

Price 4d

April, 1924

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 by GEO. H. DENNEY and FRANK G. JANNAWAY.

Published by
GEO. H. DENNEY, 47 Birchington Rd., Crouch End, London, N.8.,
to whom all orders should be sent.
Telephone: G. H. DENNEY, Hornsey 1396, or Clerkenwell 2888.
F. G. JANNAWAY, Brixton 626

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

CONTENTS		Page
Dr. John Thomas (Christadelphian), his Life and Work	97
The Bible wholly inspired and infallible— No. 107. — Early Christian Writings	100
Editorial	102
Los Angeles Declaration	107
Questions for Christadelphians	111
On the Watch Tower	114
The Alien Marriage Question.....	...	118
The Rise of the Jewish Sects...	121
Splits in the Body	124
The Berean Christadelphian and Dr. Thomas	125
“Birmingham Frictions”	125
To our “John Bright Street” brethren	128
Ecclesial News	128
From our Post Bag	131

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

Notes.

H.B. (Brixton). —Several weeks ago when you asked us to send you a copy of Lest We Forget for a correspondent, we at once replied, “Send us the name and address of the correspondent and a copy will at once be sent, post free.” You never replied. Is it truthful of you now to sign yourself, “Yours sincerely” seeing over your signature you say, “I presume you don’t want ‘Lest We Forget’ to go to my correspondent?” We have sent post free nearly 3,000, and are still giving Lest We Forget to any Christadelphian who has not already had a copy, but we are not going to give them to Brixton non-readers. —See note to T. Sandell. We hear you have similarly written the Clapham recording brother! But do you think anyone will believe you? —that although the Clapham brethren have spent hundreds of pounds in pamphlets to enlighten the brotherhood, they would refuse one to any genuine applicant? We have a good idea who your secret “correspondent” is. A brother ought not to return any book or letter “unopened” and marked “not wanted.” Proverbs 1: 24-31 is applicable.

H.M. (Coventry). —See note to H.B. we are still open to send six copies wanted by your brethren, and are waiting the names and addresses. Seeing you returned your copy marked “not wanted by Coventry,” we are not disposed to throw copies away; they are too precious for that.

J. M. THOMAS. —The report that “bro. F.G. Jannaway paid a visit to Birmingham recently and found matters among his friends so unsatisfactory that he had to break bread alone in his room at the hotel” is false. When bro. Jannaway went to Birmingham recently he was the guest of bro. Viner Hall, gave the exhortation at the John Bright Street meeting in the morning, and lectured for them in the evening. A slandering tongue is prone to adulterate his slander with a little truth to make it palatable. Last year when bro. Jannaway visited Birmingham with a big day’s work before him, he was so “run down” that in order to fulfil his public and inter-ecclesial work, he “remembered Christ” alone to conserve his energy for the 3 o’clock meeting. We did expect better things of you—Jeremiah 20: 10.

WHY NOT NOW? A postal order for 5/- or a dollar—115 cents—(American or Canadian) will ensure a copy of the Berean Christadelphian every month until this time next year, if the Lord will. Send full name and address to bro. G.H. Denney, 47 Birchington Road, London, N.8. (With the first number you will also receive an autographed picture of Dr. John Thomas at the age of 41, when he had attained a full knowledge of saving Truth).

THE CHARGE AGAINST BIRMINGHAM. —Bro. F. Walker, of Bristol in his single-handed defence of the commandments of Christ, was not allowed to finish his speech. We, however, have read the M.S., and are glad to learn it is now in type and can be had in pamphlet form of the publisher, 41 Stokes Croft, Bristol. Single copies, 4d. each; 12 for 3/6; or 100 for 25/6. The Charge is unanswerable, and we do not wonder at the lovers of darkness trying to suppress it.

“ELPIS ISRAEL,” in cloth, for 2/6. The works of Dr. Thomas have entered upon a new life with the 7/- Elpis Israel for 2/6—and Eureka in 1/- parts. Apply for prospectus to Maranatha Press, 100 Southwark Street, London, S.E. 1.

J. CARTER. —Thanks for writing you will be pleased to read the Berean Christadelphian if we send it to you; but it is only sent free to those who cannot afford 5/-.

E.I.B.—Beyond question you are zealous but you are simply saying things that were said seventy and fifty years ago to Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts when they were exposing and opposing false teachers. You write much of “love” but overlook 1 Corinthians 13: 6. The “love” you parade does not permit of Matthew 16: 23; Galatians 2: 5; Matthew 7: 14, 20-22. If you had been in the conflict in the days of Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts, your “love” would have made you their enemy. Why are you not with the “Partial Inspirationists.”? (but perhaps you are). Their “love” comprehends the followers of “brethren” J.Bell, H.G. Ladson, and A.D. Strickler. We cannot see why you refuse fellowship to the Russellites. Then, as to all your references to “peace;” you absolutely ignore such texts as 2 Kings 19:

17-22; Proverbs 28: 3; Jeremiah 6: 14; and James 3: 17; and you fail to heed 2 Timothy 2: 15. Finally, you labour Matthew 7: 1 to the exclusion of such texts as John 7: 24; and 2 Thessalonians 3: 6. Not only so, you shamefully violate Matthew 7: 1 by attributing evil motives to those who disagree with you.

ENQUIRER. —As to Ecclesial News. As stated in the three paragraphs prefacing such every month, we only undertake to insert such from those really and truly in our fellowship. The responsibility for each item of news rests with the brother who sends the Intelligence, although it is just possible the space and offer may be abused. We act with due caution, but until we know or have reason to think otherwise, we treat those who send the “news” as faithful brethren. We turn down denunciatory “Information” about third parties marked “private.”

E. FIRTH, J.S., C.A., B.W., AND OTHERS. —The pamphlets and other matter giving the facts of the Birmingham Trouble have duly been returned, marked, “unread,” “not wanted,” and in at least one case with the cowardly assurance that the writer “knows nothing of the dispute, and does not want to!” That was the cry of apostate Israel—but what did God say? —“Ye SHALL see—Ye SHALL know!” There will be a terrible awakening for such at the Judgment Seat; for willful ignorance will be no excuse then for having sacrificed purity for peace. Awake to righteousness and sin not.

T. G. SANDELL. —You have “not even opened it;” “Have not read it, and do not mean to;” and similar protests. Yet, you label the contents “rubbish,” “obnoxious,” and “effluvis” (whatever that may mean). Brother; ponder Proverbs 18: 13. The pamphlet you returned “unopened” was not what you so unjustly concluded. It was by a Bristol brother who, for more than a year has been impartially studying everything that has been published by “both sides.” We are convinced his motives for publishing his conclusions are pure and Christ-like. Brother; Awake to righteousness, ere it be too late. Let Isaiah’s words ring in your ears—“They will not see; but they SHALL see; and be ashamed.” Ignorance of the FACTS set out in the pamphlets you return “unopened” will be no excuse at the Judgment Seat for remaining in the camp of the Apostate Temperance Hall Community, in view of your attitude—Psalm 58: 4-5. But, while there is life there is hope, so your separated brethren will still engage in the work—Revelation 22: 17; 2 Timothy 4: 2.

C.H.A., B.R.W., J.S., J.L., R.C., W.D., B.T., H.Y., J.T. (Brixton and elsewhere). —Read and ponder the note to T.G. Sandell.

C. C. HITCHCOCK (Sydney, N.S.W.). —Thanks for your letter, which we read with interest. As you truly say, we live in perilous times. Let all strive for purity who desire to win the prize.

J.G.—Yes, we believe bro. Mattinson at the “open door” meeting at Ilford, is entitled to wear a sword by virtue of his rank as a Major, but we doubt whether he would lay it on the Table whilst he presided at Fraternal Meetings as you suggest. As to your other query: Yes; T.E. Pearce’s speech is in existence: we have read it.

J.W.A. and others. —We thank you for your kind remarks. Probably you are right when you say that “moral integrity invariably accompanies doctrinal integrity” and that “the reverse is true.” The news you send is too terrible in detail to publish. There are some things “not even to be mentioned.” What an untrustworthy thing the flesh is! But its influence is as great as ever.

W. DAVIES (Liverpool). —It is now over a year ago since we challenged you to give the name of a single brother out of the “more than one hundred cases in which bro. C.C. Walker successfully appealed for exemption from Military Service.” Bro. Walker has not and can not furnish you with one name let alone a hundred, and yet, not only have you not been honourable enough to withdraw and apologise for your mis-statement, but we find you are still retailing the lie. Ponder the latter half of Revelation 21: 8.

C. BRIGHTON. —Twelve months ago, we asked you not to write us again until you could furnish the evidence that bro. Walker manifested how sound he was on the question of service in His Majesty's Service by "successfully appealing for absolute exemption for our young brethren in over 100 cases." You promised the names; but we have not since heard from you! The fact that bro. C.C. Walker, who fathered the "Clause 7" Petition approved of the London Petition, is worthless in view of the fact (we have it before us now in his own handwriting) the latter was signed "only for the sake of unanimity."

Brother (wife and one child) wants house, or flat, or 3-4 rooms in a house (preferably brother's) anywhere N.W. or W. London, not too far from Wembley. Permanent tenancy (not Exhibition only). Harrow or near would suit; urgent. —MOORHEAD, Cardiff Grove, Luton, Beds.

One large, furnished room suitable for two, either brethren or sisters. Comfortable home. Board if required. Apply sis. (Mrs.) Warwick, 47 Corrance Road, S.W.2. (Ten minutes from Clapham Meeting; also all Bus and Tram Services).

Sister (widow) would take a middle-aged sister to join her for companionship; share living and household duties; use of rooms, furniture, etc., free. Berean Christadelphian Meeting Room one mile distant. Apply (sister) Mrs. R. White, 31 Oak St., Darby End, Netherton, near Dudley.

Lodging and attendance wanted for an aged sister (near a meeting preferred). Apply S.M., c/- Editor, 47 Birchington Road, N.8.

HELD OVER. —Again we regret to hold over much we should like to have inserted this month.

F. LINDARS (Brixton). —We have seen professed rejoicing at the "six hours discussion with bro. F.G. Jannaway" which you say you "would gladly have shared with others." Well, now show the courage of your profession. Bro. F.G. Jannaway will gladly come to Brixton Hall, and in the presence of your Ecclesia, share the platform with you, and repeat his part of that six hours' discussion, and thus enable your brethren to share your experience. Yes; bro. F.W. Turner may act as chairman, and any evenings will suit, except Clapham meeting nights.

T. E. PEARCE'S SPEECH. —We learn this is being printed, and that copies can be had of bro. W.W. DIGGENS, 211 Hampton Road, Ilford, Essex. "That unscriptural speech." (Perhaps that other unscriptural speech of bro. Davis will yet see daylight).

The Berean

CHRISTADELPHIAN

A 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 by
GEO. H. DENNEY and FRANK G. JANNAWAY.

Published by

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

VOL. XII., No. 4 APRIL 15th 1924 FOURPENCE

Dr. John Thomas
(Christadelphian)

His Life and Work

CHAPTER 4

Arrived on terra firma, the Doctor did not forget the resolution he had formed to seek for the Truth. He had received a letter of introduction and recommendation from the Rev. Henry Foster Burder, D.D. to a divine of the Presbyterian order in New York, and he thought he could not do better than begin his explorations by listening to the latter. He accordingly went and heard him on the following Sunday, but at once came to the conclusion from what he heard that it was no use hearing him any more. He next made use of letters of introduction which his father had brought from home, to the Rev. Archibald Maclay, late President of the Baptist Bible Society, of New York, and the Rev. Mr. Foster, another Baptist preacher. Mr. Foster asked him where he was going? The Doctor replied that he was going to Cincinnati, where he had a letter of introduction to a gentleman. Mr. Foster remarked that the western people were very hospitable but very much infected with “reformation.” The Doctor was struck with the remark, which was the first allusion to the system of Campbellism with which he was destined to have so much to do. Mr. Foster tried to induce him to remain in New York. Adhering to his purpose of going to Cincinnati, Mr. Foster gave him a letter of introduction to a Rev. Mr. Lynd, a Baptist preacher there, and also to Dr. Stoughton, professor of surgery in the Ohio Medical College. His father resolved to accompany him, and they set out together in the month of September. There were no railroads at that time, and the route was rather tedious. Nothing of note occurred on the way.

Arrived at their destination, they went to the house of a man named Brown, director of one of the Cincinnati banks, to whom they had a letter of introduction from his brother, Colonel Brown of London. This indirectly resulted in the Doctor’s introduction to Campbellism. The day after their arrival, the fact became known to a gentleman living opposite, Major Daniel Gano, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, whose interest was excited by the announcement that a Baptist minister and family had arrived from England. This Mr. Gano was a gentleman who as the result of

presiding at a debate between the Rev. Alexander Campbell and a Mr. Owen, embraced the views of the former with a sincerity illustrated by the fact that he incurred a forfeit of 500 dollars lying upon a horse which he had entered for the races at Lexington, Kentucky. Mr. Gano gave the Doctor and his father an invitation to dinner, which they accepted, and the Doctor had not been an hour in this gentleman's company when he called the Doctor's attention to the New Testament, and commenced talking with him about what he styled "the ancient gospel and order of things." The Doctor thought this a very strange, as well as unfashionable proceeding, but supposed it was the custom of the country to talk about such things—a supposition in which he afterwards found he was greatly mistaken. The Doctor, out of respect to his entertainer, paid attention to his representations. Major Gano quoted the 38th verse of the 2nd chapter of Acts in the course of conversation, and used the word "immerse" instead of "baptise." This aroused the suspicions of the Doctor, who at once said that he had never heard of such a passage in the Bible before. Major Gano replied that truly the word "immerse" was not in the verse as rendered in the English Version, but that the Doctor must know that "immersion" and "baptism" meant the same thing. The Doctor responded with the remark that he never did think anything of infant sprinkling, but that as to immersion, he considered it a matter of very little moment. Major Gano on parting, gave him a pamphlet on the remission of sins, published by Mr. Alexander Campbell, which, he told him would inform him all about the subject. The Doctor out of respect, accepted the pamphlet, but determined in his own mind not to read it, lest he should become biased in his independent search after the Truth, and get astray. In a few days the Doctor called again, and the Major gave him another pamphlet (subject— "The Holy Spirit") written by the late Walter Scott, the original founder of Campbellism. The Doctor accepted it in the same spirit as the other, and for the same reason, on his return home, laid it with the other on the window-sill.

On the following Sunday, this Mr. Walter Scott was to preach the funeral sermon of a person who died of cholera; and the Major invited the Doctor to go and hear him. The Doctor replied that he was searching after Truth, and intended to hear all the preachers in Cincinnati, and he would hear Mr. Scott in due time, but not just then. The Major replied that was all very well, but he might as well begin with Mr. Scott, which out of respect the Doctor consented to do. This was the incident that introduced the Doctor to Campbellism.

When Sunday arrived, the crowd was so great (the place being a private house) that they could not get in. The Major, therefore that he would invite Mr. Scott to go home with them, so that the Doctor might get the full benefit of the occasion. So, after the discourse, they all returned in a carriage together. A pleasant evening was spent at the Major's house. Mr. Scott introduced religious topics, addressing himself more particularly to the Doctor. He spoke of Daniel's Four Empires, which the Doctor only knew as much about as he had read in Rollin's Ancient History, and of which Mr. Scott, it struck the Doctor, knew no more. After a considerable amount of conversation, Mr. Scott remarked to the Doctor that they seemed to agree very well in the generals; "Now," says he, "suppose we take something of the particulars. What hinders that you should be a Christian?" The Doctor replied that he did not know but that he was as good a Christian as anybody. "Well," said the Major, "have you been baptised?" The Doctor answered that the only baptism of which he had been the subject was the baptism administered when he was a baby. Mr. Scott was then at some pains to show that that baptism did not avail anything; that, in fact, it was no baptism at all, but only a conventional and valueless ceremony, which had no foundation in Scripture.

At the conclusion of his argument, he asked him if he believed in Jesus Christ. The Doctor answered that he could not tell the time when he did not believe in him, as he had been born and brought up in that belief. Mr. Scott asked what hindered, then, that he should be baptised? "Oh," said the Doctor, "that was a different thing." He thought it was all very well for preachers to be immersed who had to baptise others, but he did not see any necessity for anybody else being immersed; "an answer which," said the Doctor afterwards, "manifested my ignorance." But he told Mr. Scott that he was seeking for the Truth, and if he could show him a case from the Scriptures in which a man was baptised as soon as he believed, he should give up his opposition. The Doctor, in his ignorance, thought himself well entrenched in that position. Mr. Scott at once accepted the issue, and directed his attention to the case of the eunuch (Acts 8:27-30). "There," he remarked, "you see that, as soon as he

believed, they went down into the water, and the eunuch was immersed. Now," said he, "I would suggest you do likewise."

The Doctor, a little taken aback at the suddenness and strength of the issue, said that, to be candid, he must admit that Mr. Scott had established his point; but as to being baptised, he had not come that evening to be immersed, nor was he prepared, as to change of raiment, and so on. "Oh," said Mr. Scott, "that will be no obstacle in the way. Here is our friend, Major Gano" (who was present during the conversation along with other persons), "who will furnish us with everything requisite in that respect." The Major chimed in very promptly with the assurance that he should be happy to facilitate the operation to the fullest extent in his power.

There was no escape. The Doctor was obliged to give in his adhesion, and the necessary arrangements being made, a move was made towards the Miami Canal, which passed the front of the house, on the opposite side of the road, and there the Doctor was immersed, by Mr. Walter Scott, "for the remission of sins," in the presence of a number of witnesses, at ten o'clock at night, by the light of the moon.

(To be continued.)

The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

No 107. — Early Christian Writings.

While a study of the writings of those leaders in the early post-Apostolic Christian Church, whose works have been preserved to our day, reveals that subtly and insidiously heresy developed itself in the Church until the Truth was overshadowed and its adherents driven out as schismatics and pestilent fellows, yet nevertheless running through them all is a recognition of the authority of the Bible—both Old and New Testaments—as constituting the Word of God.

Polycarp, in his letter to the Philippian ecclesia was but expressing the mind of all the believers when he said, "I am confident that ye are well exercised in the Holy Scriptures, and nothing is held by you but is therein." In this letter there is hardly one line without a Scripture reference. He bewails the falling away of one, Valens, and accounts for it by that person having "abandoned the Word of God." He quotes from the gospels and the epistles, and includes them all under the one heading—the Holy Scripture.

The epistles of Ignatius; the Shepherd, ascribed to Hermas; the epistle attributed to Barnabas; in fact every early Christian document we have bears testimony to the fact that the whole Church was united on one point until the 3rd century, no matter how divided it was on other points. The point of unity was in the reverence and respect paid to the Scriptures and their altogether unchallenged acceptance as Divinely Inspired, infallible, and the one Court of Appeal.

Dr. Keith truly says, "What stronger proof could be given of the antiquity, genuineness, and acknowledged authenticity of the Scriptures in the earliest ages of the Church, than the unreserved manner in which they are quoted by the apostolic Fathers who called upon those whom they addressed to 'remember what the Lord Jesus said,' and 'to give heed to the things that are written in the Scripture.' Undoubtedly in those days the Bible was the 'known acknowledged and undoubted rule of faith and of practice'" (Keith, Demonstration, p. 269).

Many instances of incidental testimony may be quoted. Polycarp speaks of 1 Corinthians 6: 2 as "the judgment of God," Tertullian tells of the existence of the original writings in his time, and of their open reading. Clement of Rome urged his brethren to look diligently to the Scriptures—"the true

oracles of the Holy Spirit.” Clemens, Alexandrinus, Origen, and Tertullian all bear clear testimony to the full acceptance of the Scriptures as of Divine Inspiration.

Our point is that the only explanation of this undoubted full and universal acceptance that can be given is that Jesus and the Apostles, inspired by the Holy Spirit, themselves implanted the doctrine of the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures in the heart of the early Church. Grant this as the one possible full explanation, and it becomes utterly impossible to shake the Word from its true position as the supreme and only infallible guide.

This Inspiration can never be one of degree. All—without reservations—is the testimony of the early Church as to the quality and scope of the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Paul set the standard of the belief of his time when he said, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God”—2 Timothy 3: 16, and Peter truly states its source where he says, “Holy men . . . spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit”—2 Peter 1: 21.

What right has any man, therefore, today, to refuse the acknowledgment which the early Church was glad to make? The Scriptures still stand supreme to those who desire to walk humbly before God and so to do justly. The man of wisdom hears when the Lord’s voice crieth—Micah 6: 8-9.—G.H.D.

(To be continued.)

Editorial.

THE PREVALENT “CLEAN” HERESY.

Deep down in the human heart there is always a certain amount of pride which manifests itself as self-conceit—“the pride of life”—a proud bearing, arrogant lips, and self-satisfaction. Things that minister to that pride are esteemed—such as the honours that our fellow-men can give, worldly success, and so on. Things that humiliate the human spirit and pull down pride are not liked: the human mind revolts against them. Hence, often, controversy is embittered and continued because of the reluctance of one party to admit that he or she is in the wrong, and also often because the party in the right demand the greatest possible humiliation of their opponents: abject apologies. In the Truth there is, or ought to be (as bro. Lake has many times truly said) no room and no demand for apologies. Such minister merely to the pride of the flesh—the carnal mind.

This pride is at the root of the recrudescence in recent years of the “clean flesh” heresy. The Bible tells us that we have sinful flesh: that this flesh was condemned in Adam’s case in the Garden of Eden because of sin: that it thus became defiled, and that as we were all, including Jesus, in the bowels of our father Adam when the flesh was defiled and condemned, so we all partake. Outstanding passages exhibiting the Truth are Romans 8: 3; Hebrews 2: 14, 17; Hebrews 4: 15; Hebrews 9: 28.

The Mosaic ritual, as bro. Roberts in the Law of Moses so clearly exhibits, entails a recognition of the same truth. The chapter therein on “Death” is specially to the point, and is very clear on the meaning of Hebrews 13: 11-12. To make quite plain our understanding of the matter our Statement of Faith—the basis of our fellowship, says: —

Article 5. —“That Adam broke God’s law and was adjudged unworthy of immortality, and sentenced to return to the ground from whence he was taken—a sentence which defiled, and became a physical law of his being, and was transmitted to all his posterity.”

Article 8. —“Jesus Christ wearing the condemned nature was to obtain a title to resurrection by perfect obedience, and by dying, abrogate the law of condemnation for himself and all who should believe and obey him.”

There is, therefore, no clean human body in existence today, except that of our Lord Jesus, and he has been “washed” and “made clean” by God as a result of his perfect obedience. He has thus been released from the taint of sin, and become a spiritual body, whole and clean.

No clean flesh exists among men: all are unclean. When the multitude of the saved ones at last congregate on Mount Zion it will be said of them, “These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb”—Revelation 7: 14.

Against this truth many assaults have been made. Edward Turney, of Nottingham, set forward the first attack a long time ago, and bro. Roberts waged war with him and refused any fellowship to him or those who gave him help. This was called the Renunciationist Controversy, because of E. Turney’s expression he had “renounced” his former view in relation to Christ’s nature.

Of recent years, J. Bell, of Sydney, Editor of The Shield, has been the greatest advocate of the clean flesh idea. He publicly stigmatises those who hold the Truth as “dirty Christadelphians” because they hold that the flesh is unclean.

Bro. Bell’s views are very well known, and have been strongly condemned by bro. C.C. Walker in the Christadelphian.

Bro. G.F. Lake in his effective booklet, The Clean Flesh Heresy, quotes J. Bell as follows, “A sentence cannot defile a man nor can a sentence become a physical law”—Shield, November, 1904.

“All those propensities are not sin. They are not in any way wrong. They formed part of the very good man.”

“Moral defilement is not inherent.”

Bro. Bell describes the statements found in our Statement of Faith as quoted above, “horrible teaching; to teach that human nature has sin in the flesh by inheritance from Adam.”

“Rather than accept such a slander we would join Canon Barnes.”

He says Jesus was “without any personal physical taint,” and that to say he had unclean flesh or defiled flesh is “a damnable theory” uttered by Dr. Thomas, but not by God in the Bible.

Bro. Bell has many followers. The chief one in Australia, bro. H.G. Ladson, a member of the Beechworth ecclesia, and brother in the flesh to brother C.A. Ladson, of Birmingham, in his book, The Sacrifice of Christ, says, “There is nothing standing between any man and resurrection to eternal life save personal transgression.”

Bro. Strickler in America has strenuously contended for the same and allied ideas. Bro. H. Fry, who has caused the Bournemouth ecclesia to open its door wide to apostasy, recently sent to America to bro. Strickler’s party the defence of that brother’s position which he put before the Portsmouth ecclesia and ourselves recently. Bro. Hill, of Toronto, has had it printed and widely circulated. Bro. B.J. Dowling ably deals with it in this issue.

DRIFT.

Commending a pamphlet in which Bro. Fry’s views on bro. Strickler’s heresies are embodied, bro. Hill, of Toronto, the bro. who converted bro. C.C. Walker to the giving of fellowship to the Strickler party, gives unconscious testimony to the Drift that is now in evidence. He says in a letter to bro. Marshall, of Worcester, U.S.A., “We shall have confusion just as long as we continue to mix theology with our literature.”

The pamphlet in question is headed in the same way as if the ecclesia of Christ was a limited company. Here is the heading, "A Word in Season regarding the Articles of Association for the Ecclesial Communion, Cooperation, and Fellowship." (The italics are ours.)

Now we know why so many of the articles in the Christadelphian (bro. I. Collyer's being the outstanding instances) are colourless and minus theology. Some of bro. Walker's readers like it better so, and he caters for them.

THE SCRIPTURAL WAY WITH HERESY.

Under the heading, "A clear Issue" we last month showed that bro. C.C. Walker's position in regard to heresy was now quite clear. The Scriptures everywhere, however, testify against bro. Walker's views, and we purpose using space month by month in exhibiting this fact.

Our instance this month is that of the Ante-diluvian world and the Flood.

The ecclesia at the outset, at the feet of the Edenic cherubim, developed a root of bitterness. God directed that this one, Cain, should be withdrawn from. It was not sufficient to preach the Truth and "pay as little attention as possible" to Cain's heresy that the fruit of the ground could take the place of sacrifice by the shedding of blood. So Cain was sent away. From that time onwards there were two parties: (a) the party of Truth called "The Sons of God;" (b) the party of the Flesh and of Error called "the Sons of Men."

God desired and determined upon separation between these two. The flesh prevailed and toleration ensued resulting in wholesale declension, until only one family—that of Noah—was left in the separated condition. Nor can it be supposed for one moment that the claim of Noah to alone possess the Truth would be admitted by his contemporaries. No! The building of the Ark resulted, and this was the greatest illustration of the necessity of separation by strong and definite action in order that the Truth might be preserved, that the world has ever seen.

If Noah had been content to give "little attention to passing heresies" and had refrained from warning the whole world, God would never have preserved him and his, and made that one family the nucleus of the present human race. The lesson is plain. Heresy must be watched and rooted out at the start, and the widest possible publicity given to the faithful warning, though only a few give heed.

Next month we will take Abram's case. —G.H.D.

* * *

"TODAY'S BROADCASTING."

"What are the wild waves saying?" is suggested as we hear them dashing in front of the Smoking Room in our "home from home" at Hastings.

A Christadelphian in a smoking-room! Yes, but not because we smoke, for like our co-editor, we have not once indulged in the uncleanly habit since we became a brother of Christ, which reaches back forty-nine years. In the other room the conversation was not upon what the wild waves of the sea were saying, but the waves of the air which render wireless telegraphy a fact. As we listened to the conversation we were moved to come to a vacant room and commit to paper a few thoughts on this latest of "crazes"—"Listening In." From all we have heard there is no doubt the Bradford brother was right in saying, however pleasing "listening in" may be to the natural man, it should be shunned by every brother of Christ. That is borne out by today's paper. Take the programme to be "enjoyed" by Birmingham listeners-in tonight, on their being released from their occupations. It reads thus: —

- 7.15. —The Greys' Concert Party—Solo Banjo.
 (A Music Hall variety of things?)
- 9.30. —News.
- 9.40. —Ronald Gourlay (Entertainer)—Talk on wireless hints to beginners.
- 10.05. —Mabel France (Humorous Character Study).
- 10.15. —Ronald Gourlay (Part 2).

That, we are assured, is really a superior sample! We ask: Can the head of a Christadelphian family expect God's blessing on such an entertainment? Can he expect his boys and girls to pay attention to eternal things with a wireless entertainment always at hand when their day's work is done and they have a few hours at disposal? Their father may as well surround the works of Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts with exciting works of fiction. Which are likely to be taken up and read? We know where the headphones are even provided in the bedroom to enjoy the ten to twelve o'clock broadcasts! Are we surprised at the children of such a flesh-pleasing parent turning their backs on the Christadelphian meeting room? In one ecclesia the "speakers" are so involved that no one dares to warn the brethren and sisters of the deceitfulness of mere carnal pleasures—theatre-going—picture-houses—"listening in"—card-playing—smoking—dancing, and other besetting evils. We call special attention to the solemn warnings of brethren Thompson, Fiske, and Boulton, in Questions for Christadelphians, see page 112 of this issue.

FELLOWSHIP.

The Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren, in their Final Words, issued the dictum that an item of Intelligence in the Christadelphian should be a sufficient intimation for all other ecclesias to follow; but why do they preach what Birmingham itself does not practise? Last month we were asked to correct bro. Denney's Editorial on the Beechworth (Australia) Ecclesia in so far as it concerned the Ladson family, "all separated in fellowship from bro. Bell." We had conjured up to us a happy little group of the family "ten"—knit together for the "past twenty years." But, what are the facts? One of these ten, bro. H.G. Ladson, a brother of bro. C.A. Ladson, a few years since wrote a work on the Sacrifice of Christ, views akin in the main to the Bell Heresy; views so un-Christadelphian as to compel his ecclesia to withdraw from him. Although that was in October, 1919, the facts were withheld from the Intelligence columns of the Christadelphian until September, 1920! But notwithstanding such withdrawal, the united family at Beechworth, although in fellowship with the ecclesia that had withdrawn from bro. H.G. Ladson, see no reason why their Table of the Lord should not be open to him, and they welcome him thereto. Not only so, we have before us letters written by bro. H.G. Ladson, written in those very years, charging the editor of the Christadelphian with changing the policy of the Christadelphian since his predecessor's death, corrupting the teaching of Dr. Thomas, and mutilating the works of bro. Roberts. Bro. Ladson now admits he was aware of all this when he asked us to correct bro. Denney's Editorial—and bro. C.C. Walker knew it too (although evidently they did not know we knew it). And yet we are asked by the Birmingham Arranging Brethren to respect items of Intelligence in the Christadelphian! How can we while it is edited by brethren so "bereft on the matter of Fellowship"? The fact of the matter is brethren J. Bell, A. Strickler, H. Ladson, T. Turner and others (to use bro. Lake's phrase) have so "overborne" the Editor of the Christadelphian, that he now suggests that "misunderstandings" may have been the cause of withdrawals, etc. Not only so, his mind is so "bereft" on fellowship, that he now has the effrontery to label as "ambiguous" the "language" of Dr. Thomas and used by bro. Roberts when fighting these very heresies many years ago. Twenty-five years ago, on the death of bro. Roberts, we wrote bro. C.C. Walker, counselling him to follow his predecessor in giving the writings of Dr. Thomas the place of honour in the Christadelphian. He replied we need have no fear on that score—and we had none then—but now he considers the "expressions" of Dr. Thomas are "ambiguous and objectionable," and he shamefully ousts the Doctor from "the place of honour," and he himself fills the place! —F.G.J.

Los Angeles Declaration.

ALL CHARGES CONFIRMED BY BRO. H. FRY'S SO-CALLED REFUTATIONS

"Straight is the gate and narrow is the way." —(Matthew 7: 14).

There is undoubtedly a desire in the minds of some Christadelphians today to broaden the entrance to the ecclesias and to make more all-embracing the fold. Consequently there is a demand in certain quarters for men who can whitewash religious errors and make them look like truth.

Bro. H. Fry, of Bournemouth, England, has skill along those lines, and has now eagerly grasped the mournful task of defending bro. Strickler's errors.

Doubtless bro. Fry will not concur in our opinion as to his motive, but the mode of his reasoning and his idle argumentation renders our conclusion inevitable. Possibly he deceives himself.

He writes in such a loose rambling manner, that he at once unquestionably betrays an ill-grounded confidence in himself.

Napoleon once asked a deputy, what sort of a speech the leader of the opposition made. "O, it was a miserable effort," was the reply. "Then have it printed and published far and wide that the people may understand his folly."

Surely it was no friend of bro. Fry that published his Portsmouth paper in Canada and elsewhere.

It will be observed that where bro. Fry attempts to be critical, he is very seldom correct. "Sometimes to sense and then to nonsense leaning," he blunders round trying to make a point.

In his writing it becomes at once obvious that, like bro. Strickler, his optical nerves are seriously affected by the Andrew's spectacles which he wears. His vision is dilated and the meaning of the words distorted, and so much so, that Paul's illuminating phrase "sin in the flesh" becomes obnoxious to him as "embodying the Romish doctrine of original sin in a modified form."

Bro. Fry makes a fiery attack upon the Los Angeles Declaration, which he admits "speaks for itself," and he attempts a refutation of the charges made therein concerning the errors taught in bro. Strickler's book, Out of Darkness.

THE FIRST CHARGE made in the Declaration is that the book teaches: "That the nature of Christ was not exactly like ours."

This charge is proven by the following quotations from bro. Strickler's book, which bro. Fry does not deign to consider: —

Page 26, line 28: "Christ's human nature did not make him unclean."

Page 62, line 22: "Now we have already called attention to the fact that Christ's sin in the flesh did not make him unclean or defile him."

Page 84, line 13: "We have no right to say Christ's individual flesh was full of sin or sinful flesh."

Page 83, line 31: "It could not be said of him (Christ) that he had sin dwelling in him as Paul said of himself."

Now let us note bro. Fry's most extraordinary "refutation" (?) of charge No. 1, which is so manifestly upheld by the above quotations.

He first quotes half a sentence from page 84, in which bro. Strickler adopts a marginal reading of Romans 8: 3, "flesh of sin" and then in this very connection, bro. Fry deliberately suppresses the most important and erroneous clause of bro. Strickler's sentence, viz., "But it (flesh) was not sinful while he (Christ) tabernacled in it."

Brother Fry then adds the following comment: Bro. Strickler's "reservation appears to be that the term 'sinful' could not apply in Christ's individual case, because it did not lead to sin while he tabernacled in it." Here he apologetically uses bro. Strickler's words, out of their connection, as though they were his own, so lightly penned, and then softly confesses bro. Strickler's error, saying, "In this I think bro. Strickler makes an unnecessary objection." He certainly does, but bro. Fry does not see that his whole argument is illogical and unscriptural, for as bro. Roberts declared in his debate with bro. Andrew, "sin in the flesh, is a physical attribute," an inherited unclean condition—Job 14: 4, while transgression is a moral relation. Bro. Fry's "refutation" (?), therefore does not refute, but establishes beyond question the absolute truthfulness of this charge in the Los Angeles Declaration.

CHARGE No. 2 of Declaration: "That the offering of Christ was not for himself and that Christ never made an offering for himself."

The evidence in this charge is ample and conclusive, the following quotations serving as illustrations: —

Page 56, line 3: "Now to show that Christ could not be his own ransom sacrifice through his death."

Page 87, line 16: "God's method of salvation by the shedding of blood to make atonement did not apply to Christ."

Although these words are directly opposed to the Apostolic testimony of Hebrews 13: 20, bro. Fry attempts a refutation of the charge by quoting an ambiguous phrase found on page 93, Out of Darkness, "there was a sense in which this offering was for himself." On the previous page of bro. Fry's paper, he lays down the canon: "interpret ambiguous phrases in the light of plain statements." Proceeding by bro. Fry's excellent rule, we interpret bro. Strickler's "ambiguous phrase," which reads, "there was a sense," etc., by the former two plain statements—so plain that they cannot be misunderstood, and the unquestionable result is, the charge of the Declaration is fully sustained.

This constitutes bro. Fry's second extraordinary "refutation" (?). To be accurate he should have used the word confirmation, not "refutation."

Bro. Fry goes on to say, "Bro. Strickler's critics fail to recognise the distinction between Christ's personal part, as an individual—and his official position as a representative." This is an impossible distinction that bro. Andrew tried to get bro. Roberts to "recognise," and bro. Roberts replied: "This is your impossible supposition—you cannot separate him from the work he came to do"—Debate, p.33. Bro. Fry will use bro. Andrew's argument, in an effort to release bro. Strickler from his difficulty, but on any other occasion, he would hotly repudiate it and "deny the premises." Consistency is a jewel.

CHARGE No. 3 of the Declaration: "That Christ's offering was for personal sins or moral impurities ONLY."

Bro. Fry does not attempt to refute this charge, but contents himself by saying, "It is true." But he tries to aid bro. Strickler when he makes an attempt to show that in a sense, Dr. Thomas and bro.

Roberts taught the same. As usual, bro. Fry quotes only a few words from the Doctor's argument and the trustful reader is consequently misled. These are the Doctor's words, "Sin could not have been condemned in the body of Jesus, if it had not existed there. His body was as unclean as the bodies of those he died for." "Sinful flesh being the hereditary nature of the Lord Jesus, he was a fit and proper sacrifice for sin." He "answered the purpose of God, which was to condemn sin in the flesh"—Elpis Israel, pp. 114-115.

Therefore bro. Roberts said, "Christ was included in the sacrificial work which he did for us." "He partook of this nature to deliver it from death," "Destroyed the power of death by dying and rising," and "if the death of Christ was not for himself" it "would make it impossible that it could be for us, for it only operates for us, when we unite ourselves with him"—Law of Moses, pp. 163-165.

Brethren Fry and Strickler should remember the words of bro. Roberts to bro. Andrew, "You are mixing up terms; 'sin in the flesh' is a physical attribute, forgiveness a moral relation. Do not confound the TWO THINGS"—Debate, p. 17. It is by such confounding work, that the gospel of Christ is perverted.

CHARGE No. 4 in Declaration: "That Christ died as a substitute, he was punished for the transgressions of others."

A part of the evidence offered in the Declaration in support of this charge is found on: —

Page 72, line 24: "The death of Christ was inflicted to satisfy the ends of justice."

These words teach in as plain a manner as possible that Christ was an innocent substitute on whom our punishment was inflicted.

Now we shall quote from bro. Fry's characteristic "refutation." He tries, in a furtive manner, to refute the charge, first, by proving that bro. Strickler contradicts himself, and second, by admitting that the word satisfy is apt to be misleading. There is not the slightest trace of refutation in his effort. "The word satisfy," MISLEADING!!! Well, we should say it was. The efforts of both these men are misleading. Still, we feel almost grateful to bro. Fry for the able support and strong confirmation which he has so unintentionally afforded to the charges made in the Declaration. The charges which are so abundantly sustained by bro. Fry, are further outlined in the Declaration, as follows: Bro Strickler's books are misleading and false doctrines are set forth "in so subtle a manner that the import is not discernible upon a casual reading, even though the Truth's foundations are insidiously assailed."

Bro. Fry and others having failed to discern the object of bro. Strickler in writing his books, which is, as expressed by himself, to lead Christadelphians "Out of Darkness into Light," are themselves being misled by him.

Bro. Strickler has assumed that which is incapable of proof, viz., that Doctor Thomas and bro. Roberts were in the dark on the question of "physical sin."

On page 85, Out of Darkness, he says: "It is a marvellous thing that such a theory should ever have been invented as the bearing of physical so-called sin."

On page 69, in dealing with the same question—physical sin or "sin in the flesh"—he says: "It is what your leaders have taught you."

In an interview with the writer, 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, pp. 113-115, and by bro. Roberts in the Law of Moses.

Failing to discern the motive and aim of bro. Strickler's writings, the more bro. Fry reads them, the more he is bewildered, and the more he writes in defence of them, the more does his barrenness appear. Still, we have confidence in bro. Fry that he will yet see his error, if he will only change his "spectacles," for he admits that bro. Strickler "in some cases is very misleading."

We are also glad to note that bro. Fry's faith in our "leaders" has not yet been wholly shattered by bro. Strickler, although such a result has transpired in many instances here. Let him change his optical outfit without delay, hurling his Andrew's glasses to "the moles and the bats," for they only darken his vision and strain his optical nerves. Let him use the Thomas-Roberts make only, anointing his eyes frequently and copiously with the Spirit's "eye-salve," and, as Dr. Thomas wrote, the result will be truly "enlightening in the things concerning Jesus." Then all his devouring worry and anxiety about "guilt" for "original sin, which is in fact, sin in the flesh"—Elpis Israel, p. 115, will vanish like the vapour in the sunlight, on the dewy morn that follows the darkest night.
Worcester, U.S.A.

B. J. DOWLING.

[Since we received the above, bro. H. Fry has, in writing, abandoned—denied belief in—the Truth regarding Christ's nature and sacrifice, and the Bournemouth Ecclesia have refused to accept this subject, "The Nature and Sacrifice of Christ," from a visiting brother down to lecture for them, on the ground that such a subject is "controversial." The facts have been laid before bro. G.F. Lake as the chief opponent of the Bell-Strickler-Ladson heresy. He describes them as "terrible," and is placing them before the NH. London meeting.]—G.H.D.

Questions for Christadelphians.

Impending Wholesale Declension in the Brotherhood.

(Continued from page 47).

SECTION 5.

That the Editor of the Christadelphian was included in the—to use bro. Ford's words—"small minority who would engage in non-combatant service" is borne out by correspondence from Yorkshire. We are not unmindful of the fact that he says he "would not join," and that he would "not advise any Christadelphian to join," but we are also not unmindful of his reservations: he does not consider donning khaki under conscription joining the army!

17. —The evidence lies in the fact that although one of bro. C.C. Walker's staunchest friends pleaded with him for "a straight answer" to a simple question, he could not get it. Here is the question put by bro. Norris, of Bradford, July, 1923: —

"In the event of Conscription, will you stand by and support our established attitude of non-participation in any form of Army Service, whether combatant or non-combatant?"

Weeks rolled by, but no reply was received. Letter followed letter and months rolled by, but the Editor of the Christadelphian was silent. The conclusion was, that either our brother had no mind on the matter, or he had not the courage of his convictions. Bro. Norris then thought of the Lord's instructions—Matthew 18 to "see his brother," with what result we have in the words of bro. Norris, "September 20, 1923": —

"I have heard since from bro. Walker and he does not wish to see me. It is clear he and the 'Christadelphian' are not with us re non-combatant service, which is a very keen disappointment to me."

18. —Brother Norris then intimated he was making his discovery known to the Yorkshire and Lancashire ecclesias. The Editor of the Christadelphian became apprehensive and expressed a little of his mind—negatively, and in ambiguous words; and so equivocally as to call forth this from bro. H. Norris, on “September 28, 1923”: —

“I have written again, as I would very much like it to be untrue. What I want is a positive declaration.”

It is, however, one thing to want, and quite another to get.

19. —The Editor would neither give “a positive declaration,” nor would he “see his brother.” Those who asked for bread, had to be “content” with stones. Here is the humiliating confession made by bro. H. Norris, as to how he, and the Bradford ecclesia, had to “bow down to Birmingham and its ‘1,300’” The confession is dated “October 29, 1923”: —

“For my part it is a deep personal disappointment to me to have to disappoint you in any way; but it would have been a greater trouble to me to split up our meeting.”

The easy way out!

This sequel to the correspondence between bro. H. Norris and bro. C.C. Walker reveals one of the most discreditable compromises of truth, for the mere sake of peace, it is possible to imagine, and this shows how true was the verdict of bro. Norris found in paragraph 17. * We advise our brethren to read what Dr. Thomas says about Balaamites in Eureka I., pp. 288-293. That a similar apostasy has set in at Birmingham we have the most damning evidence from brethren Barker, Boulton, Lake, Thompson, and others: evidence as startling as it is staggering, as we shall see later.

* The author of An Unjust Balance has asked, —“But what says bro. H. Norris of the writer of Lest We Forget?” We hope he will appreciate what bro. Norris does say in a final letter—“November 2, 1923”: “Ever since I have had any communication with you—everything from you has been prompt, thorough, encouraging, and straightforward and frank, all the time H. NORRIS.

20. —Brother Norris, in his letter, cited in paragraph 17, is very emphatic as to the unsatisfactory condition of Birmingham. That has been the mind of thinking brethren for many years past; bro. Lake for instance. We have dozens of letters from him detailing general and particular instances of the declension, and manifesting utter disgust with “Birmingham and the Christadelphian.” On a postcard dated “4 June, 1917,” bro. G.F. Lake says: —

“Since seeing you I have had the ‘Christadelphian,’ in which there is very little Christadelphianism to be found.”

21. —Months later, on “October 1, 1917,” bro. Lake declared: —

“The ‘Christadelphian’ has for some time been neither hot nor cold.”

Read that declaration in the light of Revelation 3: 15-16, and the terribleness of the charge against “our representative magazine” will be realized. Did we not know, to use bro. Walker’s expression, what “a stickler bro. Lake is” for purity, etc., we should have to conclude he has been “playing a double game.”

22. —We skip many letters, and pick up one dated “12th March 1920,” in which bro. Lake writes: —

“The ‘Christadelphian’ is not now ‘in opposition to the dogmas of Papal and Protestant Christendom.’ Look at the cover; so we have not got that standard to fight under; we once had.”

23. —Again we skip a few years, and find bro. Lake still maintaining his charge. Thus on “June 11, 1923, he writes—

“It is of no use to write to the ‘Christadelphian’—I am as hopeless of any good there as you are, although I do not go to your length as to Birmingham.”

We should like to have quoted a more recent one, but bro. Lake has marked every page “private.” Not one of the letters quoted are so marked: many are open post-cards.

24. —As we have said, bro. Lake was not by any means alone in his conclusions. Among the many who were of the same mind was bro. W. H. Boulton. On “October 1, 1917,” he wrote this: —

“What is to be done with regard to the ‘Christadelphian’? I am getting alarmed about it. The ‘Christadelphian’ cannot be separated from being an ‘official’ organ in the general mind; we may all know it to be a private concern, but it must necessarily be regarded as authoritative; it is getting serious, and it really appears time something was done to show the general opinion of the ecclesias.”

In view of such facts how unfair, how unbrotherly, how unrighteous, to blame Clapham for the “Birmingham Trouble.” How is Clapham responsible for these indictments from Yorkshire, North London, and other ecclesias?

Next month we shall, in addition to further questions concerning the evidence of bro. Boulton, introduce evidence from brethren C. Brighton, F.E. Williams, J.S. Dixon, A.S. Thompson, and A.J. Fiske. —F.G.J.

(To be continued.)

On the Watch Tower.

A Sunday Morning Exhortation by Brother Roberts

ALL Christ's allusions to the circumstances of his Second Coming pre-suppose a time of indefinite waiting on the part of those servants whom he finds alive in the earth. They discern the signs of their time, yet they know neither the day nor the hour when the Son of Man cometh. They recognise the Time of the End, but have to wait longer than they supposed they would when they girded their loins and set their lights a-burning. This unexpected delay caused some to relax their vigilance, and to say, "My Lord delayeth his coming." On others, though hope deferred maketh the heart sick, it produces not this effect; they endure to the end. They are the class contemplated in the words of Christ when he says, "Blessed are those servants whom their Lord, when he cometh, shall find watching." Their existence is distinctly recognised under the three-frog and Euphratean signs of the sixth vial, in the words, "Behold I come as a thief; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments."

The present time answers to all these peculiarities. The leading events of the age all tell us that the Lord is at the door. The three and-a-half times of the Papal Horn are expired. We had expected the Lord's re-appearing at the exact close of that period. We have seen the mark of its close in the altered position of the Papacy. But the Lord yet tarry; and we assemble this morning, still watching and waiting. The delay tries us, but destroys us not. It is no delay in the true sense. That is, there is no delay or slackness from the Lord's point of view. With him the time is fixed to a day, and his coming

will not be a day after the time appointed. The idea of "delay" relates to our expectations. The neighbourhood of the day has been revealed, but not the day itself. We had expected the arrival of that day as soon as its neighbourhood was reached. Time has shown us that the end, and the time of the end are two different things, though belonging one to the other. The latter we have reached: the former we yet wait to see. This delay in relation to expectation is one of the foreseen characteristics of the end; how otherwise does the Lord, at his appearing, find some who say, "My Lord delayeth his coming?" It is a delay for which some of us— yea, all of us— may be thankful. If the Lord had come as soon as some of us were expecting, many who are now rejoicing in the light would have been overtaken in darkness. He would have been here before the invitation to the marriage-supper had reached them. And to none of us would the day have come so acceptably as it will after a prolonged season of works and faith, and patience. Not that our poor works can commend us to the grace of God; for Christ has instructed us to say, after we have done all we can, "Behold, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do" (Luke 17: 10). But there is a satisfaction in the answer of a good conscience towards God, and this satisfaction will be greater after years of toil and waiting than if we had been ushered into the presence of the Lord Jesus immediately we had begun the race.

The waiting will seem long or short, according as we furnish the inner man or otherwise. Time is long to the vacant-minded, and is pretty much in the ratio of the vacancy. To a child, a day is of great length, and a year an incalculable period. With men and women of uncultivated mind, the weeks hang heavy. Time flies quickly with those who are wisely busy. To God, the fountain of all strength and wisdom, a thousand years in His sight are as yesterday when it is past.

If we store our mind by reading and reflection, we shall be enabled to realise how short are the years as they fly, and how brief would be the delay of even a whole life-time. The man who neglects the food of wisdom becomes impoverished and lean in his spiritual man, and too weak to bear the load of present deprivation or to endure the weariness of waiting. God's plans are on a great scale, and slow growth. If we make ourselves familiar with what is past, we shall understand what is present, and be able to patiently wait what is future. But if we restrict ourselves to what is now present, our minds will be dwarfed and overpowered. The things of the passing moment and the things on the surface destroy, if our impressions and motives are drawn from them only. Wisdom lies deep. You have to dig for it: sweet when found, but hard to get at. God has arranged it so; and wisdom, when found, tells you that it is wise to have it so. A fool and a wise man will look on the same objects, but be very differently impressed. A Hottentot looks up to the sky at night and sees a roof with lamps fixed to it in a planless way; the philosopher beholds the fathomless expanse and worlds in accurate array. So the surface reader looks back and sees BIBLE HISTORY as a scholastic abstraction, and the names of Abraham, David, etc., as the chance celebrities of capricious fortune; while the daily attendant at the gates of wisdom discerns the living perspective of the divine work in the earth, covering even the present hour, and sweeping forward into a future bright with glory. To such, the past is real and the future a fact, and the present, with its troubles, patiently and willingly borne. To them the waiting for Christ is no empty phrase, but words expressive of a palpable and daily-felt reality. To such as live in the present, you talk "cant" if you speak of the present life of the saints as a pilgrimage, just as thanksgiving to God and the recognition of His will, etc., is "cant" to those with whom God is only a name. But wisdom is justified of all her children, and will clothe them with honour at last.

Meanwhile, their lot is one of deprivation and sorrow. It has always been so: "come out of great tribulation," is the description of them all in their glorified state. This helps us to endure the tribulation while it lasts, not that we have much to bear compared with some, but what we do have to bear, is what every member of the family has suffered before us, more or less. The apparent indifference of God, for instance, to what is going on— the prosperity of the scorner and the casting down of the righteous— the absence of God's visible operation and the triumph of those who regard Him not— are features of our affliction which distressed the beloved of God in ancient times no less than ourselves now. Thus we find Jeremiah lamenting: "Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously? Thou hast planted them; yea, they have taken root; they grow; yea, they bring forth fruit; Thou art near in their mouth and far from their veins." Thus also, Malachi: "And now we call the proud happy; yea, they that work wickedness are set

up; yea, they that tempt God are even delivered." Thus also in the Psalm read this morning, * wherein, by the Spirit, David and David's Lord and Son speak together: "Why standest Thou afar off, O Lord? Why hidest Thou Thyself in times of trouble? The wicked, in his pride, doth persecute the poor; let them be taken in the devices that they have imagined." We are apt to think of David, and especially of the Son of David, as unsubject to the weariness which we experience from the absence of the visible working of God. We are liable to imagine them as having lived in a continual joy of God, undepressed by, the triumph of ungodliness in the earth. A careful consideration of their words will disabuse us of this idea, and help us to feel them our brethren in tribulation who have drunk of the same cup of bitterness, and exercised themselves in the same weariness of waiting and seeking after God. They felt as if God stood afar off: as if God hid Himself in time of trouble. This was to them a sorrow; a continual burden, as the similar experience is to us. The anguish of their hearts sought vent as ours will. They spent much time in prayer. They asked their Rock "why" He apparently forsook them. The breathings of their sorrow are recorded that all the children of God may understand and be comforted. In all their generations, they feel alike oftentimes desolate from the same cause; but by these they are taught to forbear to think that some strange thing has happened unto them. They become enlightened to perceive that so is the will of God that they should have a season of solitariness, in which they wait for God and seek Him with their whole heart, under the sweet power of the hope which God has linked with the sorrow. God has not said "Seek ye My face in vain." On the contrary, He has said, "Ye shall seek Me and find Me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart." And this finding of Him is the finding of all that the soul can desire, for every good and perfect gift comes from Him, but to everything there is "a season and a time," "Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart;" but the reaping is in the day of harvest. For this they have to "wait." (* January 5th, 1873.)

The righteous SHALL BE glad in the Lord. Now they are sorrowful, (though "always rejoicing" in the midst of their sorrow). Everything is against them at present; but, like David, they "encourage themselves in the Lord their God"; for He is their Rock and the Source of all the good for which they hope in Him. He asks them to be comforted: "Hearken unto Me, ye that know righteousness; the people in whose heart is My law; fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings. For the moth shall eat them up as a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool; but My righteousness shall be for ever, and My salvation from generation to generation. . . . I, even I, am He that comforteth you: who art thou that thou shouldest be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass?"

The prophet was commanded: "Comfort ye My people." So Jesus said: "Blessed are ye that mourn, for ye shall be comforted." There is a comfort now in prospect of the substantial comfort that God will bestow in the blessing and exaltation of His chosen in the day of Christ. All the groanings of the saints that the Spirit has preserved in the Word are mingled with this comfort; and by the same comfort may we comfort our hearts in the present time of waiting and patience. God is observant of all our ways; and God never forgets. Christ's eye is over all the ecclesias, "trying the reins and hearts," that every man may receive according to his ways. Therefore, our tears and our sighs, at the present desolation, are not lost, though unseen of men. Our troubles, in this respect, are pleasing to Him. In due time He will wipe away the tears and fill our mouth with laughter. In this respect we learn to rejoice even in tribulation. Those who live in pleasure at such a time as this are dead while they live. Those who for peace have great bitterness in the righteous ways of God, will yet have cause to sing, "Thou hast, in love to my soul, delivered it from the pit of corruption: Thou hast cast all my sins behind Thy back." Therefore may they even now obey the commands addressed by Jesus to those who suffer in the way of righteousness: "Rejoice, and be exceeding glad."

Especially in our day may we cultivate this gladness. The signs of the times tell us that we are rapidly nearing the time when God shall give reward to His servants the prophets: when all who fear His name, small and great, shall awake together to the joyful celebration of His praise, and the execution of His judgment upon the nations. The Frog Sign has been the notable fact of the diplomatic world for 25 years; the Euphrates is drying at an advancing speed that no human contrivance can arrest; the Papal Horn lies powerless in the dust; the Jews are everywhere rising from the down-treading of centuries. The ear that can hearken hears the voice ringing through the world, "Behold, I

come as a thief." A little more waiting for God; a little more patience; a little more endurance of evil and continuance in well doing; and the hour will arrive. The moment will be here when we shall suddenly be confronted by the great fact that the Lord is in the earth. Great will be the joy of the saints at the announcement, though they mingle trembling with their fear. —R. ROBERTS.

The Alien Marriage Question.

An Unfounded Charge against the Clapham Ecclesia.

6 Elms Road,
Clapham Common,
London, S.W.4.
March 26th, 1924.

Dear Brother Denney,

The letter of bro. Lake's which you kindly sent me in which he attacks the Clapham Ecclesia, has been considered by our Presiding and Managing Brethren. I am instructed to forward in their name the following reply which I shall be glad if you will publish in your next issue and very much oblige,

Faithfully your brother in Christ's service,

HENRY E. PURSER (Sec.).

Bro. G. F. Lake writes: —

"In April, 1906, bro. D.J. Hughes—a Clapham Presiding and Lecturing brother—spoke, voted, and wrote against the Clapham proposals on Alien Marriage. I have his circular. He was supported by two of the Clapham Arranging Brethren (bro. J.B. and J.K.) and others. These brethren were not disfellowshipped, and continued to fulfil their ecclesial appointments. Bro. Hughes' words, are, 'The resolutions to be proposed are unscriptural, and go far beyond what is written. It suggests the Romish priesthood and the Inquisition. I hope the ecclesia will reject the resolution.'"

Bro. Lake's accusation which he has published in the Christadelphian and in many private letters is false. Bro. Hughes and bro. J. Barker each believed that alien marriage, when the offence is not admitted, is a sin calling for withdrawal. This is proved by the Minutes of the ecclesial meeting at which these brethren's amendments were moved. These are: —

THE MINUTES.

"The adjourned ecclesial meeting was held on Wednesday, evening, May 2nd, at 8 p.m., bro. H. Eastwood in the chair, when the resolution of the presiding brethren in reference to marriage with the alien was further dealt with and concluded. Bro. Kirkland, who at the close of the meeting on April 11th was addressing the meeting, reiterated his objections to the resolution, and argued that if marriage with the alien was a sin it should be dealt with on the lines of Matthew 18 as per our rules. Bro. Hughes followed, stating that while he was a firm believer that marriage with the alien was inconsistent with the Truth, and had always held the view, that those guilty of this sin should be required to admit their offence. At the same time he opposed the resolution of the presiding brethren on the grounds of its wording, and particularly to the use of the word "repentance," which he argued was not to be expected from an offender; he also instanced two or three Scriptural cases which in his opinion weakened that against marriage with the alien, and suggested care in dealing with the subject. He nevertheless begged to propose the following amendment: — "That we hereby adopt for insertion in our Constitution the following rule taken from the Birmingham Constitution, viz., "That marriage with the alien is an offence against the law of Christ. That those who maintain the contrary are unfit for fellowship with those who consent to the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus. That when offence

takes place in the matter, the ecclesia shall signify their disapproval by resolution sent to the offending brother or sister; after which the brother or sister shall only retain their place among the brethren by admitting their offence. All communications in the case to be in the form and spirit of Matthew 18: 15-17.” Bro. May seconded.

“A further amendment was moved by bro. James Barker, who was also opposed to the use of the word ‘repentance’ in the resolution, and moved as follows: — ‘ (1) That any brother or sister committing this offence against the law of Christ, his or her case shall immediately be investigated by the Presiding Brethren, who shall supply the ecclesia with particulars. (2) That the ecclesia shall, on the basis of the Presiding Brethren’s report, in the absence of non-admittance of the offence, request the offender to abstain from breaking of bread at the meeting of the ecclesia for that purpose. (3) If the brother or sister admit their offence the ecclesia shall pass a vote strongly disapproving of the marriage; the same shall be sent to the offender in writing by the Secretary.’ Bro. Warwick seconded.

“Some half dozen brethren then spoke in favour of adopting the resolution of the Presiding Brethren. The meeting having been extended to 10 o’clock, and this further time having nearly expired, bro. F.G. Jannaway proposed, and bro. Fowler seconded, ‘That the question be now put,’ which was agreed to on a show of hands.

“Bro. A.T. Jannaway, the mover of the resolution, at once rose and read the resolution (at an earlier stage a question had been put by bro. Hughes asking for an explanation of the additional wording to the resolution as read at the last meeting. It was explained that the words and numbers of rules added were explanatory and not alterations to the original proposition). Bro. A. T. Jannaway stated that the resolution as read was in harmony with the Truth and our belief on this question. The word ‘repentance,’ to which objection had been taken was a Scriptural word, and an essential point where sin had been committed, as something more than mere admission of the offence was required, viz., sorrow and regret, which the word ‘repentance’ conveyed. He urged the meeting to pass the resolution by an overwhelming majority, as follows: —

“’ 1. —That any brother or sister committing this offence against the Law of Christ shall abstain from the breaking of bread until his or her case shall have been considered at a business meeting of the ecclesia (see Rule 15), and in the meantime the presiding brethren shall (in harmony with Rule 21) investigate the case with the view of supplying the ecclesia with particulars.

“’ 2. —That the ecclesia shall, on the basis of the presiding brethren’s report, withdraw from the offender in the event of non-repentance (i.e., non-recognition of Bible teaching on the subject), or, in the event of repentance, pass a vote strongly disapproving of the offence, but sanctioning the return of the offender to his or her place at the Table.’

“The Chairman then put the question to the meeting in the following order: —

“For bro. Barker’s amendment. Three voted.

“For bro. Hughes’ amendment. Ten voted.

“For the resolution. Eighty-five voted.

“The resolution was then put for and against, when it was declared carried by the overwhelming majority of 70 (95 votes for and 25 against).”

[Editorial Note. —The foregoing abundantly bears out the contention of bro. J.M. Evans in our February issue, that bro. Lake is unjust in his accusation against the Clapham Ecclesia. The fact that certain brethren voted against the wording of the proposition to withdraw from the offender is no evidence that they did not consider the offence a sin to be renounced. Nay, the above minutes clearly show that the movers of the amendments—bro. Lake’s own witnesses—did recognize the offence to be a sin, for in bro. Hughes’ amendment he uses the words “marriage with the alien an offence against the law of Christ,” “unfit for fellowship,” “unworthy of a place among the brethren.” And

bro. Barker uses the words “an offender against the law of Christ,” “the offender to abstain from breaking of bread.” Evidently bro. Lake is now heartily ashamed of his case, or he would not pitifully plead—“I have another witness, but I have promised not to divulge his name!”]

The Rise of the Jewish Sects.

(Continued from page 55).

THE MISCHNICAL DOCTORS AND THE SADDUCEES.

Antigonus and Sadoc have been styled in history the first of the “Tanaim” or Mischnical doctors. Under their lead and that of their immediate successors, a party was formed in Judea with its headquarters at Jerusalem with the object of propagating Hellenism and Hellenist doctrines among the Jewish nation. Adopting first the name of Saddoces or Sadducees, they were better known by the name Hellenists or Hellenising Jews. They cultivated Greek tastes, and professed to rejoice that under the rulership of a Greek, they had enjoyed peace and prosperity. However, many rationally-minded men, scholars and scribes of the law opposed and viewed with fear this encroachment of Hellenic philosophy and manners. From their assiduous labours in upholding the written law, the non-official portion of these men earned the title of Assideans, the Pious.

Thus we have before us the two factions of Pre-Maccabean days. But the Hellenising party waxed strong in the land, and the majority of the nation had forgotten what the Assideans were looking to, that was the Hand of God. God, seeing that His people were forgetting Him in their prosperity, and overlooking the Spirit of His laws, while observing the ritual as a matter of form, prepared to remind them that it was He, and He only, that was able to build up, to prosper, and to pluck down, and to destroy. From, to an outsider, a simple quarrel between the sons of Joseph (B.C. 195), who had been tax-collector for the Kings of Egypt, and of Syria, over Phoenicia and part of Coele-Syria, concerning as to who should succeed him in that office, a great and terrible persecution descended upon the unfortunate heads of the remnant of God’s people in Judea, and the surrounding districts.

One of Joseph’s sons, Hyrcanus, having been favoured by Onias III, the High Priest, procured the office, but dying suddenly, Onias secured his property in the Temple treasury to protect it from the rapacity of his brothers. One of these brothers was Simon, captain of the Temple, who, to wound the High Priest, gave Apollonius, the governor of Coele-Syria, an exaggerated account of this property in the Temple treasury. He in turn reported it to King Seleucus Philopator, who being in need of funds, sent a mission to Jerusalem under Heliodorus to obtain possession of it. The mission was unsuccessful, and being chided by Seleucus, Heliodorus in revenge poisoned that monarch. The throne of Syria then passed into the hands of Antiochus Epiphanes who proved himself in very truth “The Scourge of Judea.” * At this time the Hellenising party in Judea had a leader, Jason, brother of the High Priest. He was an unscrupulous and rabidly fanatical propagator of the doctrines his sect then held with others of his own fabrication. This man bought the office of High Priest from the covetous Antiochus and deposed the really righteous Onias, and with a free hand he pursued his Hellenising policy. He established in Jerusalem a gymnasium for athletic exercises, erected a school for Jewish children, to be educated under the Grecian system, and sent donations from the Temple treasury to many Greek festivals. However, after a few more years Jason was deposed and obliged to flee into the country of Ammon where he employed his leisure in scheming for revenge. He was succeeded by Menelaus who proved quite as wicked and unscrupulous as his predecessor. B.C. 171, Menelaus offended Antiochus, and Jason returning to fight him with a band of wild Idumeans, a state of insurrection ensued. Antiochus then marched against this unfortunate country, and Daniel 11 tells of the things that ensued. The 79th Psalm was probably prophetic of that time, and will give an idea of the evils and pains which followed in such quick succession.

* The Talmud.

THE MACCABEES.

Then how shall we here tell you of the Maccabean days, curdling one's very blood with horror, while yet making every nerve thrill high with the fierce excitement of battle and revenge. The raid of the mad Syrian monarch was not chiefly against the city and the people, but against God and religion and the holy manuscripts, "the most sacred treasure of the Jewish race." *

See the patriots turning at bay, the city and Temple walls bespattered with blood fort weeks. Copies of the Law were torn asunder and burned in the fire amid the fierce rage of men, and the heart-breaking wails of women, and a great sow, slaughtered in insult, in the Temple itself, and the broth of its filthy flesh sprinkled amid shouts of laughter on the sacred parchments.

Look now to the heights at the battle of Emmaus, where fierce Judas prepares for revenge. The mourners in sackcloth, calling upon God, spreading out in the sunlight before Him the charred and torn fragments of their holy books, defiled by the touch of the accursed Greeks, and painted over in wanton insult with the obscene figures of their heathen gods. #

And though it does not particularly concern this article—look a little longer. Hear the fierce trumpet blast of Israel's host; see the stern warriors sweeping down from the hills crying to God, "Vengeance! Vengeance!!" Enough of this wild story. Full well did the slaughter of the Syrian host atone for the sprinkled swine broth.

But what part did the Hellenists and the Assideans play in this momentous struggle between mad Greeks and the stricken Hebrews? An important part! The Hellenists it was who instigated the establishment of Grecian customs in Jerusalem; who suggested to Antiochus and to Apollonius, in revenge, many of the indignities that were paid to the Temple and the people; to God and to the Holy Writings; who laughed to scorn (themselves safe for a time) the agonies of mind and body endured by those who, in the face of all opposition, strove to serve God and keep His laws. But when under Judas and at last under Simon the Jews became independent, the Hellenists as a party had vanished, although their doctrines, living after them, were again quickly adopted by a new party.

On the other hand the Assideans, at the very outset of the sanguinary struggle joined the party of liberation under Mattathias. In point of time, one month after his resistance at Modin, and flight to the heights, they, to the number of 1,500, hastened to help and encourage him and his few followers. They proved bold and capable soldiers, and to their timely and salutary help is due the courage and confidence of Mattathias and his family. However, during this war their identity as a sect was entirely lost, and like their opponents (the Hellenists) they entirely disappeared.

Now if we take the years from B.C. 165 when Judas re-dedicated the Temple, to the year 143 B.C. when the land had comparative rest, and attained the zenith of its independence under the wise and beneficent Simon, as a new epoch, we have, as it were, to begin our history of the sects afresh. To do so better and to get a good foundation for what we have in view we will pass to a consideration of the Scribes.

* Maccabees, chapter 3; 4, 6.

P. Smyth, The Old Documents.

(To be continued).

SPLITS IN THE BODY

It is not true that "Christadelphianism" has split up several times in thirty years. It has during all that time, been unchanged and undivided, and is at this moment, what it was in the beginning. What has happened is this: Various persons have embraced it who were previously unconnected with it, and

who after a time, for lack of understanding or stability, have wanted to change its principles on some point or other. Those who had understanding would not consent to the proposed changes, and the innovators have had to depart. You may think this is the same thing. "Christadelphianism" does not consist of the persons who may at one time accept its principles and at another time seek to corrupt them. It is the system of Apostolic truth recovered from the traditions of Christendom by the instrumentality of Dr. Thomas, and embodied in all those who, having received it, remain faithful to it amid all the changes of human opinion and whim. There are such in the earth. Those who have left them, or from whom they have had to separate themselves, which is the same thing, are not "splits" in Christadelphianism, but the mere shedding of foreign elements that adhered for a time from other than spiritual affinities. They came and they went without affecting any change in the original institution. Discriminate between the plant and its accidental incrustations. —(R. ROBERTS, 1893).

That "1300."—Even the Temperance Hall Arranging brethren must now be heartily ashamed of having boasted of their 1300. Included therein were "more than thirty 'members' who had not attended the Table for years and years; possibly dead and buried!" Yet the Arranging Brethren knowingly included these "ghosts" in their Ecclesial Register. Now we can understand their chief presiding brethren, the Editors of the Christadelphian, including in fellowship, one—a relative—withdrawn from for unscriptural teaching—see page 106, March, Berean Christadelphian.

THE "BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN" AND DR. THOMAS.

Nearly half a century ago, bro. Roberts wrote concerning the Christadelphian what can be said of the Berean Christadelphian: "Dr. Thomas, as heretofore, has the first place. No new feature will ever displace him from that position. So long as God permits the Editor to live, Dr. Thomas shall have a voice to speak to this latter-day generation of believers for their comfort and up-building in the work of God, which was mighty, through God, to revive in our day, and which so long as this agency continues, he shall be mighty, through God to consolidate. He is in his grave, but God yet preserves to him a mouth, which, while God pleases, no man shall be able to shut. Yea, God has made his work stronger in his death than in his life, notwithstanding the efforts of evil men and seducers to have it otherwise."—R. ROBERTS.

"Birmingham Frictions."

(Continued from page 81).

We have now shown by documentary evidence that the contention of the Birmingham Arranging Brethren that brethren Davis and Pearce "must be exonerated from the charge of doctrinal unsoundness," that they "have never argued for the legitimacy of brethren joining the constabulary and using force," and that "they did not actually oppose withdrawal," is in amazing contrast to their own earlier opinions of the speeches, and is directly contradicted by the speeches and letters of the two brethren.

There are two or three matters we propose to deal with, because the references thereto and the treatment they have received in Birmingham Frictions and An Unjust Balance obscure the real position and tend to prejudice the brotherhood against the Clapham decision.

The first point is, the reference to the joint investigation undertaken by bro. F.W. Turner and the writer at the request of the Clapham Ecclesia, and the capital that is made of the fact that although they had access to the same evidence, the two brethren are in opposite camps.

It cannot be reasonably contended that this in itself is a solid excuse for inaction. There is available ample evidence for any who desire to reach an independent decision if they are so inclined.

It will probably come as a surprise to such as the Clevedon brethren that we accept entirely and without reservation bro. Turner's own judgment as to the facts of the case. We have already quoted his own pronouncement that the speeches were "false," "dangerous," and "erroneous" and he has formally voted for a resolution to the effect that the withdrawal from the John Bright Street brethren (described by bro. Islip Collyer as "Birmingham's sin") was unscriptural.

It is because of these two facts admitted by bro. Turner that we withdrew from the Temperance Hall. He is content to remain in fellowship with an ecclesia responsible for these two sins. We are not.

On page 6 of *An Unjust Balance* bro. Turner admits that if our charges can be substantiated, duty to Christ and to his Truth would demand an immediate withdrawal from such unrighteousness in doctrine and practice. Why, then, does he so violently upbraid us for taking the action that he admits it is our duty to take, if we are so convinced?

Again, in *Birmingham Frictions* and *An Unjust Balance* (covertly in the one and openly in the other) there is the suggestion that certain of the Clapham brethren were committed to division from Birmingham as a settled policy. It is a terrible accusation if it means that we were determined, with or without a just cause, to bring about a separation. Is it really necessary for us to deny such a cruel charge?

It is quite true that for some time the Clapham brethren have been much exercised in mind at certain actions and tendencies observable in Birmingham. This uneasiness has by no means been confined to the Clapham Ecclesia. It was shared by other London brethren and by many in the provinces, the evidence of which has appeared in the *Berean* recently. We declare emphatically that the ardent desire of the Clapham brethren was that Birmingham should once again become as of yore—a city towards which the brotherhood could look for sound doctrine, example, and leadership.

With regard to the John Bright Street affair, a recital of our actions in connection with the trouble proves that from the very beginning our endeavours were earnestly and honestly directed to healing the breach if righteously possible. The only reason we enter into this phase of the matter is to remove the impression sedulously fostered in the Birmingham and Brixton pamphlets that we were bent upon division, whatever the merits of the case. On the contrary it can truly be said that it was our efforts to heal the breach at all costs that brought upon us the castigation contained in these publications.

To proceed then: What was the attitude of the Clapham Ecclesia when the London Committee was formed to investigate the trouble? We declined to have anything to do with it. We merely asked bro. Boulton to keep us informed of what was being done. At this period there was very little prejudice in favour of John Bright Street—in fact there was much to the contrary. The whole affair was regarded by many as a nuisance—threatening to disturb the harmony of the brotherhood.

Consequently, when three of the John Bright Street brethren presented themselves for fellowship, some of the Clapham brethren (we are not referring to those who have now left us) were none too pleased. Now mark this. If the charge made against us be true, we should have seen in it the very opportunity to flout the Temperance Hall decision to disfellowship John Bright Street. On the contrary, we informed the John Bright Street brethren that we must decline their fellowship in view of Temperance Hall action of disfellowship. But having made this grave decision it became incumbent upon us to ask Birmingham to give us a reason for their action of withdrawal.

We asked the Temperance Hall to grant us an interview—the supreme thought in our mind being to bring about reconciliation. We continued these efforts until it was clear that Birmingham's implacability and determination to pursue an unrighteous course made reconciliation impossible.

The writer personally pleaded with brethren J.F. Smith and F. G. Ford to relax their conditions, but all to no purpose.

Again, if we had been out for division at all costs, it is incredible that we should have put forward our basis of reconciliation of February, 1922. It was an heroic endeavour to smooth the differences between the two parties, and it was this effort to compromise that has brought upon our heads abuse and contumely.

But our opponents cannot have it both ways. If they lash us for our alleged inconsistency they cannot in the same breath charge us with plotting for division. If we had been working for separation we should never have framed such a basis. We should have sought to accentuate the differences, and to have formulated as heavy an indictment as possible against the Temperance Hall.

Our action in trying to find a way out of the impassé has been the subject of the most ungenerous and unjust criticism on the part of the Birmingham and Brixton brethren.

The Basis was not, as is contended by the Brixton brethren, a formal resolution as to the character of the two speeches. Even if it had been, it did not say that they were of a Scriptural or proper character. It was a basis put forward as a possible formula to which the two parties might assent. There were amongst us some who strongly dissented from the terms of it, and who made it quite clear that while they would raise no objection if the two parties were prepared to accept it, they themselves were not satisfied with it as a true definition of the position as they understood it.

There was a willingness to go to the uttermost for the sake of peace.

J. M. EVANS.

(To be continued.)

TO OUR "JOHN BRIGHT STREET" BRETHREN.

History is repeating itself, and our faithful little band in Birmingham could well reply to the Temperance Hall taunts as bro. Roberts did sixty years ago to the Campbellites: "As to the remarks with which Mr. King has favoured us, they may be briefly dismissed. Antipas is not so small as he would have his readers believe. Twelve have grown to forty, and several immersions are pending. Has Mr. King no recollection of a time when Campbellism in Birmingham was weaker than this? But we don't expect to progress like Campbellism. Campbellism sails with a popular wind blowing on all sides: Antipas goes in the teeth of the breeze and is surprised when he makes an inch by the log."—ROBERT ROBERTS, February, 1864.

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.

AMMANFORD. —Sister A. Charman is now in isolation here, not having as yet been able to join her husband at Milford Haven. If any faithful ones visit here she would be glad to see them.

BEWDLEY. —See Shatterford.

BEXLEYHEATH (Kent). —Cooperative Hall, Broadway. Sundays: 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Thursdays, 8 p.m. We have pleasure to report that we have gained by removal bro. and sis. O. G. Beere from the Clapton Ecclesia, and brethren E.W. Cuer and E.R. Cuer from Clapham (Avondale Hall) Ecclesia. Our first Tea and Fraternal Gathering will be held, if the Lord permit, in the above hall on “Good Friday,” April 18th, tea commencing at 5 p.m., and we cordially invite any brethren and sisters in our fellowship to be with us.—GEO. L. BARBER, Rec. bro.

BIRMINGHAM (John Bright Street Ecclesia)—Bristol Street Council Schools. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11; Lecture, 6.30 Thursdays: Bible Class, 8. Since our last report we have been cheered by the help in exhortation and proclamation of the Truth of brethren S.M. Harrison of Lichfield, and T.P. Trapp, of Gunnersbury. We have also had the company of sister Gibbons, Leamington, and sister Clapcott, of Gunnersbury. We still continue our witness for the Truth, our attendance of strangers being sometimes good, sometimes poor. However small the results, however, we sow the seed, planting and watering: God alone will, if it be His will, give the increase. Bro. Atkinson of Crewe paid us a surprise visit during the month, and we were pleased indeed to have his company at a supplementary meeting for breaking of bread. —Wm. LESLIE WILLE, Rec. Bro., 40 Parade, Sutton Coldfield.

We have for some time lost trace of bro. N.F. Brown, and failing in our enquiries, we have decided to remove his name from the ecclesial register. The Arranging Brethren wish me to state that should any ecclesia come into contact with bro. N.F. Brown, will they immediately communicate with us.

BIRMINGHAM (Edmund Street). —Dear Brother Jannaway: Greetings. The following letter has been sent to John Bright Street Ecclesia. Will you very kindly publish this in the Berean as promised:

Dear Brother Wille: —At a special meeting of the Edmund Street Ecclesia held today the following Resolution was passed unanimously: —“That we, the Edmund Street Ecclesia accept the Scriptural position of the John Bright Street Ecclesia as represented in their letter to us dated February 15th, 1924.” Sincerely your brother,

J. E. WEETMAN, Rec. Brother of Edmund Street Ecclesia. April 6th, 1924.

The brethren and sisters of Edmund Street Ecclesia greatly appreciate your kind assistance in coming to a mutual understanding with John Bright Street Ecclesia, With warmest love, Yours sincerely. —J. E. WEETMAN. [The John Bright Street brethren are as gratified at this “news” as we are. —EDITORS].

BOURNEMOUTH. —“Dear Brother Jannaway: I am writing to let you know that after serious consideration of the ‘Birmingham Trouble’ I have come to the conclusion that the position taken up by the John Bright Street Brethren is Scriptural. I am therefore taking up the same position and shall in future meet with bro. Wilkinson at this place. I am enclosing a postal order, value 5/-, for the Berean Christadelphian. Kindly send me back numbers from January to April.”—F. C. WOOD.

COVENTRY (Christadelphian Ecclesia Cooperative Room, Lockhurst Lane, Coventry). —Breaking of Bread, 2.45 p.m.; Lecture, 6.30 p.m.; Bible Class, Wednesday, 8 p.m. We are pleased and thankful to announce that Leslie John Gates, elder son of bro. and sis. H. C. Gates, has witnessed a good confession of those things most surely believed among us, and was baptised into the saving name of Christ on March 11th. We are greatly encouraged by this addition to our small number, and we trust that our young brother will run well and obtain the prize of eternal life. —H. C. GATES, Recording Brother, 14 Wyken Way, Stoke Heath, Coventry.

CROYDON. —Gymnasium Hall, 117 High Street; Sundays 11 a.m., 6.30 p.m.; Thursdays 8 p.m., Horniman's Hall, North End, West Croydon. We purpose holding (if the Lord will) a Tea and Fraternal Meeting on Saturday, April 19th, in the St. Peter's Hall, Selsdon Road, South Croydon. Tea, 5 o'clock; after meeting, 6.15. A cordial invitation is extended to all brethren and sisters in fellowship. —ALF. J. RAMUS.

DEAL. —We much regret having to announce the death of our sis. Fanny Chitty at the advanced age of seventy-six years, after a faithful walk in the narrow way for fifty-four years, she having been immersed in July, 1870, at the age of twenty-two. For many years our sister has been in complete isolation, but sis. May Graham of our Ilford Ecclesia, and who was a close companion of our sleeping sister expresses no doubt as to which side she would be with in the apostasy which is now in full swing under the leadership of the Temperance Hall and its Birmingham magazine.

DERBY. —You will be pleased to know that bro. Lomas, who has been recording bro. for the Derby meeting for upwards of 20 years, and his sister wife, have come out for the whole of the Truth, and now meet with us at the above address; and we hope (D.V.) to be further strengthened by others who are looking into the matter. —W.E. CAULTON. [We greatly rejoice at this news. We have keen recollections of pleasant times in the past with bro. and sis. Lomas. —EDITOR].

EDINBURGH. —Sister (Mrs.) B. Godfrey, 2 Wellington Place, Leith (formerly of the Clapham Ecclesia) has severed herself from the Temperance Hall, Birmingham, fellowship, and continues in fellowship with the Clapham Ecclesia. She will be pleased to see any of the same mind who may be visiting the city.

HAVERHILL (Suffolk). —We, in isolation, desire to associate ourselves with the Clapham meeting, believing them to have taken the right stand with regard to the Trouble in the brotherhood. We wholeheartedly believe in the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith. —Your bro. and sis. in Christ, C.H. ATKIN and C. ATKIN, Rookwood, Haverhill, Suffolk.

HEREFORD. —Bro. Morton reports that the majority here who are heart and soul with the present apostasy, have forcibly removed the whole of the ecclesial furniture and fittings from the meeting room, leaving the premises quite bare, and paying no respect to any claim of the minority brethren. The latter have borne the affliction patiently, and ask for the prayers of their fellow-pilgrims in the present vale of shadows.

HARROGATE. —Christadelphian Room (Harrogate Girls' Club), 2 Parliament Terrace. Breaking of Bread, 3; Lecture, 6.30. We have now obtained a room at the above address, and shall welcome to our meeting all in the John Bright Street fellowship. Brethren visiting the neighbourhood will oblige by advising the undersigned with a view to their services being utilized. —W. MOSBY, Holmeside, Borough Bridge Road, Knaresborough. P.S.—Please note correct address as above, not that appearing as W. Mosby, Edenholme, Park Grove, Borobridge, Knaresborough on p. 62 of February Berean Christadelphian. —W.M.

NOTTINGHAM. —Corn Exchange. Sunday morning, 10.30 a. m.; Sunday School, 2.30 p.m., Lecture, 6.30 p.m.; Huntingdon Street Schools: Eureka Class, Tuesday, 7.45 p.m. Week-night meeting, Wednesday, 7.45 p.m. Arrangements have been made to hold the Easter Tea and Fraternal Gathering in the Assembly Hall of the Clarendon Street Schools near the Arboretum (five minutes' walk from the Victoria Station). Brethren and sisters will be in attendance from two o'clock. From intimations already received we hope to have brethren and sisters present from most of the ecclesias in fellowship. Subject for meeting: "The return of the Bridegroom."—W.J. ELSTON.

OLDHAM. —Cooperative Guild Room, Greenwood Street, Huddersfield Road. Breaking of Bread, 2.30; Lecture, 6.30. Having regard to the latter-day departure from the One Faith, as evidenced in the compromise of the Principles concerning the duty of brethren in voting, taking oaths, and the joining of the Special Constabulary and similar State services, and the fellowshipping of those who think these

are not sins: ten brethren and sisters, after an ecclesial discussion, have come out in accordance with the following resolution: —“That we, the Oldham Christadelphian Ecclesia, shall withhold our fellowship from Birmingham (Temperance Hall) until such time as they shall accept in their fellowship only those who whole-heartedly support the basis of faith concerning military service and constabulary, and shall extend our fellowship to those Ecclesias who have taken a similar action.” We much regret that the brethren and sisters in Oldham were not given a fair opportunity of hearing all the evidence, but we trust others may soon become aware of the falling away, and with us take heed. A separate meeting has now been started, and we would welcome any brethren and sisters in our fellowship who may visit this district. —A. GEATLEY, Rec. Bro. Those who have come out: brethren W. Cockcroft, W. V. Butterfield, J.T. Hargreaves, A. Geatley; sisters W. Cockcroft, Annie Cockcroft, Alice Cockcroft, Nellie Cockcroft, W.B. Butterfield, J.T. Hargreaves.

SHATTERFORD (nr. Bewdley, Worcs.)—We here endorse the decisions of Ilford and Clapham Ecclesias in dealing with the heresy which is now troubling the household. Any brethren and sisters in the Berean fellowship who might be passing this way, will be welcomed to the table of the Lord at the house of bro.W. Pigott at the above address. Breaking of Bread at 2.30 p.m., or can be arranged at different time upon request for convenience of any passing this way. We all hope your health is better and wish you and your co-editor God-speed in your earnest contention for the Faith. It is a consolation to know there are a few Joshua’s and Caleb’s in the camp yet. —H. PIGOTT.

SWANSEA. —After a series of special meetings of seven weeks’ duration, during which our position in relation to the Birmingham dispute was discussed, we now find ourselves the small number of fourteen members out of an Ecclesia of over 100, compelled to separate ourselves from those who seek not the Truth in its purity. It is indeed sad to see the laxity which has crept into the latter-day ecclesias, but we thank God and take courage in the fact that our eyes have been opened to spiritual wickedness in high places. For the guidance of any brethren or sisters who may be coming this way, and to whom we extend a hearty welcome at the Lord’s Table, we wish to point out that there are now three sections in Swansea as a result of diverse opinions upon this deplorable discussion: (1) Those who reaffirm their fellowship with Birmingham Temperance Hall; (2) Those who maintain neutrality of action, and who are prepared to fellowship all who accept their Basis of Faith; and (3) We, who extend our fellowship to John Bright Street ecclesia and only those ecclesias in their fellowship. We have joined hands with a few in Skewen and Mumbles who are still found on the Lord’s side, and with their assistance and company we hope to be a goodly number of twenty-one. For the present we are compelled to hold our meetings at 33 Gerald Street, but we trust soon with God’s help to find more suitable accommodation. We also take this opportunity of thanking you for the spiritual food given us through the medium of your splendid Berean Christadelphian. —J. H. MORSE.

CANADA.

BRANTFORD (Ontario). —C.O.F. Hall, 136 Dalhousie Street. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Thursdays, 8 p.m. With thanks to our heavenly Father we take pleasure in reporting that the majority of the C.O.F. Hall Ecclesia of the city have endorsed the position taken by the South Brantford Ecclesia over a year ago, as being in accordance with Christ’s commands; and therefore have joined us in our effort to maintain the Truth in its purity, both in doctrine and practice. The united ecclesia, though taking the place and attitude upon all matters of doctrine and fellowship formerly held by the South Brantford Ecclesia, will in future meet in the C.O.F. Hall. —WALTER J. LIVERMORE, Rec. Bro.

HAMILTON, Ont. —I. And O.F. Chambers, 194 Main Street, E. Sundays: Bible Class and Sunday School, 9.45 a.m.; M.I.C. 10 a.m.; Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m.; Lecture, 7 p.m.; Wednesdays, Bible Class 8 p.m. Since last reporting progress, we have gained two by immersion into the sin-covering Name. On January 24th, Miss Martha Martin (daughter of our bro. and sis. Martin), and on February 28th, Miss Maud Smith. We trust they will run well and gain the prize of eternal life. We desire to thank the following brethren who have assisted us in our ecclesial labours: brethren Gibson and

Newnham, both of Toronto. We welcome brethren and sisters coming to Hamilton who are prepared to stand firm to the position we have taken in our fight against current errors. —H. J. WARD, Rec. Bro.

TORONTO. —Don Hall, 957 Broadview Avenue. Sundays: 10.30 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8.15 p.m. At the meeting of the arranging brethren of the above ecclesia on February 4th, 1924, it was decided to withhold intelligence from the Christadelphian magazine on account of its inconsistent attitude in handling the issues raised by bro. A.D. Strickler, of Buffalo, U.S.A., and to forward intelligence for publication in the Berean Christadelphian until such time as the Christadelphian magazine manifested a change in this matter. I enclose a copy of the letter sent to bro. C.C. Walker covering this decision, which you may possibly find space for. We have assisted Alma Gertrude Magee through the waters of baptism, and pray that the time of her probation may at last find favour. Bro. W.J. Livermore, of Brantford, exhorted and lectured for us on February 23, and there was an appreciative number of strangers present. —ARTHUR EMENY, Rec. Bro.

[COPY]

Don Hall Ecclesia, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Dear Brother Walker, —Greetings. It is with much regret on behalf of the arranging brethren of the above ecclesia, that I have to forward to you the purport of a resolution passed at their meeting on February 4th. The effect of this is that on account of laxity and inconsistency on your part in the handling of the Strickler errors in the Christadelphian magazine, we shall henceforth refrain from forwarding intelligence for its pages. We believe that if bro. Strickler were honest to the brotherhood, he would withdraw his pamphlets and teachings, and therefore remove this continent-wide offence. Further, we cannot understand why, if bro. Strickler was wrong ten years ago (according to your own letters to bro. Smallwood) he should now be described as “sound.” We would earnestly urge upon you the necessity of removing the ambiguities of the situation the magazine has created, as the action we, along with other ecclesias in this continent, have taken in withholding intelligence, is one much to be deplored. It is our earnest hope that you will see the unwisdom of supporting bro. Strickler’s errors, and return once again to the path whereby we can all feel with certainty that you are not giving support to teachings which have riven ecclesias all over this continent.

Faithfully your brethren in Christ,

The Arranging Brethren of the Don Hall Ecclesia, Toronto, Ontario,

PETER ARTHUR EMENY, Rec. Bro.

263 Monarch Park Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

UNITED STATES.

WORCESTER (Mass.). —Dear Brother Denney. Greeting. Will you kindly publish in the Berean Christadelphian the enclosed copy of letter sent to bro. C.C. Walker. With your permission our intelligence in the future will appear in your magazine, and the Lord willing, it shall continue to appear there so long as you uphold purity of doctrine and fellowship. Fraternaly yours, B. J. DOWLING, Rec. Bro.

Worcester Christadelphian Ecclesia,
Assembly Hall, Elm and Chestnut Sts.
Worcester, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

March 6th, 1924.

To the Editor of the “Christadelphian,” Birmingham, England.

Dear Brother Walker. Greeting. At a meeting of the arranging brethren held March 3rd, 1924, a resolution was passed whereby I have been instructed to inform you that because of your persistence

in allowing intelligence to appear in the Christadelphian from ecclesias who would corrupt the Word of God, this ecclesia will not from henceforth send intelligence for insertion until the magazine close its intelligence columns to, and discontinue its fellowship with, those ecclesias who continue to fellowship and uphold those who pervert the Gospel of Christ.

Our ecclesia does not fellowship those who hold, teach, or countenance the false doctrines set forth by bro. A.D. Strickler, and published in his pamphlet, *Out of Darkness into Light*. You, yourself, are aware that Dr. Thomas' Scriptural expositions on the "Constitution of Sin" are made void by the teachings in the above-named pamphlet. You have also declared yourself to be "at doctrinal variance with bro. Strickler." This is indeed deplorable, as it classes you among those who know that (to use bro. Roberts' words) "our whole foundation is being tampered with. Those who ought to defend that foundation are in sympathy with, and apologizing for, and helping those who are tampering with it."

This being your position, we cannot allow ourselves to be identified with it by having our intelligence appear side by side with that of those who pervert the Truth. We would exhort you, therefore, to endeavour to make the magazine a voice only to those who are contending for the faith.

When this course is resumed we shall be pleased to send ecclesial intelligence.

Faithfully your brother in Israel's Hope,

B. J. DOWLING, Rec. Bro.

FROM OUR POST BAG.

AUSTRALIA
(From BRISBANE).

"In regard to the Declension from the Truth which has set in like a flood—I am with you whole-heartedly, and I must say that no true brother of Christ can remain neutral in this issue and retain the love of God. I send a copy of a letter sent to the Birmingham Ecclesia yesterday. It is the second one. Received no reply to the first, of which I also sent you a copy" (Evidently the writer and those with him have grasped the facts of the Birmingham Trouble—they are set out in detail—Refusing to sign the London Petition for Total Exemption from Military Service; the adoption of Clause 7 which would have handed the brethren over to a section of the Army; fellowshipping brethren who do not think it is a sin to join the Constabulary; cutting off faithful brethren on account of opposing those who contravene Christ's commandments; cutting off brethren who hold fast to the Truth, simply because they dare to assemble themselves together to remember Christ—to wit, the Blackheath Ecclesia—no wonder unfaithful Temperance Hall Arranging brethren do not want their wicked decisions discussed and brought to light; we doubt if the Temperance Hall Ecclesia as a whole ever hear of such communications as the one sent for them as the foregoing from Australia). "We take this opportunity of writing you to ascertain if there is any likelihood of your visiting Australia. You will remember writing us in answer to our invitation some eighteen months ago—that the state of your health did not then admit of your undertaking the journey and the task. The brethren here have instructed me to write you again to pay us the desired visit, . . . you would be able to clear up matters . . . Personally knowing bro. Walker as we do, we can quite understand his attitude, for we have suffered from it for many years; indeed several years ago we were struck with the similarity of his attitude towards evil doers, with Eli towards his sons . . . His latest attitude towards the Bell heresy and Bell's supporters is only in keeping with that attitude. Just fancy him justifying himself in fellowshipping one such on the grounds of his 'being acquainted with her from childhood, and that she assented to Jesus Christ having come in the flesh.' Why all the clean-flesh people assent to that as a matter of words. Ask them if he came in the unclean and defiled flesh, etc. When brethren who have been looked up to for a lead on moot or knotty problems pander to natural sentiments, it seems to us the smooth or Laodicean state has just about been reached."

From MELBOURNE.

“A number of us here are surprised to see C.C.W.’s remarks on bro. Mansfield of Adelaide. . . . Bro. C.C.W. does not know what the John Bell trouble is, but he will have to. To ask anyone if they believe ‘Jesus came in the flesh’ is a very crude way of putting it. Of course he came in the flesh; but the word flesh should be qualified. If bro. Mansfield (of Adelaide) or sister Minnie Adams (of Perth) had been asked, ‘Did they believe that Jesus came in sinful flesh’ their position would have been exposed; their answer would have been ‘no’ . . . However, this is only the beginning of dawn on this troublesome and dangerous subject, which has troubled the household since 1874.”

NEW ZEALAND.
From AUCKLAND.

“Expression was given some months back that a new magazine would have to be set going—and here we have the Berean Christadelphian sent us—we like its ring, and wish it a full measure of success in upholding the purity of the Faith. We hope shortly to send Intelligence for insertion in the Berean Christadelphian.”

From HAWKES BAY.

“Like yourselves, we are out ‘for the whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth’ and it behoves us to remove anything that stands in the way. We are certainly living in perilous times. We are beset with the same troubles in this country, and we have to warn and choose the right way. The matter has troubled us a good deal, but now there is a way made clear from another source. We cannot do without a magazine. In these latter days we need stirring articles. I enclose twenty shillings for the Jewish Relief Fund from two lovers of Zion.”

* * *

From BRISTOL.

A sister out of the kindness of her heart sent me the following: —

I have today read “Christ’s Commandments” in April “Christadelphian,” and if you have not done so, I would like you to read it; it seems to me so helpful just at this time, and may help you.”

I sent her, in substance, the following—

Your note was appreciated. I had already seen the article, and was strongly impressed with some of the arguments when turned on Temperance Hall. Possibly something may appear in the “Berean” thereon, if there is room. * But there is so much demand for space; the increasing circulation, too, shows that the ecclesias throughout the world are waking up from their stupor of confidence in Birmingham.

* Yes, it will receive attention in our May Editorial. —(EDITORS).

I will ask you one question on the paragraph beginning “The Law of Withdrawal” (page 162, 2nd column): —Did John Bright Street act according to their conscience when they tried to uphold God’s Truth on what they conceived to be introduction of false doctrine? And was not the Law of Withdrawal abused when Temperance Hall withdrew from them for thus being conscientiously engaged?

Temperance Hall admits they are doctrinally sound. Was not the Law of Withdrawal abused, then, when they withdrew from John Bright Street?

This is but ONE instance of the article applying to Temperance Hall.

Then, some of the arguments—how weak. Fancy, because we do not call those who are at variance with the first principles of God's Truth brother and sister, we are presumptuously affecting to pluck Christ's sheep out of his hands. What twaddle. Did bro. Roberts presumptuously affect to pluck Christ's sheep out of His hands when he denounced Ashcroft, Hadley, Andrew, and others who opposed the Truth? Don't be beguiled by such carnal reasoning. After fighting for the Truth all these years the "Christadelphian" would open the door and let in that "glorious doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man." No. The Truth is a decided separation—separation in the first place by accepting that system of Truth made up of First Principle doctrines—one of which A.D. and T.E.P. would nullify. Cater for such, and without this clear line of accepting the First Principles, all our work will be useless. Why come out from orthodoxy? The evidence that they have done so, stands against them in cold print, which I have supplied you. If you had read (as I have) T.E. Pearce's speech, and still regard him and his companions faithful brothers and sisters, it shows a lack of apprehension of what those words really mean . . . Oh; for the perception of a Dr. Thomas and a bro. Roberts. We should have had none of this namby-pamby. Do you remember how bro. Roberts broke up the Birmingham Ecclesia over a matter that started in Nottingham (the Partial Inspiration)? According to your arguments he had no right to interfere in Nottingham affairs. But strike he did—broke up Temperance Hall Ecclesia, and reformed it—no shilly-shallying—a straight cut. * As then, so now. A decided stand is necessary.

Nothing is more noticeable on the Temperance Hall side than its Laodiceanism. When bro. Roberts' Elijah-like attitude is adopted then we have these whimperings of unkindness and lack of love.

Away with such foolishness. To the law and to the testimony must be our cry; albeit the whimperers will go on whimpering, and allowing those in your fellowship to stealthily steal your crown by their insidious actions and plausible arguments. Hold fast that thou hast, that no man take thy crown."

* Ah! He was of a different stamp to the Editor now enthroned at Birmingham. A huge Ecclesia—a peace-at-any-price magazine—and good opinions of the clergy, had no weight with Dr. Thomas or bro. Roberts. When the circulation of the Ambassador was only a few hundreds, he forfeited 50 per cent. rather than cater for the Davises and Pearces of his day.

IN FELLOWSHIP.

Brethren and sisters visiting other places will find the following list useful. The brethren named will be willing to afford information as to meetings, in their vicinity, of those of like precious faith: that is, of those who wholeheartedly and unreservedly hold and adhere to the Birmingham Basis of Faith, and who, consequently are standing aside from the Temperance Hall and allied ecclesias by reason of their harbouring false teachers, while excluding faithful brethren who protested at the unfaithfulness: —

BEDFORD. —W. H. Cotton, 23 Rosamond Road.

BEXLEY HEATH. —G.L. Barber, 9 Bramley Place, Crayford, Kent

BIRMINGHAM. —W.L. Wille, 40 Parade, Sutton Coldfield.

BLACKHEATH (Staffs). —C. Powell, 20 West St., Blackheath, Staffs.

BLAKENEY. —H. Matthews, Brook Cottage, New Road.

BOURNEMOUTH. —J. Wilkinson, 438 Wimborne Rd., Winton, Bournemouth.

BRIDGEND. —W. Winston, Clifton House, Bridgend.

BRIGHTON. —J.A. Anstee, Edith Avenue, Peacehaven.

BRISTOL. —F. Walker, 41 Stokes Croft.

CASTLEFORD. —E. Foster, 16 Joffre Av., Glasshoughton.

CHESTERFIELD. —F. Sidaway, 63a Tamworth St., Lichfield.

COLCHESTER. —L.H.W. Wells, 73 Kendall Rd.

COVENTRY. —H. G. Gates, 14 Wyken Way, Stoke Heath.

CREWE. —J.W. Atkinson, 34 Meredith St. Crewe.

CROYDON. —A.J. Ramus, 66 Lower Rd., Kenley, Surrey.

DERBY. —W.E. Caulton, 26 Sun St., Derby.

EDINBURGH. —Mrs. B. Godfrey, 2 Wellington Place, Leith.

FALMOUTH. —W. Warn, Budock House, Falmouth.

HALIFAX. —F. Shepley, 3 Calder Terrace, Mytholmroyd, Yorks.

HAVERHILL. —C. H. Atkin, "Rookwood."

HEANOR. —(See Langley Mill).

HEREFORD. —W.H. Morton, 62a St. Martin's St., Hereford.

HITCHIN. —H.S. Shorter, "Eureka," Walsworth Rd., Hitchin.

HUDDERSFIELD. —W. Bradford, 12 Union St., Hill Top, Slaithwaite.

IPSWICH. —S. Simpson, 116 London Rd., Ipswich.

KNARESBOROUGH. —W. Mosby, "Holmside," Borobridge Road, Knaresborough.

LANGLEY MILL. —A. Bowles, 21 Milnhay Rd., Langley Mill.

LEAMINGTON. —H.W. Corbett, 16 Joyce Pool, Warwick.

LICHFIELD. —S.M. Harrison, 102 Birmingham Rd.

LINCOLN. —Bro. and sis. Heaton, 109 Sincil Bank.

LIVERPOOL. —(Mrs.) C. Philpotts, 31 Stanley St., Fairfield, Liverpool.

LONDON (North). —C. Redmill, 30 Florence Rd., Stroud Green, N4.

LONDON (South). —F. Button, 22 Stockwell Park Crescent, S.W. 9.

LONDON (East). —W. Diggins, 21 Hampton Rd., Ilford, Essex.

LONDON (West). —W.E. Eustace, 21 Chelverton Rd., Putney, S.W.

MANCHESTER. —(See Oldham).

MARGATE. —A Furneaux, “Lachine,” Addiscombe Rd., Margate.

MILFORD HAVEN. —A. Charman, Castle Hall.

NEATH. —S. L. Watkins, 29 Winifred Rd., Skewen

NEW TREDEGAR. —G. Evans, 22 Jones St., Phillipstown, New Tredegar.

NOTTINGHAM. —W.J. Elston, 97 Woodborough Rd.

OLDHAM. —A. Geatley, 116 Cooper Street, Springhead, Oldham.

OXFORD. — F. Mayes, Hunt Stables, Stadhampton.

PORTSMOUTH. —C. H. Lindars, Ropley, Hants.

PLYMOUTH. —A. J. Nicholls, Old Laira Road.

RAINHAM. —E. Crowhurst, 73 Ivy St., Rainham, Kent.

REDHILL. —W. H. Whiting, 65 Frenches Road Redhill.

RHONDDA. —G. Ellis, 150 Kewry Street Tonypany, Rhondda, Glam.

SHREWSBURY. —J. Evans, 12 Poplar Avenue, Castlefields.

SLAITHWAITE. —(See Huddersfield).

SOUTHAMPTON. —C.M. Robinson, 69 Randolph St.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA. —F. Jackson, “Dometo,” Swanage Rd., Southend.

ST. ALBANS. —W. Goodwin, The Bungalow, Beresford Rd., Fleetville.

ST. AUSTELL. —A. Sleep, Moorland Cottage, Moorland Rd., St. Austell.

SWANSEA. —J. T. Davey, Boar’s Pit Farm.

SWINDON. —H. R. Bryant, 36 Alfred St.

TIER’S CROSS. —H. Thomas, Haverford-west, Pemb.

WELLINGTON, Salop. —H. G. Saxby, 47 Urban Terrace.

WESTON-SUPER-MARE. —A. Higgs, 42 Baker Street.

WORTHING. —A. Jeacock, St. Olaves, Boundary Rd., Worthing.

SCOTLAND.

Apply to J. Holland, 39 Wellpark Rd., Saltcoats, Ayrshire.

UNITED STATES.

(For list of ecclesias).

B. J. Dowling, 76 Florence Street, Worcester, Mass, U.S.A.

CANADA.

(For list of ecclesias).

W. Smallwood, 194 Carlow Avenue, Toronto, Canada.

AUSTRALIA.

A. H. Barncastle, 413 Elizabeth Street, Sydney, N.S.W.

INDIA.

L. W. Griffin, Chakadahpur.

NEW ZEALAND.

AUCKLAND. —L. Walker, 3 Mewburn Avenue, Mt. Eden, Auckland.
