked God for the London Standing Committee when they took up the unequivocal attitude they did on the question, for we felt convinced that if the Temperance Hall view was taken, then we were indeed in a morass of difficulty. . . .

There are some points on which we may differ, but the use of force is not one of them, and any brother who suggests that joining the army or any of its arms is not a matter of doctrine, is certainly out of harmony with the Truth as I know it, and should be avoided until he (or she) has purged the error.

It is a serious thing to condemn a brother at any time, but there does come a time when it is necessary, and this is such a time. . . .

The time is come for plain speech—bro. Davis has advocated the use of force, and has declined to withdraw his words—there is only one remedy. The Temperance Hall Ecclesia has endorsed his words, after vividly condemning them—there is only one remedy. The Temperance Hall Ecclesia has disfellowshipped brethren who contended for Christ's commands—there is only one remedy. Who is on the Lord's side? —A. V. FELTHAM.  
Leamington.

[We are sorry to curtail our brother's excellent letter, but even now it exceeds the limit of 200 words. —EDITORS.]

\* \* \*

#### ANOTHER UNJUST BALANCE.

To the Editors of The Berean Christadelphian.

Dear Brother Denney, —Brother Lake has just issued a circular entitled "The Clapham Ecclesia and Military Service," in which he misrepresents the position of that Ecclesia.

He claims that there is a parallel between certain events at Clapham and Birmingham and that our action at Clapham is inconsistent.

Bro. Lake entirely misconceives the ground of our action. We did not withdraw from Birmingham merely because two brethren some years ago dissented from the action of their ecclesia.

Our reasons are set forth in our literature. They are: —

1. —Retaining in fellowship brethren who taught false doctrine and who have not abandoned it.
2. —Unrighteously withdrawing from brethren who were and are not guilty of unscriptural doctrine or practice.

The contention that there is a parallel between the events at Clapham and Birmingham cannot be sustained.

At Clapham: —

A young brother joined the Army, and when the proposal of withdrawal came before the meeting, his father, allowing his parental affection to overrule his duty, opposed the resolution. Another brother, a close friend of the father, pleaded for leniency on account of the youth of the soldier. 'He is only a boy,' was his plea. Both voted against the resolution. No iniquitous speeches were delivered requiring condemnation. Consequently no brethren were ejected from the fellowship because of faithful protests.

The father was subsequently withdrawn from for prolonged absence. The other brother is dead. I say without any hesitation that had the Birmingham incident followed the same course, we should not have taken action against them. But how do the two cases compare: —

At Birmingham: —

An amendment was moved, supported by speeches destructive of some of Christ's solemn commandments.

The speakers "have not changed their views nor withdrawn their speeches."

The brethren who urged that the scriptural course should be taken against the offenders have been unscripturally disfellowshipped, as the Brixton brethren (F.W. Turner & Co.,) admitted.

Bro. Lake misapprehends the reason for our action. He is wrong as to his facts. And his conclusions are equally erroneous.

I have asked bro. Lake to substantiate his statement that we have in our fellowship those who voted against the withdrawals at Clapham by giving me their names. So far he has failed to do so. Having made the charge without evidence, he is now going to see if it is true. I do not know of any, but assuming that we did have such in our fellowship, the real question is, Are they sound in doctrine and willing to support us in action against offenders? —not, Did they some time ago vote against withdrawals?

And the same equally applies to brethren Davis and Pearce. Are they now sound in doctrine, and are they ready to heartily support the action of the ecclesia, then, so far as they are concerned, there is no barrier to fellowship, notwithstanding their previous speeches and actions.

It is a very painful task for me to have to write thus, in view of my personal regard for bro. Lake, but he has been misinformed as to our true position and the real facts of the case, and he is consequently likely to mislead others. —Faithfully your brother,

London, 29/11/23.

J. M. EVANS.

\* \* \*

“PLAGUE SPOT” OR “LIGHTSTAND”?

To the Editors of The Berean Christadelphian.

Dear Brother, —Pamphlets to hand. They disclose a deplorable state of things in Birmingham. I was aware that there was something wrong there a long time ago. It appears to have become a plague-spot instead of a lightstand. I have just written a long letter to bro. C.C. Walker, but I do not expect it will make any difference. I place very little confidence in men. There was a wholesale apostasy in the days of the Apostles and after, and human nature is made of the same stuff still. It is a great comfort to me to know that there are at least a few faithful brethren left, but you will require money to carry on the work. I could help in that way. . . .

Dunedin, New Zealand.

CHARLES BERRY.

[Truly a little help is worth loads of pity; but while grateful and appreciative of bro. Berry's kind offer—the work being done in the old country is self-supporting. Many thanks. Your good work at Cannock is still fragrant in our remembrance. —EDITORS.]

---

## 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, as set forth on page 238, 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 25<sup>th</sup> of the previous month.

---

ARDROSSAN. —Lesser Town Hall: Breaking of Bread at 11.15. We still continue to proclaim the Word of Truth to all who have ears to hear. To this end we have had a strenuous time since the beginning of October, when we commenced a series of six lectures, bro. Holland taking the first bro. Grant the second, and bro. Raxworthy (of Margate) taking the third. The remaining three by the same brethren in the same order. In the case of the lectures, we gave them in the large Town Hall; the attendance of the strangers was meagre. We now give addresses in the Lesser Hall instead of the lecture, the addresses being more for our own education than that of the alien. In this connection we may say that we have a few interested strangers who come regularly, and are not afraid to ask questions. Then we have commenced a Sunday School, of which bro. Grant has charge, there being quite a good number of scholars. On Tuesday evenings we hold a Bible Class for the benefit of all who care to avail themselves of it. So far the attendances have been good and encouraging. Our young brother, John Davidson, jr., made his first public appearance as "speaker" at one of these meetings. We must place on record our appreciation of the visits of brethren from London (Clapham), bro. H. Jannaway and sister M. Jannaway, and also bro. and sister J. Barker, all of Clapham. The ecclesia is grateful that they came this way while on holiday. We also mention that bro. Raxworthy, who is in isolation in Glasgow, comes down to the breaking of bread when he finds it convenient. Sister Collins, of Kilmarnock ecclesia, has taken the same stand as we here in Ardrossan. She was received into our fellowship on the 18<sup>th</sup> of November. We are on the same basis of fellowship as advocated in the Berean Christadelphian, we having withdrawn our fellowship from Birmingham (Temperance Hall). —JOHN HOLLAND, Rec. Bro.

BRIDGEND (Adair Chambers). Meetings: Sundays, 11 a.m., Breaking of Bread; 3 p.m., Sunday School; 6.30 p.m., Lecture; Tuesday evening 7.30 p.m., Improvement Class, Subject, "The Image of Nebuchadnezzar's Dream;" Thursday Evening at 7.30, Eureka Class, at the residence of bro. Sid. Evans. The works of Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts are never likely to take a back seat here. A sister has painted for our room three beautiful pictures of the Tabernacle in the Wilderness, viz., The Encampment, The Holy Place and the Most Holy Place. They have nicely served the purpose of illustrating a course of lectures thereon. We have been encouraged by the addition of another useful brother, viz., bro. J. Webber. Our meetings have been fairly well attended by the interested alien. We re-affirm our position with regard to those fellowshipping Temperance Hall; we cannot tolerate reservations. We are sure there are many like us, who have regretfully cut off those near and dear to them. They have all our sympathy, and our prayer is that they will be faithful unto death. We now number twenty-four regular attendants. —W. WINSTON, Clifton House, Bridgend.

CROYDON. —Gymnasium Hall, 117 High Street; Sunday, 11 a.m. and 6.30; Thursdays, 8 p.m., Horniman's Hall, North End West Croydon. It is with much pleasure we report the following additions to our fellowship. Bro. and sis. Plummer, bro. and sis. Wilson, sis. Clark, Senr., Bro. and sis. H. Clarke, sis. Reynolds. All of these brothers and sisters are from Streatham, with the exception of sis.

H. Clark who recently left North London as sis. W. Manders, and who has now been united to bro. H. Clark in marriage. The best wishes of the Ecclesia are extended to them in their new relationship. During the month of September, the Clapham Ecclesia assisted us by giving a special course of lectures in the above Hall. We take this opportunity of thanking the brethren for their help, both morning and evening, which has been much appreciated. —A. J. RAMUS, Rec. Bro.

DERBY. —We are now six. Bro. and sis. Lowe and bro. J. Lacy have joined us and come out for the whole of the Truth. Bro. Lowe has completed nearly forty years' service in the Truth. He came out during the war because a brother joined the Special Police. —W. E. CAULTON, Sec.

GUNNERSBURY. —Ivy Hall, Wellesley Road, Chiswick, W.; Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; Wednesday, 8 p.m. We have had the pleasure of the company of bro. and sis. Cheffins of Birmingham John Bright Street, and sis. I. Jarret of Clapham, at the table of the Lord. We much regret having to report that sisters L. Maxwell and D. Jeffries have left us to resume attendance at Ealing, and fellowship with Birmingham Temperance Hall, and thus place themselves out of our fellowship. We are encouraged by the attendance of several interested strangers to the lectures which we are able to maintain by the help of brethren from other ecclesias. —W. E. EUSTACE, Sec.

ILFORD. —Cranbrook Hall; Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; Bible Class 8 o'clock Tuesday evenings, Cleveland Road School. We have pleasure in reporting the immersion of Harold Horsfall, son of our bro. and sis. Horsfall on October 10<sup>th</sup>, and Leonard Lear on October 17<sup>th</sup>, both of whom we trust will receive an abundant entrance into the Kingdom of God. On September 29<sup>th</sup> we had the company of many brethren and sisters at our Tea and Fraternal Meeting, when "Our Covenant Relationship with God in Christ" was profitably considered. We welcome sis. Handley and bro. and sis. White from Westcliffe-on-Sea. They have removed to Laindon and are now meeting with us. We have had the pleasure of the company of sis. May Graham, of Southsea, and bro. H. Lander, of Bristol, at the Table of the Lord. Both sis. Graham and bro. Lander carefully considered the documents published by the Temperance Hall Ecclesia and especially the pamphlet, Ecclesial Relationships, and are convinced that the conclusions set forth in our leaflet Ecclesial Relationships are Scriptural and correct, and have therefore decided to separate themselves from the fellowship of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia and associate themselves with us. —W. W. DIGGENS, Sec.

IPSWICH. —Public Hall (Arcade Street Entrance); Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m. We take this opportunity to thank the Clapham and Ilford Ecclesias for their help in sending lecturers to our small meeting, thus enabling us to carry on. We have been greatly encouraged of late by the regular attendance of one or two interested friends. —S. C. SIMPSON.

LANGLEY MILL. —The minority here, formerly of Heanor Ecclesia, meet on Sunday mornings at 11 o'clock for the breaking of bread. Invitation is extended to brethren and sisters in fellowship with Clapham ecclesia. Address: 21 Milnhay Road. Please note. —ARTHUR BOWLES.

LONDON, S., CLAPHAM. —Avondale Hall, Landor Road, S.W.; Sundays, 11 a.m. and 6.30 p.m.; M.I.C., 9.50 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 baptism—November 11<sup>th</sup>, Mrs. Ruth Evendon (formerly neutral), Miss Caroline Emma Lancaster (Presbyterian); November 18<sup>th</sup>, William Frederick Buck (Church of England), Lena Elizabeth Buck (neutral), and Louisa Evendon (neutral). We also add to our number and are pleased to welcome sisters E.A. Robinson and D.A. Robinson, from Southampton. Our bro. F.E. Robinson and sis. Carrie Brighting were united in marriage on October 27<sup>th</sup>, and we assure them of the best wishes of the ecclesia. They have removed to Southampton where they are at present in isolation. It is our painful duty to record the death of sis. E.L. Thompson on November 9<sup>th</sup>. She suffered patiently for several years, and was laid to rest at Nunhead Cemetery on November 14<sup>th</sup> by our bro. F.G. Jannaway, a number of brethren and sisters being present. A Fraternal Gathering will be held on Saturday, December 29<sup>th</sup>, at 6.30 p.m. in the Essex Hall, Essex Street, Strand. Brethren and sisters in fellowship will be heartily welcomed. —F. J. BUTTON.

LONDON, CLAPTON, E.5. —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. It is with pleasure that we have to record the immersion into the Saving Name, on the 6<sup>th</sup> November last, of Mr. Thomas Forester Shelley. Our prayers are that he may “run with patience the race that is set before him” and so gain the prize, even an incorruptible crown, at the appearing of Our Lord. Our brother has since been united in marriage to sis. Gladys Dunkley of this ecclesia, and both have the good wishes of the brethren and sisters in their new relationship. We are also pleased to report the transfer to this ecclesia of bro. A.W. Ramus, who was formerly a member of the Bristol Street, Birmingham, Ecclesia, although in isolation for some time. He has now secured permanent employment in London, and his association with us will be greatly appreciated. We have had the company of sis. Hutley of Gunnersbury around the Table of the Lord during the past month.

LATER: —At a Special Ecclesial Meeting held on the 1<sup>st</sup> inst., which was convened in order to consider the Resolutions passed at the meeting held in Birmingham on the 15<sup>th</sup> September last, I was instructed to forward to you, for insertion in the Berean Christadelphian, a copy of a letter which has been dispatched to bro. Southall, and which expresses the views of the Clapham Ecclesia in connection therewith. It reads as follows:

“We acknowledge receipt of your communication wherein you give an account of the meeting held in Birmingham on 15<sup>th</sup> September, 1923, and the Resolutions passed on that occasion.

The brethren and sisters of this Ecclesia are in agreement with these resolutions, having but recently withdrawn from Temperance Hall Ecclesia, Birmingham, and all who fellowship them, because, among other things, the spirit of these resolutions has not been acted up to.

You have not informed us as to whether all the signatories to these resolutions have taken like action, which, of course, should be the logical outcome, and until we are in possession of a definite assurance on this point we cannot fully identify ourselves with this movement although agreeing with the bare wording of your resolutions.

We feel that the mere passing of resolutions does not strike at the root of the trouble unless such are translated into definite action.

We note that there were some present at your meeting who apparently endorsed the resolutions, but who continue to fellowship those who are not like-minded; hence our hesitation to identify ourselves fully with your movement.

We may also point out that there is the very grave Constitutional issue which has not been touched upon by your resolution.”—C. C. REDMILL, Sec.

LONDON, STAMFORD HILL. —This ecclesia asks for the insertion of the following explanation of their position: —“We are not in fellowship with any ecclesia anywhere. Our position has been made clear by circular letter to all ecclesias. As none have accepted our position we are not in fellowship with any ecclesia or member of the brotherhood anywhere.”—H. G. STANSELL, Sec.

NOTTINGHAM. —Corn Exchange; Sunday morning 10.30, School 2.30, Lecture 6.30; Eureka Class, Tuesday evening 7.45; Bible Class, Wednesday evening 7.45 in the Huntingdon Street Schools. Since last report four more have renounced the vanities of this world to grasp the divine riches. Their names are as follows: —Leonard Reynolds, Dora Smith, Lily Lomax, and Grace Elston, daughter of bro. and sis. E.H. Elston. Much interest is still manifest in the lectures. The Sunday School Party is fixed (D.V.) for December 26<sup>th</sup>, at the Huntingdon Street Schools. Tea at 4.30. After tea the scholars will build up the Tabernacle Model while its significance is explained. Intending visitors will find someone in attendance at the schools during the afternoon. —W. J. ELSTON.

ST. AUSTELL. —We shall be glad to welcome any brother or sister who would visit the West at our breaking of bread at 6.30 p.m. on Sundays, which is held at bro. Milner’s, 64 Slades, St. Austell, also Bible Class on Wednesdays at 7 p.m. Only those on the Clapham basis and a pure fellowship invited. —ALFRED SLEEP, Rec. bro., c/o Mrs. Beale, Moorland Road, St. Austell.

[The Clapham Basis is practically the Birmingham Basis, but Clapham insists on all its members accepting it without reservation. —EDITORS.]

WELLINGTON, Salop. —Bro. H. Saxby writes: —“We are greatly encouraged by the fearless stand that the Berean is taking at this crisis. We are in isolation here, and are glad to have the opportunity of meeting with those of like mind. On Sunday, November 11<sup>th</sup>, we were encouraged by a visit from the faithful four from Crewe, and found great joy in meeting with them at the table of the Lord. This trouble has driven some back to the Apostolic example of ‘breaking bread from house to house.’ —H. G. SAXBY, 47 Urban Terrace, Wellington, Salop.”

#### AUSTRALIA.

SALISBURY, Queensland. —Bro. R.W. Ferguson writes—“As regards our position re the withdrawal from Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia we fully endorse it, and have stood aside from that ecclesia and ranged ourselves with Ilford, Clapham, and John Bright Street, Birmingham. I enclose copy of letter sent to bro. C.C. Walker.”

[Excellent letter; sorry lack of space forbids its re-production at present. —EDITORS.]

#### CANADA.

GUELPH, Ontario. —We have two more added to our numbers: N. Geo. Norton Slipp was baptized on October 28<sup>th</sup> into the saving name of Jesus Christ, and Daisy Fletcher, late of Swindon Ecclesia, England, is meeting with us. On October 31<sup>st</sup> bro. Slipp and sis. Fletcher were united in marriage. May their union be blessed, and they at last receive that most blessed reward, Eternal Life. —J. HAWKINS. Sec.

[“Answers to Correspondents” and many other matters held over].