

Price 4d

June, 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	177
The Bible wholly inspired and infallible— No. 109. — “Hold Fast” (2 Tim. 1: 13)	180
Editorial	183
Are we walking worthily (R. Roberts)	188
Birmingham Frictions	192
A Bible Class Address	196
Clerical Tactics... ..	199
Birmingham Temperance Hall Manifesto..... ..	201
Tweedledum and Tweedledee	202
Munition Making	203
Neutrality	205
The Next War..... ..	206
Blind Incompetency..... ..	207
Answers to Correspondence	208
Immortality after Judgment..... ..	209
Ecclesial News	211
From our Post Bag..... ..	215

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

Notes.

“FOOD FOR THOUGHT for those in Fellowship with the Temperance Hall Meeting, Birmingham; containing the Speech made by T.E. Pearce, 25th October, 1917.” The above pamphlet is now in print and may be had free on application to W.W. Diggins, 211 Hampton Road, Ilford, Essex. It should be read and THOUGHT UPON by all those to whom it is addressed, unless they have definitely decided that they do not mind who or what they fellowship.

“DREADFUL” READING. —This is the verdict of the Editor of the Christadelphian concerning the pamphlet entitled Solemn Warnings. We unreservedly agree with his conclusion. In all our experience in the Truth (and it extends further back than does the experience of bro. C.C. Walker, we have never read such terrible indictments by one’s own “friends” as are found in Solemn Warnings. The Editor admits that the watchmen who give the warnings are not in the camp of the Berean Christadelphian. This is evidently what makes him regard the pamphlet as so dreadful. The first edition of 3,000 has already disappeared and another edition is in preparation. Copies can be had of F.G. Jannaway, 99 Stockwell Park Road, London, S.W. 9. One copy 1½d.; 12 copies 1/6; or 100 copies 10/-, all carriage paid. Get it and see what F.W. Turner, W.H. Boulton, A.S. Thompson, G.F. Lake, and others really think of Birmingham and the Christadelphian.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE Berean Christadelphian. Readers may take it for granted that future issues will comprise forty pages, and that therefore the price will be 6d. per month, or 6/- per year. We shall not send out any personal demand for this increased 2/- but shall trust to our readers to send same in stamps on receipt of the July number or before. All such receipts will be duly acknowledged. We have received a host of letters asking for the enlargement to be carried out. These have greatly encouraged and strengthened us.

“CHRISTADELPHIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL.”—We are pleased to announce that the long-felt, but neglected, want—a Christadelphian Children’s Magazine is about to be supplied, under the title of Christadelphian Family Journal. It is proposed to issue the first number in July next. Will all interested apply for particulars to bro. E.W. Browne, 14 Elms Road, Clapham, S.W.4.

AMERICAN AND CANADIAN REMITTANCES. —In sending Money Orders from the American continent always ask for the English money value to be put on the Order as well as the Canadian or U.S.A. This saves much trouble at this end.

A. SHARPE (Nottingham). —We have no sympathy with those who report charges against un-named brethren, with the possibility of causing innocent brethren to be suspected. We exhort you to carry out the Lord’s instructions, found in Matthew 18.

E. FIRTH, and two others (who, however, took infinite pains to conceal their identity). —The Editor of the Christadelphian in 1923, commended his readers to read An Unjust Balance, the work of bro. F.W. Turner. Well, the pamphlet which you returned, “unopened and unread,” contained Solemn Warnings from the pen of the author of An Unjust Balance, as well as from the pens of well known professed friends of Birmingham and the Christadelphian. Is it that you only listen to them when they pander to your vanity? That was the sin of Israel. If you really desire to know how perilous the times are in which we live, read these spontaneous, heart-deep, Solemn Warnings of G.F. Lake, W.H. Boulton, W.H. Hill, A.S. Thompson, and others. The most sad feature of the matter is that mentioned by the Somerset sister (see From our Post Bag this month).

R. HEATON. —Fancy our innocent question in the Oldham tram to a brother—“Are you on my list?” being construed as on a level with “I am of Paul, I am of Apollos”! The “list” referred to is a Register of those who (inter alia) were parties to the London Petition, with whom we desire to keep in touch, and to whom we invariably send any information bearing upon the matter. Although the London

Standing Committee long ago ceased its operations, we have personally never let go the responsibility, for no one can say how soon it will be necessary to present a renewed Petition.

I. COLLYER. —We gladly publish your repudiation of having taken part in “supporting the Suffolk Street approach and urging re-union;” and, “not by word, inflection, or look, suggest the faintest encouragement to the idea of re-union.” Then all the more shame for prolonging the agony from July to November 1920, by taking part in meetings with the Suffolk Street folk, and remaining silent while the brotherhood was having it reported to them, by the Fraternal Visitor people, that all was proceeding “cordially.” Bro. Lake did not speak without knowledge. We have no doubt that, apart from “outside pressure,” bro. C.C. Walker would have been “overborne,” as bro. Lake stated. By “outside pressure,” we mean letters from London to Birmingham, the climax being reached by a visit of bro. C.C. Walker to London on the eve of, what proved to be, the final meeting between the Temperance Hall and Suffolk Street Arranging Brethren. The correspondence (now before us) is enlightening, and testifies as to how “bereft” the Temperance Hall leaders were on the matter of fellowship. The London meeting, on the eve of the climax (September 16th, 1920), you will find referred to on page 63 of the Clapham blue book, paragraph 3 (Birmingham Trouble, 1917-1923). The Scriptural course was to have asked at the outset if Suffolk Street brethren entirely accepted and upheld our Statement of Faith, and if they were prepared to withdraw from those who did not hold it in its entirety: and whether they were prepared to cancel their resolution of 1905 asking merely for “substantial acceptance.” We now know why you and others did not take that course. Time has shown that as in the Davis-Pearce case the “substantial acceptance” was sufficient for you. There is, today, no real difference between you and Suffolk Street. As bro. Davis contends, “only a shadow separates” you.

J. HANDLEY. —Thanks for “running that slander to earth” at Oldham, and discovering “it was bro.-- --, who told bro.-----who asked bro.-----, if it were true that-----.” Oh dear! Why didn’t the Oldham leaders attend the meeting and face the foe, which they were invited to do? Nice shepherds!

A. E. FELTHAM. —We agree—“The latest resolution at the Temperance Hall (e.g., not to fellowship any who fellowship John Bright Street sympathizers) should have a decided effect on the waverers: they can scarcely eat their often expressed opinion that the brethren of John Bright Street were wrongly withdrawn from: it will, I imagine, put some of them in a strange quandary.” Just so: but the ghost of “thirteen hundred” is not without a terrorizing effect on those who have not the moral courage to “stand alone” like Daniel.

L. WOODS. —Have you ever heard of the saying, “With all his faults we love him still”? Having asked you that question, may we ask you to learn a lesson we learnt many years ago? When one finds it necessary to add a postscript to a letter, re-write it, embodying the postscript. If after reading the amended letter you find it necessary to add another P.S., re-write it, embodying the P.S. And once again, should you deem it necessary to add another P.S., re-write the letter embodying that P.S., and so on, ad infinitum. Your letter, before us, contains no less than three P.S.’s. Just see where your uncertainties land you. In the same letter you ask us to “debate the matter with bro. A. Davis;” and yet you state that you are sure we have misjudged his view of H.M. Forces. But, of what use debating with one who is no longer the owner of his own speech? He has bequeathed it to bro. C.C. Walker and the other Temperance Hall Arranging brethren! Arrange a debate with bro. C.C. Walker, and we will mount the platform on the other side of the table. We know his mind, from his letters and the Christadelphian since 1914, and have no hesitating in declaring the brotherhood is being misled, and the audience would soon perceive such to be so.

SOUTHPORT ECCLESIA. —We thank you for your pronouncement, but is your resolution to be merely a matter of words? Are you prepared to refuse fellowship to those from apostate meetings who visit you but who say they accept your basis? Grimsby Ecclesia passed a similar resolution, but in the same month had three Birmingham Temperance Hall brethren as lecturers!!!

GREAT BRIDGE. —We are delighted to hear that a meeting room has been secured and that you are forming an Ecclesia. We will attend your first meeting (D.V.)

J. FRANKLIN. —Before troubling us with any more extracts from the letters of sister M. Adams, please say boldly and plainly where you stand in the matter of fellowship. You “know her mind” and you “know what bro. J. Bell contends for concerning the nature and sacrifice of Christ.” With such knowledge are you willing to receive her into fellowship at your North London meeting should she visit it as she did Crewe?

LONG LETTERS. —Some half dozen correspondents have sent us controversial letters aggregating about 100 pages, and seem vexed because we do not reply “in detail.” Is that reasonable? We can but guess what our fellow-editor’s post gab is like, but we know what our own is: it makes it utterly impossible to reply in detail to the hundreds of letters received. In almost every case we reply, and give our conclusions, but we must leave it to our correspondents to fathom our reasons.

W. JACKSON. —We heartily agree with what you say concerning the writers of some of the letters of Solemn Warnings—“One realises that the perception of duty does not ensure its fulfillment. The keenest appreciation of the Truth may be associated with the most utter cowardice in the face of a clear and definite moral issue.

The Annual Outing of the Clapham Ecclesia and Sunday School to Bushy Park and Hampton Court is fixed for Saturday, June 28th. Programmes can be had of F. Button, 22 Stockwell Park Crescent, London, S.W.9. A hearty invitation to all Berean Christadelphians.

J.H.S.—You say the Editor of the Christadelphian has pushed you off the fence! Do you mean pushed or pulled? We know of nearly fifty Ecclesias sitting on the fence waiting apparently to be pushed or pulled off. The Editor of the Christadelphian is now to be used by the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia to clear all the fences by July 31, although, to save the faces of those who wont be pulled off, they are to have the privilege of having their “silence” counted as consent to fall down before the Birmingham idol, and thus acquiesce in being absolutely ruled by an Editor who was not only an utter failure at the Tribunals, but who has been an utter failure in ruling his own house. Scripture and faithfulness to Pauline injunctions leaves us no choice but to thus speak—1 Timothy 3: 1, 4-5.

E.W.—Maybe this note will catch the eye of the brother you have in mind, and have the desired result. You think a lecturer should not roll off his lecture and texts as something to be recited as a matter of memory, with Bible in hand but never opened. As you say, what is the use of telling people to bring their Bibles unless they are given an opportunity to turn to them. Berean Christadelphians want their lecturers to follow Paul—Acts 17: 2.

C.C.W.—Your un-Christlike taunt against your fellow-publisher and Bristol namesake in being alone in his town in the fight for purity is unworthy of the professed representative of your worthy forerunners. To say nothing concerning how frequently they found themselves alone, have you forgotten the Lord in his loneliness? Have you forgotten the Great Apostle who had to lament that “no man” stood with him? Shame on your taunt, although it is quite in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution of the proverbial “1300.”

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. 6 JUNE 15th 1924 FOURPENCE

Dr. John Thomas
(Christadelphian)

His Life and Work

CHAPTER 6

On the following Sunday (after the incident referred to in our previous chapter), as the Doctor was walking with Mr. Campbell to Mr. Campbell's own meeting house in the morning, Mr. Campbell remarked to him that he should call upon him to speak again in the afternoon. As there was the prospect of a considerable time to think over the matter, the Doctor did not object. He was, however, again taken by surprise: for Mr. Campbell occupied from half-past ten till two, and then concluded the meeting with the remark that they would have a recess for a quarter of an hour, after which Dr. Thomas would speak to them. The Doctor had calculated upon a considerable interval between the morning and afternoon meeting, and was taken aback at finding he had only a quarter of an hour to prepare. He had considerable difficulty in fixing his mind upon anything to say, but decided to speak on the Apostasy, of which he had read something. He occupied the afternoon with this subject, speaking, as afterwards transpired, to the satisfaction of those who heard.

The meeting over, the Doctor determined within himself that this sort of business must stop. He felt that he was being entangled in a work for which he was utterly unqualified, and which was entirely opposed to his tastes; he determined therefore to get out of the way as fast as possible. He decided to proceed to Baltimore, by way of Washington, in Pennsylvania. Communicating his intention to Mr. Campbell, the latter arranged to send him as far as Washington, Pennsylvania, and gave him a letter of introduction to Mr. Postlethwaite, Somerset House, Pennsylvania, and another to Mr. Carman, of Baltimore. In due time he bade farewell to Bethany, after spending an agreeable month in Mr. Campbell's company. The Doctor makes the following remarks on this occasion, in the Apostolic Advocate, Vol. 1, p. 88.

“We were much gratified with his acquaintance. We became much attached to him; and though before our interview and subsequent to our baptism, we had read much of his writings, and highly approved of them, yet we never advocated him. Our visit to Bethany, however, excited in our heart a friendship for him, which we exceedingly regret should have terminated so unpropitiously; but so it was. For Mr. Campbell, we would have laid down our life if called upon; so much greater was his personal than his literary influence over us.”

“During our stay at Bethany we accompanied Mr. Campbell to three or four of his appointments. Wellsburg was one. On returning to the meeting house in the afternoon, he observed to us: ‘Brother Thomas, I shall call upon you for a word of exhortation.’ As may be supposed, we were electrified at the announcement. We expostulated. We urged the suddenness of the call; our unpreparedness; our not having spoken on the Christian religion before, and so forth. But all to no purpose; he would take no denial, but insisted, observing that he liked to try what sort of mettle people were made of, or words to that effect. Mr. Campbell has had abundant opportunity of trying our mettle since! Finding there was no escape, and disdaining the imputation of cowardice in a good cause, we went forward and did as well as we could. He again took us by surprise at another of his meetings, which, added to the foregoing, hastened our departure from Bethany; for, thought we, we can never stand such impromptuism as this.

“From Bethany, we travelled eastward, by way of Somerset Court House, in Pennsylvania. To some brethren at this place, we had letters of introduction from Mr. Campbell. We remained with them sixteen days. Nothing would satisfy the brethren but that we should speak on every occasion. A disposition to oblige induced compliance, though sorely against our inclination; for we did not travel as an evangelist, but simply to find a place of settlement in our peculiar way of life; besides, the labour of public speaking was very great owing to a want of previous preparation, and the violence it did to our disposition, which is naturally reserved, and gratified by an abstraction from the noisy and busy haunts of men. But the things we have least sought after are the very things we are most engaged in. Our constant desire was to obtain an honourable living by our calling in as quiet a way as possible. But this desire, in the way we had marked out, has been completely thwarted; and we find ourselves tilling the soil in the retirement of a country life at home, but, when absent, buffeting the waves of a stormy sea. We never sought the engagements of an editor, nor of a public speaker; and from the time that Mr. Campbell put our mettle to the proof until now, we have never addressed the people from inclination, but always from a sense of duty, and at the earnest solicitation of others. Many have been the times that we would rather have travelled thirty miles from than five miles to an appointment. We mention these things to show that our public labours have been disinterested and super-imposed; if they had not resulted in the applause of those who have called us out, it is because, though called out contrary to inclination, we have always determined to do our best in speaking according to the oracles of God, or not to speak at all. A public life is not a life of our seeking, but if we must engage in its concerns, we will strive to direct our course by no other rule or standard of expediency than that of the Word of God. We plead for no man but ‘The man Christ Jesus;’ for no sect but that ‘everywhere spoken against’ of old, and we are resolved to hold no man’s person in admiration for the sake of advantage, even should it result in our falling back upon the much loved solitude of private life. Our wants are few and simple. Mankind have nothing in the way of honour, glory, or renown to bestow that we think worth contending for. We ask the world for nothing. We neither fear its frowns nor court its smiles. If a nobleman of old would receive nothing at its hands lest it should be said that it had made Abraham rich; neither would his descendants.”

At Somerset Court House, the Campbellites requested him to settle among them as their preacher, a proposition which the Doctor could not for a moment entertain. His object was not to become a preacher but to get into medical practice. He told them so, and that he must at once push on to Baltimore, where he was informed the most intelligent congregation of the Reformationists was situated, and where, therefore, he presumed they would be able to do all the speaking for themselves, and leave him to attend to his medical duties.

He arrived at Baltimore on a Sunday evening, and to his dismay (his approach having been signified by his Pennsylvanian friends), he was at once solicited to address the congregation. He wished to decline the engagement, but they would take no denial: and he spoke. Having heard him, nothing would satisfy them short of taking the public hall (Scottis' Hall), and calling the public together to hear the new preacher. The hall was engaged for a week, and every night in the week the Doctor addressed the public on "The Ancient Faith," which he considered the faith promulgated by Mr. Campbell to be.

(To be continued.)

[By a printer's slip the following line was left out in the April issue—it should have come in above the last two lines on page 99: —

"position. Mr. Scott at once accepted the issue, and directed his"]

The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

No 109. — "Hold fast" (2 Timothy 1: 13).

(Continued from page 138).

Paul was acquitted at his first trial following upon his two years in Rome "in his own hired house preaching the Kingdom of God." He then went away to refresh the churches by his presence and counsel, and to break down, wherever he found it, the apostasy which was already working like a leaven. He was but two years thus engaged when he was again apprehended. In that time he visited, among other places, Asia Minor, and he testifies to the strength of the declension from the Truth there when he writes from the dark Mamartine prison to his beloved son Timothy: "Thou knowest that all they which are in Asia are turned away from me." He mentions the leaders in this evil way. They were Phygellus and Hermogenes—2 Timothy 1: 15.

Another great figure in the early Church had forsaken him—Demas—who only two years before supported him. —Compare 2 Timothy 3: 10, Colossians 4: 14 and Philemon 24.

Now throughout the whole of the epistle to Timothy, the last letter Paul wrote before his execution, two great themes prevail.

(1) The grave necessity of holding fast the truth; the "form of sound words."

The Greek term translated "Hold fast" in 2 Timothy 1: 13 is one that means "to have and to hold continuously and lastingly," and is the strongest possible term that could be used. This may be illustrated by a glance at Bullinger's English-Greek Lexicon, where it is shown that six Greek terms are translated "hold" and "hold fast." This is the one with the greatest possible emphasis.

(2) The grave danger of the times that the Truth would be covered over by Apostasy.

Echoes of Paul's fight for the Truth against error within the ecclesias are heard as the epistle is read. Asia has gone away from the Truth. Hymenaeus and Philetus, other leaders, have preached error, and their word eats like a gangrene. Profane, i.e., worldly and unprofitable babblings increase. The Greek colloquialism translated "babblings" was composed of a seed and a small bird fond of picking up seeds. It was applied to men who picked up small things and chattered about them to their fellows. Of such were those in Athens who are described in Acts 17: 21 as spending their time in nothing else but to tell or to hear some new thing. It was thought that Paul was of like character, and the question was asked, "What will this babbler say?"

So that Paul indicates to Timothy the tendency to pick up and discuss new things as growing in the churches, and a thing to be shunned. Then we see some entangling themselves with the affairs of this life: others striving about words and raising foolish and unlearned questions and generating strifes. Looking ahead he sees the results. These he tabulates in 2 Timothy 3. The list is terrible but true.

“Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse.” It is the Greek word for juggler that is translated “seducer.”

“They shall turn away their ears from the Truth, and shall turn unto fables.” The word translated fables is always used in Attic Greek prose, from which Paul sometimes quoted, to denote a legend of early Greek times before the dawn of history. Afraid of trial or persecution at Paul’s first arraignment “all men forsook him.” Now in his darkest hour only Luke remained, that faithful physician whom the Spirit directed to write the Gospel that bears his name and the Acts of the Apostles.

Take now these two great themes, and you can read the Apostle’s mind and reconstruct the circumstances of the ecclesias of the years 64-66. Only thirty years after our Lord’s ascension, and everywhere there was departure from the Truth. Hence the tremendous warnings contained in this epistle. Some wanted new things and new explanations: some were accepting the idea that the resurrection was past already: that it took place at baptism: and that the saints would be preserved alive to the coming of the Lord. This gangrene at last brought the old lie of the Immortality of the Soul back from the world into the Church.

Some desired liberty of thought and brought in Greek legends.

When Paul fought hard for the whole Truth they “turned away from him.” There is, however, one very illuminating passage. “Loved this present world”—2 Timothy 4: 10. A flood of light is poured upon that day by this. The Greek here for “loved” is to regard: to let the tendency of the will be toward.

Now in what way could a great worker like Demas be brought to forsake Paul to whom up to 64 A.D. he had been a comrade and a help to so large an extent as the passages we cited show? Take the Greek for “present world” and you see what brought the climax and the break.

One burning question of the day was how far the ecclesias of Christ could accommodate or please the world around so as to avoid persecution. With Paul was no middle way. Either all or none was his position. “Present world” means the circumstances of the age as existing at that time. Demas regarded—paid attention to—the circumstances of his times, and sought, by allowing the tendency of his will to be suborned by the circumstances, to make things easier. Hence he fell out with steadfast Paul, and went away to Thessalonica to prosecute his nefarious work.

Circumstances have nothing to do with the Truth of God. Hold fast to all of it. Let not the will be towards the world in any way. That was Paul’s position, and the Spirit directs through him that this should be the case with every true Christian.

Now we come to our point. This epistle was the product either of human thought or of Divine. It sets out two absolutely opposite positions. Intolerance of change or deviation on the one hand; tolerance and a leaning to new things and the seeking of new thoughts on the other, with ease and friendship with the world around.

Paul prophetically outlines how, while he stood with God and Christ for the policy of “Hold fast” and “No change in a rigid code,” yet, nevertheless, the other side would win, apparently and temporarily, the victory. Evil would wax worse and worse: perilous times would come. The Truth would always be in danger till Christ came. This position and this prophecy have been subjected to the great test of time.

If the position of the Asian ecclesias and their leaders and Demas had been the correct one, time would have proved Paul's fears to be groundless. Apostasy would not have triumphed.

But time has proved Paul and the small minority of "only" ones with him to have been right. Moreover, the tendency of human nature is always the same. It still is. Ease is still desirable to the flesh and sought for earnestly.

The fact remains that the Truth can only be held unbroken by a policy of "having and holding continuously and lastingly." Having, therefore, been tested and proved by time and circumstance the Word through Paul is demonstrated to be true, although the majority of his brethren contemporary with him held an opposite view. Is it not, therefore, easy to see that the reason why Paul's message has been true to the letter, while Demas and his co-workers have been proved wrong and false is that the former was inspired of God, while the latter were inspired by the human mind. The one endures like an impregnable rock: the other crashes to ruin in its own sandy foundation. The Truth will win the final victory, but it is always victorious in the individual who "holds fast the form of sound words committed to him." The judgment seat will exhibit this fully. —G. H. D.

(To be continued).

Editorial.

THE SCRIPTURAL WAY WITH HERESY.

2. Abraham.

When Noah's family came out from the Ark, the Truth was supreme in the earth. Error was entirely wiped away, and mankind was given a new clean start. Within the life-time of Noah declension had set in, and departure from the Truth followed. By the time that Abram was born, which was probably but two years after Noah's death and 352 years after the flood, the Truth had been almost entirely submerged. A careful reading of Genesis, chapters 12 to 50, gives revealing references to the mixed character of the world's thought in relation to the Truth of God. For instance, the Egyptian king, spoken of in Genesis 12: 15, seems to worship, or at least recognise, the same God as Abram. Melchizedec carried on the true worship of God in Jerusalem, though the Canaanites around were leading the world's wickedness. "The iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full" indicates that apostasy had not yet become complete in their case: some vestiges of the Truth still remained. Partial apostasy had set in in Mesopotamia, and to preserve the Truth God called out Abram "from his kindred and his father's house." Abram obeyed the call to exile, and without the Divine explanation one would be at a loss why he went out, not knowing whither he went, and also why such a necessity should have arisen. God gave Joshua the explanation: "Your fathers dwelt in Mesopotamia of old time . . . and they served other gods. So I took your father Abraham."

Yet the relatives of Abraham were not so far advanced in departure from the Truth as those in Canaan and elsewhere. This is evidenced by the fact that when Abram desired a wife for Isaac, and when in turn Rebekah and Isaac needed a refuge for Jacob, both had recourse to Padan-aram, to the home of their fathers. Genesis 27: 46 is illuminating: "If Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth . . . what good shall my life do me?" The departure of the Hittites from the Truth was more pronounced than in the land which cradled the human race, and from whence Abram came.

Now if the way advocated by bro. C.C. Walker had been taken, Abram would never have needed to "come out." He could have gone on "paying as little attention as possible to passing heresies" and lived his own life, protesting, maybe, against the heresies but not to the extent of withdrawing himself from those who held them.

God's way was stern. "Come out" was the command, and Abraham obeyed. It meant leaving his ecclesia and all his friends and family, but the father of the faithful did it. Hence the testimony to him in Hebrews 11: 8. Why did Lot accompany Abraham? Evidently because he was of the same mind, and came out for the same reasons. Lot was a "just" man, "vexed with the filthy conversation" of the Sodomites—2 Peter 2: 8. Not many came away from heresy. So it ever was. The lesson is a stern one. God's command to those in ecclesias where this doctrine is neglected was and is "Come out." We shall not let bro. C.C. Walker re-write Genesis 12 "in terms of modern speech."

* * *

DRIFT.

As time goes on brethren who aforesaid were pillars reveal how broken they are. Bro. W.H. Boulton has, to a brother who recently wrote him, made his own mind and position clear: it makes sad reading. Bro. Boulton quotes bro. A. Davis as follows: —

"If you will refer to Rule 30 Birmingham Constitution you will find it authorises automatic disfellowship . . . without a formal vote of the ecclesia Any brother who joins the Police force may now be automatically disfellowshipped and I shall offer no protest.

"If as is likely in spite of the rule his case is submitted to the Ecclesia, I reserve the right to vote for or against or not at all according to circumstances"

Bro. Boulton expresses approval of this terrible travesty of the Truth in regard to fellowship and further says: "We are asked to ignore this. . . . In our judgment no brother whosoever he may be, has the right to judge his brother. In such circumstances we cannot associate ourselves with Clapham." Bro. Boulton is "not asked to ignore" it. He is asked to face the facts, and here he coolly and deliberately says that he sides with bro. Davis: accepts his position: and "refuses to associate" with Clapham Ecclesia because they have seen and shown to all that Apostasy can be condoned in every possible phase of it on the grounds held by bro. Davis. One doctrine is equal with another. All must be held true and firm. No "right" is "reserved" to "vote against" withdrawal from those who call any doctrine in question. Bro. Boulton can now find company with those who would sell the Truth. The Divine command is, "Buy the Truth, but sell it not"—Proverbs 23: 23. "Circumstances" have nothing to do with the matter.

* * *

We would gravely warn the brotherhood against bro. C. Brighton. He has written us voluminous letters not marked "private," but accompanied by a request that we should not quote from any of them—so afraid is he of the truth being made manifest. We have respected his request. He now writes us asking us to "veto any reference to himself in future." But he is everywhere endeavouring to substitute ephemeral and sentimental vapourings for solid truth and robust faith. Hence we feel it our duty to place his own position as defined by himself on record, so that none may be misled by his hearty and good-humoured manner into the mistake of following his example. Here are his words: —

"I am bound to vary my methods according to my conception of the individuals I address."

"We in Leicester were asked many times to correct the errors of others. We refrained from doing so."

"London presents a spectacle of the failure to observe this sound principle."

"Many attempts were made to involve us . . . but we here felt that we had no right to assume the care of all the Churches."

So bro. Brighton advocates surreptitiously (please don't publish it) that it is a sound principle (the italics are ours) to "refuse to correct the errors of others." Then every lecture we give that attacks the "errors of others" is wrong.

Surely anyone can see that apostasy is the easiest possible thing under bro. Brighton's "method." Be warned, brethren, and take the Epistle to the Galatians for your guide. —G.H.D.

SPLITS IN THE BODY.

An esteemed brother writes us: —

"I have just been reading 'Splits in the Body' in March Berean Christadelphian. My mind instantly reverted to those other equally weighty words from our beloved bro. R. Roberts contained in the Guide to Formation and Conduct of Ecclesias, article 42, 'Ecclesias in relation to one another.' The following extract is the part I especially refer to: —

'But there may be cases when a reasonable doubt exists, and where a second ecclesia will come to a different conclusion from the first. What is to be done then? Are the two ecclesias that are agreed in the basis of fellowship to fall out because they are of a different judgment on a question of fact? This would be a lamentable result—a mistaken course every way. They have each exercised their prerogative of independent judgment: let each abide by its own decision without interfering with each other. The one can fellowship a certain brother, the other cannot. Are they to aggravate the misery of a perhaps very trumpety and unworthy affair by refusing to recognise each other because they differ in judgment about one person? What sadder spectacle can there be than to see the servants of the Lord Jesus frowning at each other and denying each other the comfort of mutual friendship and help because they cannot agree about a given action or speech of perhaps some unworthy person? The course of action is to agree to differ.'

"I shall be glad to hear either privately or through the Berean Christadelphian for what reasons the unquestionably sound principles propounded in this article have not been applied to the case of brethren Davis and Pearce."

OUR REPLY.

Although our correspondent has underlined the words in italics, he thereby makes manifest that he has overlooked the all-important hypothesis upon which bro. Roberts gave such excellent counsel, namely; "There may be cases where a reasonable doubt exists, and where a second ecclesia will come to a different conclusion from the first."

In the case of brethren Davis and Pearce there does not exist any reasonable doubt, the Temperance Hall in general and brethren F.G. Ford and C.C. Walker being our witnesses: the latter, the editor of the Christadelphian, never held back and recanted until confronted with his own compromising attitude on the Military Question, then he changed front instead of buying up the opportunity to renounce the ungodly views he propounded in his article on "Conscience"—Christadelphian, 1916, p. 169. He was cowed when bro. Davis reproachfully exclaimed, "Remember Clause 7!" He let slip the opportunity and is now leading his blind followers to perdition. Even now, it is not too late for him to retrace his false steps and get back to the divine way so faithfully trod by his worthy predecessor, bro. Roberts. Will he show himself thus strong? or will he verify bro. Lake's prophecy of "a second Ashcroft"?

The Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren are aware of the gravity of the indictment and are doing their level best to suppress the evidence, just as they have suppressed (but not renounced) the two speeches. Why all hatred of the light if there is any reasonable doubt? For us to sink differences because some, who have not heard the speeches, think there is a reasonable doubt, would soon land us

back in the ranks of the Apostasy. On its own showing, the Temperance Hall Ecclesia sinned in cutting off the John Bright Street brethren from fellowship, and brethren A. Davis and C.C. Walker know it.

Furthermore, when “one of the parties” regards the difference as vital, there is no option but to stand on one side from those fellowshipping brethren tampering with our common Basis, which we know certain ones in the Temperance Hall are doing.

The Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren did not scruple to shunt their weekly Bible Class to hear Apostate Mellowes impugn the Truth. Was their excuse the grand opportunity it would give the editor of the Christadelphian to riddle the Rev. Sorcerer’s indictment? What child’s play! For who that attended the Bible Class needed to be shown that Mellowes was but an apostate hireling? And yet, the editor bravely promised to repeat the performance, but outside pressure prevented his being gratified. The editor of the Christadelphian has now a golden opportunity of exhibiting the courage of a “true shepherd.” All over the country the sheep are leaving his “fold”—scarcely an ecclesia not affected, and ecclesias he persuaded to “keep out of the trouble” are fast coming in. We are told “bro. C.C. Walker is too dignified to meet any Tom, Dick or Harry.” No one asks him to. Those from whom we should choose a representative are all his equal—some even older in the Truth than he—brethren who have supported him through thick and thin until they saw his “good citizenship” was causing him to sell his young brethren to commit sin by “donning khaki” and “voting” if compelled! Will the Temperance Hall Executive be as equally brave as they were with the Sparkhill vicar, and arrange a face to face between their “shepherd” and one of those they profess to believe are scattering the sheep? No fear of only about “90” of the “1300” turning up to see where the “loose slates” are, especially at cross-examination time, each of the disputants being compelled to categorically answer the questions put.

* * *

The author of An Unjust Balance pitifully pleads of the John Bright Street sympathisers that “they have leisure, energy and money”! Well, if such be the case we thank God for those good gifts—James 1: 17, and from our long, and life-long, experience of those who are with us in this matter, the fold of the unfaithful shepherds will have no peace so long as we think there is a possibility of recovering some wandering and misled sheep. May our Heavenly Father bless them in thus spending, and being spent. —F.G.J.

Are we walking Worthily?

A Sunday Morning Exhortation by Bro. R. Roberts.

A too constant and exclusive dwelling in the circumstances of our present life is certain to disqualify us for viewing it properly and using it rightly in relation to the objects for which we have been separated for Christ by the Gospel. The time and the state we live in are but part of a mighty programme which reaches backwards and forwards in long distances. And if we are not familiar with this programme, we cannot rightly estimate the relation of our individual parts to it, and are, therefore, liable to live after a wrong plan. Of course, the remark applies only to those who have professedly made Christ their portion. As regards others, their lives are lives of vanity, beginning and ending in darkness. From the cradle to the grave, they are without God and have no hope (Eph. 2:12), and cannot be expected to be influenced by any consideration outside the circle of mortal requirements and experiences. But as to those who are Christ's, they neither live for themselves nor die unto themselves. They are separated for a great purpose and a mighty plan, reaching back to historic ages, up to the throne of the Almighty Power, and forward to the aion of blessedness in Abraham. This is the spirit or genius of their calling. But are they equal to it? Do they rise to it? Are they walking worthy of it? Do their minds, and purposes, and principles expand to the height, and breadth, and depth of the calling of God in Christ Jesus?

The upshot will show that in some cases it is so, and in many cases not so; which, of course, will mean that all who are called to this calling will not be chosen. Now about this matter there is no mystery, as to the principle by which the choice will be regulated, or its relation to our own present control. There is no more exact relation between seedtime and harvest than there is between the result to a saint, of the course pursued in this present time, as regards those attainments which will determine his standing before the Lord at his coming. Cause and effect are the universal rule of divine procedure, no more in the operations of Nature than in the causing every man to find according to his ways. There will be nothing arbitrary or capricious in the acceptance of some who profess Christ and the rejection of others. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

Now in the particular matter in question, the appointment of this weekly celebration of the sufferings of Christ touches the root of it. What is the object of this breaking of bread? To bring to remembrance. To bring to remembrance what? The things involved in the symbols. What are these? The answer to this opens out, you see, on all sides, like the spokes of a wheel from the hub. "The sufferings of Christ and the glory to be revealed" are a compendious summary of really most high and mighty matters, which branch out in all directions, and to which the mind requires to be continuously applied to obtain that due degree of familiarity required. In this respect, the result will be in accordance with a man's degree of diligence. If he give but a scant attention, he will have but a small acquaintance and a weak faith. How can it be otherwise? How can a man become acquainted with God, and in actual, practical, earnest love with Christ, and at home with all the divine purposes and ways, who comes but occasionally to the breaking of bread, who reads the Scriptures in a haphazard sort of way, or perhaps not at all, while he is all the while very diligent in his attention to all business concerns and domestic matters? As God has constituted things, it is impossible. The brain takes all its impressions from without, and it can only receive so much— each day a little. It may be compared to a book of blank pages, on which each day writes something on each page. The character of the writing depends upon the holder of the pen. If a man's whole strength is each day spent— from sunrise to the evening shade, in attending to mortal matters, the natural man holds the pen all the time, and a natural man's record is the result. The brain is filled with images of natural perishing life, which profit nothing for the time to come. But let God have the pen some part of the day; let the Word be diligently read, let the soul ascend frequently to God in prayer, let the thoughts rest sometimes on the Promises, let the business of God have some share of the day's counsel and strength, something then is written for God; and this process continued from day to day will fill up a good account. The mind will be in-letted with the ideas of God, and the man brought into a state of increasing ripeness for the calling to which we are called by the Gospel.

The Breaking of Bread is but a central point in this spiritual activity. We shall use it unwisely if we are content with the formality of attending to it. Its object is to keep us alive to every good word and work. The table is a radiating point for those influences that help us to overcome in the battle between the natural and spiritual. Chief among those influences is that "memory" which stands so prominently forward in the original institution. The Gospel is only saving to us "if we keep in memory" what is delivered therein (1 Cor. 15:3). This phrase "keep in memory" points to the principal difficulty and the principal danger which we have to encounter in the race set before us in the Gospel. The things of the natural man require no effort of memory. They are present; they are before our eyes; they appeal to powerful instincts that spontaneously work in our bosoms. Home, friends, family, comfort, property, honour, and the other things that go to make up the circle of the present life, require no memory and no effort at attention. They are with us and in us, and sweet to us as natural men. But the things of Christ are out of the sight of the natural man: they are past and future. We learn of them from the word apostolically delivered eighteen centuries ago, and, prophetically, before then. We know them not otherwise. Consequently it requires an effort to keep them in memory, the more particularly because of the clamour for attention the other things are constantly making. We do not learn of God's matters in the clouds. There is nothing in the sky, or sea, or landscape, or town, or business, or home, or body, or blood, to tell us of them: quite the contrary. We know of them only through the Word preached and read: and as faith cometh by hearing, so faith continueth by the same instrumentality. Consequently, before the things of Christ can become a power in our minds at all able to compete with the things of the natural man, they must be diligently and constantly renewed by

special culture, in reading the Word of God, and prayer, and meeting, and the various other ways in which the memory may be refreshed and the knowledge strengthened and increased. This is the more true, because the things of Christ, in many points, are distasteful to the natural man.

When we achieve the victory, in a constant appliance to the word of Christ, our position is one of surpassing interest, even if of present pain. We realize where we are, what we are about, and what great things are ahead, by the power of which we can reconcile ourselves patiently to present disadvantages, and rightly look on the scene which is passing around us.

We stand on an elevation, so to speak, looking down on the busy world around. We see the crowd of fashion, resplendent in the varied beauties that wealth has generously lavished, cultured in all the superior mannerisms and intelligencies of the natural man, and mutually attentive and loving. It is a pretty picture, albeit we know it is mostly hollow; but the Truth enables us to say, "We can afford to endure this picture. We are not of these people. We cannot be of them, because their gaynesses and their comforts are not mixed with God." We may feel that we should like to share their amenities, their sociabilities, their pleasant company, their good graces; but it is not possible. There is a gulf between us. It is a pity; we feel it; we are sensible of the deprivation to which the Truth subjects us in the isolation it imposes, but we know it is only for a season. This is the day of Sin's sons and daughters. The day of God is at hand, and, with it, such company will be brought to light as will make Fashion's ranks appear meagre and poor. This company is ours, if we consent, like the Head of it, to be, while in the world, not of it.

Then we look on the successful men of business. We behold the spectacle of their prosperity, whether in the full tide of well-managed thriving concerns, netting handsome profits put into the concern or laid securely by in investment; or the affluence of opulent retirement, adding yet house to house, and yet piling the increasing gold. The Truth helps us to say, "Ye have laid up treasure for yourselves, and in a fashion ye are enjoying yourselves, but your life is ignoble; and noble or ignoble, there is a canker in it all; ye cannot keep what ye have; ye must depart; ye must flee as a shadow; and the plenty ye have scraped industriously together, and skilfully fenced from harm, will do nothing for you with Him who has the key of the future, and who will kill or save alive on His own principles only, which are not commercial principles."

On the busy political world, where high honour is reaped and rich prizes secured in the arena of intellectual prowess, we can calmly look with the recollection that it is destined shortly to pass away with a great noise, and the elements thereof to melt with fervent heat; and that the only enduring politics are those of Jesus of Nazareth, who, in his day, submitted to be a stranger and a pilgrim, but who, at his return in power and great glory, will look around for his faithful stewards to share with them the honour of universal empire, to be enjoyed in the unspeakable luxury of an incorruptible body. We can say to the whole throng of bustling aspirants and successful competitors, and established possessors, who, with great airs of self-consequence, divide among themselves the honours and fat things of the present kosmos, "We can wait. You have clutched a shadow. Your world passeth away; the Kingdom of God which will be here in due season endureth for ever. He gives it to childlike believers in His Word. Ye cast His Word behind you. 'Woe unto you that are full now; for ye have received your consolation.'"

Or, we turn and look into the swarming ranks of the Church. Bishops and parsons, sleek and well-favoured, educated to the highest pitch of culture, honoured of all men, secured in their temporalities by the most solid of human guarantees— what an exercise of patience to behold their pride, and their power, and their affluence, and their respectability! But even to these, the Truth enables us to be calm, and in patience to possess our souls. To these it enables us to say, "Your position is desirable in some respects, but we are glad we share it not. A little like the cry of 'sour grapes,' perhaps, but none the less a sober saying; for ye belong to a system accursed of God, and destined to vanish before the whirlwind of His anger in this culminating latter day. You are full now, and laugh now, and are spoken well of now, but it is your destiny to be emptied of your greatness, and filled with weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth."

These consolations are very real where faith is strong enough, through the reading of the word and prayer, to lay hold of them. But, of course, our right to appropriate them depends upon our acceptance of the position of Christ in all other respects. In this evil time, this means the acceptance of the pilgrim's disagreeable part, and the obedience of commandments which are disagreeable to the natural man. If we merely have knowledge of Christ without obedience, we shall find when the time comes that the consolation of Christ does not belong to us. It is well, therefore, to try ourselves in the moments of anticipations. It is well to ask ourselves the question, if we occupy the position entitling us to rejoice in hope of the coming glory. The position is plain; it is not attractive to the flesh; it involves self-denial as to worldly ways and honours. There is, therefore, a temptation to avoid it, or modify it to an extent, interfering with our acceptance. The consolation of Christ is for those who accept the sufferings of Christ; and every man will have his part of this suffering, even in this free country, who courageously and openly acts the part of a true disciple in obeying the commandments and taking part in the affairs of Christ, as existing at the present time in his Truth and his brethren. The rewards of Christ are only for the faithful stewards; and faithful stewardship means the use of ourselves and our substance as the property of Christ and not as our own— a policy of life which interferes with all the ordinary aims and pursuits of men, but which brings with it a great present advantage of peace and joy, secures an inheritance which the wealth of the world could not purchase, and which no rules of human valuation can put a price on, and no glory can compare with. —R. ROBERTS.

“Birmingham Frictions.”

(Continued from page 127).

The effort to compose the dispute by way of compromise failed. It is probable that the Clapham brethren would have been content to have left the matter there. They had decided that they could not righteously withdraw their fellowship from the John Bright Street brethren, and they hoped that in time a settlement of the trouble would come about. It is evident, however, that the Birmingham Arranging Brethren were determined not to leave matters as they were. They issued their pamphlet, Ecclesial Relationships, and this was the turning point.

Hitherto the Clapham brethren had striven to put the best possible construction on the action of Birmingham, but the publication of the above-mentioned pamphlet was the first of a series of events which convinced some who had been prejudiced in favour of the Temperance Hall that there was something radically wrong in Birmingham. The other factors which finally convinced the Clapham brethren that there was corruption in Birmingham were the Temperance Hall answers to the Clapham Questions and the publication of bro. Davis' letter. Much sarcastic and unbrotherly comment has been passed upon the change of action which followed.

Take for instance an incident in which the writer figured. When asked by bro. Newman at the “Cosmo” meeting if any fresh evidence had been received between October 26, 1922 and January, 1923, the answer was given without any hesitation, “There is no fresh evidence—There was no need of any.” The account of this incident in An Unjust Balance is pure fiction. A very vivid imagination has tried to produce the impression that the writer had got himself into a trap. Nothing of the kind. So far as he was concerned, and from the evidence at his disposal, he had for a long time been convinced that false doctrine was being nursed in Birmingham. There were others, however, of the Clapham brethren who had not been so intimately in touch with the intricacies of the affair, who had not yet fully grasped the true significance of the evidence. The issue of Ecclesial Relationships commenced to open their eyes and caused a re-examination of the whole of the facts of the case. The printing of bro. Davis' letter and the Birmingham Answers (to be found at the end of Birmingham Frictions) followed.

These three factors threw a fresh light upon the evidence previously available, and to all reasonable men will be sufficient to account for the action of the Clapham brethren which followed.

They proved that we were not justified in our efforts to smother the evil that existed in the Temperance Hall Ecclesia.

This review of the Clapham brethren's action in this affair will prove to any impartial mind that from the beginning our efforts were sincerely directed towards peace. It was the Birmingham Arranging Brethren's determination to shield wrong doctrine and to unrighteously use their Constitution to disfellowship brethren without a Scriptural reason that made division inevitable.

A great effort is made in Birmingham Frictions to prove that so determined were the Clapham brethren upon division at all costs that we refused what has been described as the "Christ-like proposal" for settlement made by the Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren appearing on page 30 of their pamphlet.

To those who are not conversant with the history of the controversy it might appear that this was a proposal that might righteously have been accepted.

We candidly admit that at first blush it did seem so to us. We do not wish to be unkind, and we hope we shall not ruffle the feelings of Birmingham people if we compare this proposal to some of the articles of manufacture for which it is famous. At a first glance much of the jewellery made in that busy centre looks very much like the real thing, but a close examination reveals the base metal.

So it was with this proposal. It contained no real concession or retraction. There was concealed in it the same refusal to admit they had been unfaithful in dealing with unsound doctrine, and unrighteous in excluding brethren against whom there was no Scriptural charge.

We will not touch upon the claim that a proposal which contained two conditions was unconditional. We credit the reader with sufficient intelligence to deal with that point himself. The gist of the proposal was that Temperance Hall would unconditionally cancel their withdrawals provided the John Bright brethren unconditionally and without reservation withdrew their resignations which preceded the withdrawal and provided Clapham supported the proposal.

Now if the two acts—the resignations and withdrawals—had stood upon the same plane, the proposal would undoubtedly have formed the basis of a settlement. But let us examine them. Why did the John Bright Street brethren resign? Was it a Scriptural and constitutional act? Undoubtedly. False doctrine had been taught. The Arranging Brethren were asked either to get the false teaching retracted or failing this to deal with the offenders. They failed in their duty and so the John Bright Street brethren in the exercise of their undoubted Scriptural and constitutional right stepped aside. At any time they would have returned had they received the assurances to which they were entitled.

Will any dare to affirm that the action of the Arranging Brethren in disfellowshipping John Bright Street was either Scriptural or constitutional? There is no Scriptural charge against John Bright Street. We have the official ground—given to us on page 50 Birmingham Frictions: "Because they had already disfellowshipped us and declined to comply with the ecclesial resolution." The first part of this charge is a perversion of the facts. As we have shown, they had merely exercised their right to step aside by virtue of the Constitution, Rule 32.

The second charge can only be sustained by a perversion of Rule 5. Who will have the effrontery to affirm that when false teaching is involved we must bow to the will of the majority. Rule No. 5 merely applies to "order" and "arrangements" not to questions of doctrine.

We therefore conclude that the Arranging Brethren had no right to demand the canceling of the John Bright Street resignations as a matter of bargain or barter. Their duty, having committed an unscriptural and unconstitutional act was to annul it without conditions. Had they done so, then indeed the way to peace would have opened up. We pleaded with them to go a step further, but without avail. Had they yielded to our importunities how differently events might have run. But no: they were

implacable. John Bright Street must unconditionally and without reservation withdraw their resignation.

On reflection we found we could not righteously recommend such a course. The John Bright Street brethren had repeatedly offered to cancel their resignation upon receiving satisfactory assurances as to the doctrinal soundness of certain brethren. They had stepped aside in a Scriptural and constitutional manner, and they could not possibly have assented to a proposal which in effect branded that act as one worthy of the extreme penalty of withdrawal. Therefore in all essentials the proposal of the Arranging Brethren maintained their original unrighteous position.

Here is one other wrong impression which the Arranging Brethren have sought to convey. It is that the Clapham brethren in their action have acted out of harmony with the Birmingham constitution in so far as it relates to inter-ecclesial relationship. The evidence is all to the contrary. We have shown that we respected long-established practice in our dealings with the Temperance Hall. A careful reading of Ecclesial Relationships will reveal that the Arranging Brethren refused to admit that the London Brethren had any claim to an investigation under Rules 34 and 35. They contend that these rules only apply to a case of removal. Although it may be granted that they were framed to meet cases of removal, we do not admit that they are not applicable to the case under consideration for this reason.

As soon as the Temperance Hall meeting withdrew from John Bright Street it ceased to become a domestic concern. According to the Birmingham Constitution, it was required that other ecclesias should respect their decision. Now if the Arranging Brethren's contention be admitted, no ecclesia has any right to question their decisions, however unrighteous they may be, and they are even forbidden the right to investigate unless a member of the John Bright Street meeting should remove to a town outside Birmingham. On the face of it such a contention is contrary to reason. The Arranging Brethren are very ready to charge London with "Papal pretensions," but surely their interpretation of the constitution has a strong ex cathedra air about it. It is simply this; that however unrighteous their decrees may be and however unreasonable their reading of the constitution, every other ecclesia must bow the knee. This was never the intention of the one who framed Rule 34, which expressly states that if investigation be refused by an ecclesia the matter in question shall be investigated without them.

To acquiesce in the Arranging Brethren's interpretation of their Constitution would be to forfeit that very ecclesial independence of which they are so jealous. The Clapham Ecclesia claim the right to exercise their own judgment in affairs which involve fellowship with other ecclesias, and they recognise that every other ecclesia has the same right. This is the very essence of ecclesial independence. To in any way acknowledge that the decrees of a particular ecclesia are infallible and must be obeyed on pain of excommunication is a very long step toward Ecclesia Ascendancy. It is true that the exercise of this right of independent judgment has led to disturbed conditions in the brotherhood, but it is not the cause of the disturbance. The cause is the unrighteousness in the Birmingham Temperance Hall, and if other ecclesias in the exercise of their undoubted right and duty contend with the evil, naturally there is trouble and dissension. Let the evil thing be purged and peace will ensue.

And now a final word. The Clapham brethren in their withdrawal from the Temperance Hall undertook a grave responsibility. No one is more conscious of that fact than themselves. But would it not have been equally as grave if they, after their investigation and finding no true Scriptural charge against the John Bright Street brethren had decided to withhold their fellowship. This, in effect, is what the Arranging Brethren's interpretation of their Constitution requires. Again, assuming that upon investigation we had found that the John Bright Street brethren's charges were untrue, and that the Temperance Hall must be acquitted, what should we have done? Could we have righteously decided to fellowship both? I trow not. Should we not have felt it our duty to refuse the fellowship of the guilty ecclesia, and fellowship only the acquitted. Undoubtedly. Why, then, allow our sense of justice and right to be blinded by mere numbers and prestige. Let us judge righteously and impartially. If we are ready to withdraw from the few when they condone false doctrine and unrighteously exclude brethren

from fellowship, why should we quail in our duty if it requires us to apply the same stern law to a numerous and influential Ecclesia? —J. M. EVANS.

A Bible Class Address.

Lessons from the words of Christ in Luke 12: 22-31.

Were we submitted to a cross-examination as to our conception of the daily conduct and attitude of mind which should be manifested by a true disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, I do not know of any better reply than a recital of the words of the Master himself, to be found respectively in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of Matthew, and in the twelfth chapter of Luke—part of which we have now to consider for a few minutes.

In those chapters of Matthew's gospel which I have mentioned, we have what is called "The Sermon on the Mount," containing, as we know, a very comprehensive lesson as to our behaviour towards those with whom we have to mingle, both inside and outside the brotherhood. Christ there clearly defines our relative position in the society of mankind; but in the discourse of Christ which we are now considering his words come nearer home and concern particularly the individual as an individual, and regardless of his social standing. And, in both these discourses, the words of Christ contain lessons which apply to every brother and sister in every age. In the case of the present subject in particular, it would seem, so far as we can tell, that the application of the lesson is more appropriate and necessary today than it was at the time of its utterance.

It has been said that there are two kinds of philosophy, the true and the false. There is the false philosophy of the worldly man who accepts everything as inevitable, and who achieves high reputation—if not during his lifetime, then subsequently—for his indifference to circumstances either of ease and affluence or of poverty and hardship. These so-called philosophers will sometimes incur a considerable amount of privation and self-denial in the pursuit of the ideals which they profess, but if we probe a little below the surface it is not long before we find the cankerous growth at the root. The underlying motives prove to be altogether unworthy, judged by divine standards; man is the exalted being and God is left altogether out of account.

On the other hand, in the words of Christ which we are considering, we have the true philosophy, a state of mind in tune with its Maker. Not a callous indifference to our circumstances, nor a sullen fortitude in the face of difficulties. These words are, in fact, an elaboration of that commandment which Christ urged as the first of all commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." All other things are subservient to this in the mind of Christ, but we find in our daily experience that the divine order of things is entirely reversed. The world's dictum is, "Attend to your business, attend to your homes, attend to your pleasures and recreations, fulfil your duties as a citizen;" and then, if you are able to do all these things so efficiently as to have any time left over, you can, if you feel so inclined, go in for a little piety—provided always that it is done in a genteel manner and with due regard for the susceptibilities of one's neighbours.

Fortunately, however, we have very clear evidence, both in the Word of Truth and in our own experiences, that we are under no obligation to the world, and we note particularly that Christ, in uttering these words, addressed himself specifically to his disciples.

As we study these gospels we find that Christ fitted his remarks to his audience, or to that particular section of his listeners whom he wanted to teach or rebuke. Sometimes his words were exclusive to those who did not accept his authority or teaching and we remember what stinging words of censure he used on certain occasions. At other times he addressed individuals amongst those of his followers who came to him for advice, notably in the case of the rich young man—an incident which has recently been so cunningly misapplied by some who certainly know better but have not courage to

confess it. On the present occasion we see that, whoever else may have been in the audience, Christ's remarks were confined to his disciples as a body, and we therefore know that we not only can but must apply them to ourselves if we are to justify our position as his brethren.

These words of Christ are so entrancing that we always find pleasure in reading them and in hearing them read. The figures employed are so appropriate, and the language with which the ideas are clothed is so simple and yet so majestic as to be almost poetical. But Christ did not deliver these lessons merely as word-pictures to be framed and hung on the bedroom wall. *

If any practical application of these words of Christ is attempted it is generally in justification of license, or at any rate of improvidence and laziness, rather than in the sense in which the words were intended; and even in our own cases, with all the best of intentions, I am sure we all have the utmost difficulty in disengaging ourselves sufficiently from the entanglements of our earthly cares to exhibit the faith and patience which Christ enjoins.

“Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on.”

What a reversal of the present-day order of things, and what havoc would be wrought if these precepts were applied wholesale and in a strictly literal manner. It is difficult to name two things which more completely dominate the masses today than those of eating and drinking, and of bodily adornment. More business deals are done over the luncheon table than in any other way, and there is hardly a contract of any importance which is not saturated (the world says “cemented”) in wine or spirits; while as for the domestic and social spheres, these pay a homage amounting almost to reverence at the shrine of Dame Fashion. We need not worry very much about that, because it is to us a manifest token that the sands of time, so far as gentile dominion is concerned, have almost run out, for we know that, As it was in the days of Noah, so also shall it be in the day of Christ's return. And we remember, in any case, that these words were addressed to his disciples and were not for world-wide application.

But, while wisely applying these rules of conduct to ourselves, we must be watchful as to how we apply them. Christ did not teach entire indifference to our bodily needs or appearance, and his injunctions to “Take no thought” did not mean that we were to be thought-less. Suitable bodily nourishment, clothing, and suchlike things are necessary, and we have to take our part in providing them. That Christ recognised this is evident, for he says, “The Father knoweth that we have NEED of these things.” Obviously the lesson is that these things must take their relative place in our thoughts, that ALL temporal considerations are to be absolutely subservient to our first duty of seeking the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.

We have a similar lesson in the words of the Psalmist who, speaking of the wicked, says, “God is not in all his thoughts.” He does not mean by that that the righteous are to exclude all other thoughts but thoughts of God Himself—that would be impossible of achievement. What is meant is that God must have the first place in all our thoughts. All our words and actions are preceded by thoughts, and if all our thoughts are blended with a remembrance of God and our relative position as subjects of His creation and vessels of His mercy, our words and deeds will be in harmony with His will.

* We all know the little weakness of seaside landladies and hotel keepers in this respect. When you have been sleeping for a fortnight with “The Lord loveth a cheerful giver” suspended over your pillow, one cannot but accept the unknown extras on the bill without demur—and that is about all the use the world has for Biblical texts.

P. L. HONE.

Croydon.

Clerical Tactics.

More than fifty years ago, bro. Roberts wrote: —

“The only safety for those who oppose us, lies in avoiding controversy, keeping quiet, and leaving us alone. The leaders of surrounding darkness, so far as they have come into collision with us, know this, and act upon it; yet we prosper and increase. The Word of God is on our side: we are an outgrowth of that Word; and everyone who looks into that Word, understanding and believing it, will be of us.”

Those sentiments are as true today as when bro. Roberts penned them, for the present Editor of the Christadelphian and his colleagues are so conscious of the evidence concerning their declension from First Principles, that they are doing their utmost to keep the brotherhood in the dark, realizing, to use the words of bro. Roberts—“their only safety lies in avoiding controversies, keeping quiet, and leaving us alone.”

Hopeful that the policy of suppression would accomplish the end in view, he endeavoured to keep the Temperance Hall scandal out of the pages of his magazine, declaring the matter to be “finally closed!” His colleagues realizing that the matter was not closed, issued the 52-page Final Statement! Still the scandal spread and the friction increased. Neither the Editor or his Birmingham colleagues, however, could well issue anything further in view of their final statements, so they requisitioned An Unjust Balance. But the author thereof was equally foolish by issuing with his pamphlet a 4-page leaflet entitled A Final Word. Knowing how true were the words of bro. Roberts, first above quoted, the author of An Unjust Balance adopted the tactics of the clergy, and counselled the brotherhood thus:

—“You who—so far have happily kept out of this turmoil, our advice is—Keep out! . . . If you would value ecclesial harmony, security and peace, shun the trouble as you would shun the plague.”

Sheer clericalism.

No Christadelphian with a backbone ever talks like that. It is just what Mr. Campbell said when Dr. Thomas wielded the Sword of the Spirit. It was what David King said when Bro. Roberts upset the harmony of the so-called Church of Christ in Birmingham. And it is just what is advised as bro. Roberts remarked by “all pretenders, —whether a mitred Pontiff or a village miracle-monger; an imperial archbishop or a Methodist-ranter; a sanctimonious ‘Plymouth’ or an insipid Campbellite.”

These “hush-tactics,” counselled from Birmingham head-quarters, will not avail one little bit. They were counselled to the Rhondda Valley brethren, some of whom asked us to meet the Birmingham representatives face to face, but we did not get the opportunity, the meeting being held behind closed doors a day before the one appointed, and closing with an anathema on anyone daring to listen to us. (The three left the Rhondda the same day!) In Birmingham, when and where the Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren were given the opportunity to come and “expose” us, not one of them put in an appearance, although the open meeting was arranged for a day and an hour when a dozen of them were free! In Oldham, the centre of a network of Lancashire and Yorkshire ecclesias, where we did expect to find “grit,” aye, even there the “warriors” were conspicuous by their absence; for although hundreds of personal invitations were sent out, and although at least a dozen of the surrounding ecclesias were represented, not one of the professed “shepherds” put in an appearance—“shepherds who careth not for the sheep,” who call us wolves, and yet when they hear us coming “they leave the sheep and fleeth!”

The “shepherds” on the previous Sunday issued warnings on the lines of An Unjust Balance. In some cases they even arranged little family parties to keep certain ones away from the meeting. The same tactics were resorted to at Bexley Heath, where certain Temperance Hall partisans decreed that brethren F.W. Turner and another be invited to appear and present the case for Birmingham. Naturally,

the other side demanded that they also be represented by—say bro. W.H. Trapp and another, and two were chosen and invited for the agreed date. The date was changed by the Temperance Hall partisans—and still again changed, and then abandoned, for it appeared that our brethren could and would face the other delegates at any time. The outcome was the non-shaded light still shines in the Cooperative Hall, Bexley Heath.

Those who do attend these open meetings, show themselves to be something better than blind followers of the blind; they realise their individual responsibility; they know that they and not their leaders will have to answer to the Judge when final accounts are rendered.

Birmingham knows, as bro. Roberts said in a similar situation, that, “Other Societies can be argued out of the field; whereas the effect of argumentative attack upon us is, in every case, to strengthen our cause and increase our numbers;” that is with those who are God-fearing, and not men-pleasing; for in this Birmingham scandal, our fight is with those who want to alter the divine gauge to suit human works. —(F.G.J.)

Birmingham Temperance Hall Manifesto.

A SERIOUS ISSUE.

Said one of the Birmingham Temperance Hall Arranging Brethren recently, “It is time these ecclesias were brought to heel that have said they will fellowship both sides in Birmingham.” In this spirit the Birmingham Ecclesia have sent out a letter to all Ecclesias, or nearly all, this month.

There is not a word in this letter about upholding the Faith, or withdrawing from those who hold false doctrine. No; it is a bald, plainly-worded demand that all ecclesias shall submit to Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia and not in any way question its decisions. If brethren are withdrawn from by Birmingham Ecclesia for breaking, or alleged breaking, of its Constitution, everybody must quietly submit. On the other hand, if while withdrawing in great haste from those who appear to question their rules, or are so accused, the Birmingham Ecclesia decides to retain in fellowship those all over the world who attach themselves to false doctrine, no one must in any way question their position. Finally, the manifesto calls loudly for immediate severance from the John Bright Street brethren with whom no doctrinal error is found, and for continued fellowship with those who hold false doctrine. The ecclesias are given till July 31st to submit to the latter-day Papacy in Birmingham.

What will such meetings as North London, Ealing, and Brixton do now? All these meetings, and many others in the country, passed resolutions to give fellowship to both Temperance Hall and John Bright Street in Birmingham.

They will now have to give up “neutrality” and say which they side with. We pray that God may guide and lead all such meetings to do the right fearlessly.

Let us fear our God, and not man. —G.H.D.

Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

The Christadelphian records with pleasure the fact of certain of the Temperance Hall brethren and sisters being united in marriage, but it tells half the truth—shame forbids it telling the other half which is told by the Fraternal Visitor, with which the Christadelphian will have no dealings (in the open!). The half of the truth told by the Fraternal Visitor is that those Temperance Hall Christadelphians applied to the Fraternal Visitor community to allow them to go to the Suffolk Street Hall and have their marriage religiously solemnized by members of the Suffolk Street folk—known

generally as the “Partial Inspirationists.” What a wicked farce! What a spectacle for the angels! The Temperance Hall leaders (!) having fellowship with the Suffolk Street leaders by having their marriages religiously solemnized, with prayers, praises and exhortations, by men they deem utterly unworthy to sit down with at the same “Table” on Sunday mornings. And the only excuse offered by bro. C.C. Walker is that any decided objection would mean “a split!”

And this is the Ecclesia and this is their chief Presiding Brother who commands all ecclesias to fall down and worship its decrees by 31st July under penalty of anathema!

What a wicked farce! —F.G.J.

Munition Making.

An estimable brother in the United States, has written us letters advocating excluding munition-makers from fellowship. His last letter which embodies the pith and marrow of all previous ones we now reproduce word for word, simply dividing it in order to deal with his arguments and questions as we proceed.

The words following “A” are our correspondent’s, while our rejoinders and answers will be prefaced with “B.”

A (1)—“You state in the December Berean Christadelphian, in reply to W.J.S., ‘To our mind the work (munition-making) is so repulsive, we wish we could find a “Thus saith the Lord” prohibiting it, but until we can we hesitate to make it a matter of fellowship.’ What then is behind the repulsiveness?”

B (1)—The fact that our neighbours, not being sufficiently enlightened to discriminate truth and sentiment—between what is lawful and what is expedient—are apt to judge by appearances, and speak reproachfully of what they do not understand.

A (2)—“Are we to believe that what the Scriptures infer is less binding than that which is plainly taught!”

B (2)—Are you correct in using the word “infer”? Do you not mean “imply”? or, rather do you not mean that you “infer” what is not plainly taught? If that is what you mean, then we affirm emphatically that whereas what is “plainly taught” in the Scriptures is binding as a First Principle of Fellowship; that which we simply infer is a matter for suspended judgment and on which we must allow liberty of conscience both for ourselves and for them from whom we differ. For instance—smoking and novel-reading, each to our mind un-Christlike. Dare we withdraw from a brother because perchance he has a smoke or reads a novel?

A (3)—“Are we to believe that reasoning out of the Scriptures is not as seasonable now as when Apollos proved that Jesus was the Christ? or when Christ taught the Resurrection?”

B (3)—Yes; just as seasonable. But to reason out of the Scriptures is different to reasoning outside the Scriptures. Apollos proved from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ, and so did Christ the doctrine of the Resurrection. Surely you do not contend we can only prove those doctrines by inference, or that the Scriptures only teach them by implication. Coming to munition-making, where are we told in the Scriptures, a brother should be cast out of fellowship for manufacturing glycerine, or, making the wheel of a gun-carriage? or for growing potatoes to feed the soldiers? Where is the Scripture forbidding such work, for they are all munitions of war?

A (4)—“But, where is the passage of Scripture to prove that ‘non-Combatant service in the Army’ is wrong?”

B (4)—That question makes us rub our eyes in amazement, that any Christadelphian should ask such after what has been re-printed from the writings of Dr. Thomas on the “Devil’s Armies.” True, his reputed successor, the present editor of the Christadelphian does not like the Doctor’s method of calling “ a spade a spade,” and thinks his predecessor “no model” in that respect, but such a critic has showed, by his article on “Conscience” (Christadelphian, 1916), that he is an advisor to be shunned in the time of trial.

A (5)—“But where is the passage of Scripture to prove that non-combatant service in the Army is wrong?”

B (5)—Brother: open your eyes—look again at those three words, “in the Army;” and if you do not know what they stand for, study any Army Manual and then read what Paul says about being “entangled” (2 Timothy 2: 4). True the present editor of the Christadelphian pleads that during the late war the Government made us all soldiers by Act of Parliament! Oh, what an ungodly suggestion. What must the Lord think? He who, “having all power,” kept His faithful brethren “outside the Army,” those faithful ones who refused to don the Devil’s uniform and engage in “non-combatant service.”

A (6)—“One of the basic commandments is ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ yet the understanding of the application of this law was not left to chance, but was enlightened by the judgments upon the basic laws which Moses gave (Exodus 20: 1).”

B (6)—Quite so.

A (7)—“These judgments are explicit, and by observing them we are able to study the divine standard of righteousness, so that we need not lean upon our own understanding.”

B (7)—Yes; quite so.

A (8)—“The man who owned an ox which gored was responsible for the death of his neighbour.”

B (8)—True; under certain circumstances (Exodus 21: 28-29).

A (9)—“Was the untied ox a less potential evil than the 12-inch shell?”

B (9)—There you are getting off the track. Cannot you see the difference between a man who makes parts of a 12-inch shell, and the “powers that be” controlling munitions of war? As much difference as between the owner of the ox, and the farm labourer who cuts the grass on which the ox feeds. According to you the farm labourer is equally responsible with the owner of the ox.

A (10)—“Was the untied ox a less potential evil than the 12-inch shell?”

B (10)—Certainly: for the former could do fatal mischief whereas the shell is harmless until set in motion by a servant of the great fourth beast. But, as we have seen, the cases are not parallel.

A (11)—“Was the sin of omission of Deuteronomy 22: 8 a greater sin than the sin of commission of 1914-18?”

B (11)—You are simply begging the question in terming the latter a “sin.” You do wrong in anticipating the Lord’s verdict.

A (12)—“I mean the sin by Israelites who were as much out of harmony with the signs of the times as the Judaizing brethren, in Paul’s day, “that they were out of season with the divine Word, and obeyed and applied a commandment given to the Gentiles to themselves (Joel 3: 9-10)?”

B (12)—In no way does that bear on the question we are discussing.

A (13)—“We doubt not that many of such brethren will again be found out of season, and will be beating their plough-shares into swords just at the time when the Lord intends to show that the Gentiles trust in reeking tubs and iron chard is as vain as other Gentile notions (Psalm 46: 8, 10).”

B (13)—See our previous rejoinder.

(To be continued.)

Neutrality.

By bro. A. T. JANNAWAY.

Neutrality, in regard to a definitely revealed and important Bible truth, is an attitude which a faithful brother will not countenance for a single moment. How could he, resting as he does under the sacred obligation of earnestly contending, as did Paul, for the whole counsel of God (Acts 22: 27; 2 Timothy 2: 2; Philippians 3: 17; 4: 9; Jude 3)? Neutrality is not consistent with dutiful stewardship. It savours of supineness, laxity, cowardice. God’s witnesses must show themselves fearless and outspoken advocates of whatever He has been pleased to reveal—yes, and fighters, too, when the Truth is in jeopardy. But why this talk of neutrality? Is it because some cannot make up their minds in regard to a particular item of the faith? This is not a justifiable reason for brethren who are enlightened to gag their own mouths. Is it because a certain few think that the doctrine preached has not been distinctly revealed? That is not a sufficient reason for silence on the part of brethren who know to the contrary. The class of doubter who advances the cry of “Be neutral” has ever existed, and been the cause of worry to the brethren and clog to the dissemination of the Truth. “Not revealed” is a cry that must be passed by unheeded by those who have eyes to see, and are determined that so far as they are concerned, the Truth shall flourish, and not die. But there is oft times much that is fallacious about the plea for neutrality. It is often raised as a treacherous white flag to deceive the side that is making headway. It comes frequently from those who have very pronounced views on the side of error—from men who cannot bear to hear the Truth without a vigorous protest against it, and who cannot refrain from sowing the seeds of heresy when the opportunity occurs. No, neutrality is neither Scriptural nor practicable. God asks men to write and labour on the basis of belief and conviction, not enlightenment and doubt. Let us keep to the divine arrangement, and we shall earn the approval of our Master.

The Next War.

“Earl of Ypres Tells Boys and Girls to Prepare.”

“‘Prepare you, ye boys and girls, for do not think there will not be any more war, because there will,’ said the Earl of Ypres yesterday when addressing the children at Deal Central Schools on the lessons of Empire Day.

“‘The millennium has not yet been reached,’ he continued. ‘Although you are only children now, when the next war does come—and come it will—you will be called upon to take your part. Remember the teaching and training you are receiving today. Remember the very fine example set you by the men and women of the Empire.’”

This is an extract from The Daily News for May 24th, 1924.

One brother wrote us the other day to ask us if we thought a Labour Government would be merciful to conscientious objectors if a war broke out under its regime. We do not think it would. A recent happening will illustrate the position taken up by the present Minister of War, Mr. Stephen Walsh, who was but recently a mill-hand.

For years the Boys' Brigade has been training boys and youths under the aegis of the Episcopal Church in habits of temperance and morality with an imitation of Army discipline and drill. It has also been the custom to get the District Commanding Officers of the British Army to come along and make the Annual Inspection in all districts. At Brighton this Annual Inspection has always been carried out by the District Commandant. Negotiations, however, have been recently opened up by the War Office with a view to making the Boys' Brigade into a preparatory military organization connected up with, and in part controlled by, the War Office. The Boys' Brigade have this month declared against this, and emphasised the fact that militarism or training in the use of arms is not part of the object and aim of the Boys' Brigade.

As a result Colonel Logan, although all the arrangements were made and bills printed, at the very last moment under the direction of the War Office, cancelled his appointment to carry out the Inspection. The War Office refuses to countenance the Boys' Brigade unless it submits to the military yoke, or to help it in any way.

We submit that "there is no help in man," and that "Labour" like "Liberalism" and "Toryism" is military and anti-Christian at heart. This, therefore, is not the time to play with the question of absolute separation in the spirit of some who trouble us today. —G.H.D.

Blind Incompetency.

Imagine a surgeon providing the best of medicine, and yet paying as little attention as possible to the deadly bacteria hovering around ready to undo his good work!

Imagine a father instructing his boys, and yet paying as little attention as possible to the evil influences of naughty companions!

Imagine a mother feeding her baby with the purest of milk, and yet paying as little attention as possible to the flies hovering around the little one!

We all know what the results would be: patients who never got well; boys who never come into the truth; babies who never thrive.

Now, imagine the Christadelphian editor who inculcates paying "as little attention as possible to the passing heresies and crotchets which becloud the Truth" (Christadelphian, 1924, p. 124). Bro. Lake was not a bit too vigorous when he warned of "a second Ashcroft."

What a contrast to the author of Eureka and the author of Christendom Astray and The Trial! We cannot imagine either of those two soldiers of Christ paying "as little attention as possible to passing heresies and crotchets which becloud the Truth."

It becomes clearer and clearer as to why, after bro. Roberts' death, bro. Walker mutilated the title page of the Christadelphian in removing its "opposition" to the Apostasy.

Answers to Correspondence.

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

STRANGERS AT THE BREAKING OF BREAD.

S.G.H.—On the above matter, Dr. Thomas wrote: “You know what our practice is in New York City. We assemble every first day of the week to break bread. Very few if any of the outside barbarians attend the meetings. Not because we should not be glad to see them on the occasion, but because they do not take sufficient interest in the memorialisation of a redemption they fail to appreciate. When any strangers drop in we take it as an indication that an interest is arising in their minds which we are glad to see, and would be careful to do nothing in word or deed to discourage.”

SEX IN THE KINGDOM.

I.O.—Jesus says, “In the Resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage.” This so far answers the question as to show that the present uses and relations of sex will be abolished. The other part of the answer follows by inference. If marriage is to be abolished, we may fairly conclude that sex in which marriage originates, will be obliterated also; but whether this will involve the assimilation of woman to man in all respects is one of the questions that cannot be answered. Our present mood would incline us to believe that God will provide some other basis on which woman may still continue to be a trustful and dependent helpmeet and companion to man, but inclinations are nothing to the purpose. We can only speculate; and speculation is worth as much on one side as the other. It is one of the points in which we must console ourselves with the reflection that “What we know not now, we shall know hereafter.”

NOT ABLE TO KILL THE SOUL.

R.P.—In reply to what is the meaning of Christ’s words—“Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul” (or life), we say there is a life in relation to those who are Christ’s, which cannot be touched by any man, however violently they may treat the body, and the poor, mortal life belonging to it. This life Paul says, “is hid with Christ in God.” “Christ,” he says, “is our life; and when he shall appear, then shall we appear with him in glory.” He is the “building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,” our house which is (to come) from heaven—on being clothed with which our mortality is swallowed up of life. This “life” is the “treasure in the heavens which faileth not,” spoken of by Jesus, and said by Peter to be “reserved in heaven.” Now when men kill the saints, they only terminate their mortal existence; they do not touch their real life which has its foundations in their connection with Christ in the heavens. This, Christ has in his keeping, and specially takes it into his keeping at their death. “Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of all his saints.” Their lives in the sense of future purpose then go into his hands in a special manner. Having been faithful unto death, he takes special notice, and prepares a crown of life to be given at that day (2 Timothy 4: 8). Therefore we are not to fear those who can only demolish our corruptible body, and cannot do anything to prevent resurrection. Who are we to fear? Him who hath power to DESTROY BOTH BODY AND SOUL (life) in hell (the anti-typical judgment fires of Gehenna, which will burn up the proud and all that do wickedly, leaving them neither root nor branch, but utterly destroying them, from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power). We are to fear God who has the power to utterly annihilate from the universe, and who will use this power on all such as are unworthy; but we are not to fear man, who can, at best, only hasten the dissolution to which we are Adamicly liable.

THE COMINGS OF CHRIST.

D.S.R. —Respecting the statement in Eureka (Volume1, page 118), that John “tarried till the Lord came,” the Doctor makes plain his views in the Herald for 1851, pp. 145-149. The article is too long for our pages, but, a summary thereof has been given in the Christadelphian for 1875, p.340. It reads thus: “There are three Comings but only two Appearings. John the Baptiser preached Christ’s Coming (Acts 13: 24), which was the first. Jesus declared of himself that he would come before all the Apostles should have preached in all the cities of Israel, which coming was the second. And, lastly, the Apostles preached his coming to subdue all things to himself, to raise the dead, and to reign over the earth, which is the third. The third Coming will be a second Appearing; not, however, in humility and suffering, but in exaltation, with power and great glory. At the second coming there was no appearing at all.”

Immortality after Judgment.

Yes, I have ever taught resurrection first, and judgment afterwards. Saints are raised to judgment before judgment is committed to them. If there were only one class of saints, and that class consisting of the righteous only—that is, who only walk in the Truth or Spirit, there might be some reason in and for the issuing from Sheol, Hades, or the invisible state of things, incorruptible. But there were in the days of the Apostles, and there have been in all ages and generations since, and will be until Christ comes, two classes of saints—the just and the unjust. The just who contend earnestly for the Faith once for all delivered to the saints, and hold fast their confidence, firm and unshaken to the end, and are always found where the Truth is, sharing with it whatever good or evil may befall; and the unjust, who, though “washed hogs,” return to their wallowing in the mire. These “handle the Word of God deceitfully.” They teach for doctrine the commandment of men; they make void the Word of God by their insane and foolish traditions or crotchets. “They discuss everything and settle nothing;” they speak evil of those things they do not understand; but what they understand naturally, or as natural men, such as vain philosophy and science falsely so called, about which they are always twaddling and trying to harmonise with revelation the natural motions of sins, and emotions of the flesh; in these things they corrupt themselves: these are spots in the feasts of the saints, clouds without water, carried about of winds; they beguile unstable souls, to whom they promise liberty, while they are themselves the slaves to corruption. “Better,” says Peter, “for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.” These are they who “sow to the flesh,” while the saints of the first class are they “who sow to the Spirit.” Now Paul says “whatsoever a man, or saint, soweth, that shall he also reap.” But when shall he reap what in his saintship he sows? A child, such as Timothy was once, would easily answer this question. But now, “grave and reverend signors,” and those who ape them in their chirurgical substratum of ecclesiasticism, know not how scripturally to answer the question. They affirm traditions that nullify the Truth, some affirming that he reaps as soon as he dies; others that he reaps when he comes out of the grave, incorruptible and immortal. The former affirm that it is an immortal soul that reaps at death: the latter, that it is an immortal body at the resurrection. Will they tell a simple enquirer how an incorruptible soul or body at death or resurrection, in dying or rising, can “reap corruption of the flesh,” and be subject to “second death?” That which is incorruptible, cannot reap corruption from any source, within or without. Nor can it be said that the reaping of corruption pertains to the present life. This would nullify and destroy the Apostle’s argument, and be to subject both classes of saints to a common punishment. This state of existence is the sowing-time, the resurrection is the springing-time. Paul must be construed in harmony with himself. Paul pointed the Christadelphians in Thessalonica to the Lord’s presence, as the time when and place where he would have joy or sorrow on their account. No; reason teaches (and Paul had much to do with reason and reasoning), that for saints who have been sowing to the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, to reap corruption of the flesh, in the presence of the Lord at His coming, that flesh must come out of the ground flesh, capable of corrupting, which incorruptible flesh cannot. When corruption and mortality put on incorruptibility, bodily appearance is not necessarily affected.

Incorruptibility is a matter of essential being. An incorruptible being, endued with life, can diversify its appearance—can become luminous, or draw in its light and appear as ordinary beings. It can affect others by divine power, for it is divine, and its power divine. When Christ returns, and has His first interview with the elders of Israel, He will, doubtless draw Himself in, which is opposed to what is indicated by the phrase letting Himself out. During the forty days with the Apostles, He drew in; so when He comes to revise His suspended work in the midst of the years—in the forty years' epoch of the Second Exodus—He will draw in: else how shall one discern the wounds with which He was wounded, in the house of His friends? For to let Himself out would so dazzle all observers, as totally to obscure all sight of His wound-scars (Ambassador, 5, 129). —DR. JOHN THOMAS.

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.

ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE. —The brethren and sisters whose names appear beneath have withdrawn from the Birmingham (T.H.) fellowship, as they believe the stand taken by the Clapham and allied ecclesias to be a right and just one. This means our severance from the Ashton meeting, whose Arranging Brethren had definitely decided for the Birmingham (T.H.) ecclesia. For the present we shall break bread "from house to house," and shall welcome at the table any brethren and sisters who may be in the neighbourhood and who endorse our position. We accept whole-heartedly and without reservation the Birmingham (Amended) Statement of Faith. Our prayer is that in these "perilous times" when drift and declension are so apparent, we may receive strength to remain a separated people, and so gain the Master's approval at his appearing. Particulars of meetings from J.H. Mellor, 27 Newmarket Road, Waterloo, Ashton-under-Lyne. Bro. and sis. Wm. Ryder; bro. and sis. H. Browne; bro. and sis. Mellor.

BACUP. —I am writing to say that myself and four sisters have withdrawn our fellowship from the Heywood Ecclesia. I enclose the copy of withdrawal we sent to the Ecclesia. I may say that three of us are twelve miles from Heywood Meeting and the other two sisters live in Bury which is twelve miles from us. However, we shall try to meet as often as we can. —J. M. HEYWORTH, 34 Lee Road, Bacup, nr. Manchester.

BIRMINGHAM (John Bright Street Ecclesia)—Bristol Street Council Schools. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11; Lecture, 6.30 Thursdays: Bible Class, 8. We are continuing in our warfare against error, and against those who would "tamper with the gauge." We are happy to announce that bro. John Phipps (of Shirley) and bro. Robinson (formerly of Leicester Ecclesia) have decided to meet with us. We have also been encouraged and cheered by the visits and help of brethren A.E. Feltham (Leamington), W. Southall (West Bromwich), and sisters E. and P. Corder (Wilton Terrace, Southsea). —A. H. BROUGHTON, Asst. Rec. Bro.

BIRMINGHAM (Edmund St. Ecclesia). —Shakespeare Rooms. Lecture, 3 p.m.; Breaking of Bread, 4.45 to 5.30 p.m. It is with pleasure we have to report that we are continuing at the above address to carry on the work of God, and have had the help of brethren Southall and Phipps. Will you please insert the letter below which will explain why we have withdrawn from bro. Gilbert Price, but the Truth must be maintained pure even at the cost of separation. Copy of letter sent. —"Owing to bro G. Price having returned to the fellowship of the Temp. Hall Ecclesia and by so doing knowingly endorsed their unscriptural and heretical doctrine of fellowship by majority votes, we can have no fellowship with him unless and until he rectifies his position." —J. E. WEETMAN, Rec. Bro., 204 Burbury St., Lozells, Birmingham.

BLACKHEATH (Staffs.).—Ross Assembly Hall. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m.; Lecture, 6.30 p.m.; Bible Class, 8 p.m. 20 West Street. Since last report we have lost by removal to Shatterford, sis. Elsie Pigott. We commend her to the faithful ones there, and to a close study of the Word. April 27th brought us the company of bro. and sis. Cheffins, of Sutton Coldfield, also sis. Emmaretta, and Phoebe Corder of the Wilton Terrace, Southsea, Portsmouth Ecclesia. We gave them a cordial welcome to the Master's Table, being in fellowship with the Berean Christadelphian. We welcome all of this standing having the assurance that they have left the lukewarmness associated with so many of the surrounding ecclesias (united in the word we stand). We thank God for the help received in the past, both financial and otherwise. Our field of operations is wide and the enemy is well dug in. The Rowley brethren have gone out from us and even forbid us preaching the gospel here, but we must gather our forces together and attack the strongholds of the Apostasy. Bro. Wille gave us a lecture upon "The False Foundation of Modern Religion." We had seven interested strangers. We pray God they may be like the noble Bereans of old and search the Scriptures. —W. H. SIDAWAY, 46 Hawes Lane, Rowley Regis, nr. Birmingham.

BRIDGEND. —Adare Chambers Ecclesia. Meetings: Sunday morning, 11, Breaking of Bread; Eureka Class, 3 p.m.; Lecture, 6.30 p.m.; Tuesday evening 7.30 p.m., Bible Class. We are very grateful for the warm support in the Berean for May, and gladly confirm the statement made on our behalf, "that we are always ready to give an answer for our faith." We have never been accused of error. That is what we separated from, and we cannot understand how or why we are condemned by people we have never seen or heard of. We hope doubters will examine us through the Berean Christadelphian, the enlargement of which we would gladly welcome. We again have pleasure in recording a welcome visit from bro. and sis. Ellis and family. —W. WINSTON, Clifton House.

BRIGHTON. —Athenaeum Hall, (Room C), 148 North Street. Breaking of Bread, 5.30 p.m., Lecture, 6.30 p.m. We are continuing in putting the Truth before the stranger in this place where lectures are given every Sunday by the efforts of brethren sent from Clapham. We shall be pleased to welcome any brother or sister visiting here who stands for purity of doctrine and fellowship. Will anyone communicating please note my change of address: "Brynteg," South Coast Road, Peacehaven, Sussex. —J. A. ANSTEE.

COLCHESTER. —Moore's Buildings, Barrack Street Colchester. Breaking of Bread, 11.15 a.m.; Lecture, 6.30 p.m. We are pleased to say we have at last secured a room in the above building. At this time, too, we take the opportunity of thanking all the brethren who have helped us so willingly in the work of the Truth, to publish the good news of the Kingdom. It gives us pleasure to state that sis. Bacon has joined us from the Temperance Hall meeting in Colchester, and we hope she will be strengthened to stand for the "whole Truth." Sis. D. Riley, we are sorry to state, has again left us for Toronto, Canada, and we pray she may have a safe voyage. We have gained two by immersion into the Sin Covering name; Mr. E. Wade and Mrs. E. Wade. We trust they will run well and gain the prize of Eternal Life. Ilford brethren kindly undertook the immersion for us. Sis. Swain met with us for a few Sundays at the table of the Lord. We are sorry to say she has now returned to the Ipswich meeting. —L. H. W. WELLS, Sec.

COVENTRY— Christadelphian Ecclesia Cooperative Room, Lockhurst Lane, Coventry. Breaking of Bread, 2.45 p.m.; Lecture, 6.30 p.m. We are thankful to say that another has stepped aside from the erroneous fellowship of Birmingham Temperance Hall and those with them. Bro. Horace Smith, after stating in writing his convictions in regard to the "Birmingham Trouble" was interviewed by our Examining and Arranging Brethren, who were satisfied with the correctness of his convictions in regard to the matter, and he was therefore received into our fellowship after resigning fellowship with the Coventry (Masonic Hall) Ecclesia. We now number ten. We have been greatly helped and encouraged by visits of brethren from Leamington, Blackheath, and John Bright Street Ecclesias, and a brother and two sisters from Sutton Coldfield. —H. C. GATES, 14 Wyken Way, Stoke Heath, Coventry.

CROYDON. —Gymnasium Hall, 117 High Street; Sundays 11 a.m., 6.30 p.m.; Thursdays 8 p.m., Bible Class St. Kilda's Schools, Chatsworth Road. —We are delivering a special course of lectures in answer to a series of sermons which have been delivered by a local minister. We hope some good will result. —ALFRED J. RAMUS

HITCHIN. —We are pleased to report the addition to our meeting of bro. T. S. McNair, late of Wakefield, who has removed to this town, and praise our Father who has thus graciously helped us in the doctrine and strong in the Word. We meet at "Eureka," 46 Walsworth Road, Hitchin, at 10.30 on Sundays, and shall be pleased to welcome any brethren in our fellowship who are passing this way. —HERBERT S. SHORTER.

ILFORD. —Sundays: 11, Cranbrook Hall, Cranbrook Road: Bible Class, Tuesday evenings at 8 p.m. Cleveland Road Schools. We have pleasure in reporting the immersion of the following: on March 19th, Miss Ethel Haynes, daughter of our bro. and sister Haynes; on April 30th, Miss Lucia R. Coliapanian, daughter of our bro. and sister Coliapanian; on May 14th, Mr. Charles t> Benton, son of our sister Benton. We are pleased that they have remembered their Creator in the days of their youth, and we trust they will be faithful even to the end of their probation. On behalf of the Ecclesia in Colchester, on April 20th we immersed Mr. And Mrs. Wade. Our hope is that they will attain unto the Kingdom of God. We regret to state that on February 24th last our sister Case died after a long and painful illness. She sleeps awaiting we believe a certain resurrection to Life Eternal. Our sympathy is extended to bro. Case in the great loss he has sustained. We have had the company of bro. H.C. Gates, of Coventry, in the service of the Truth. Our Mutual Improvement Class on May 14th held its annual Tea and Fraternal, and a most profitable and upbuilding time was spent in considering some of the words contained in the Seven Letters to the Churches of Asia. —W. W. DIGGENS.

LEICESTER. —64 Redcross Sq. Breaking of Bread at 11 o'clock. It is with thanks to our heavenly Father that I have pleasure in reporting that in faithfulness to Christ and his commands, bro. C. Ask has withdrawn his fellowship from the Temperance Hall Ecclesia and those in fellowship with same, and is now meeting with me at the above address. Will brethren in fellowship with Clapham who intend visiting or passing through Leicester please write. —E. C. CLEMENTS.

LINCOLN. —109 Sincil Bank. Breaking of Bread, Sunday, 11. Bro. and sister Heaton report their meeting as above, and will be pleased to be joined by any who have determined to stand for purity of the Faith, and have separated from the toleration of error which has been so painfully manifested. Previous notification will assist. Sister Hardcastle has now united with them, and they trust others will yet be moved to stand faithful to the Lord Jesus. Sent as requested by W. J. ELSTON.

LIVERPOOL. —Sundays, 11 and 6.30, 18 Colquitt Street (off Bold Street); Wed., 8, 31 Stanley Street, Fairfield. On May 3rd a meeting was held at which bro. Elston, Nottingham, spoke on the Ecclesial Trouble. About seventy brethren and sisters from Liverpool and the neighbouring ecclesias were present and heard a defence of the position we have taken up. We pray that our efforts will receive the blessing of God and more will stand with us for a wholehearted acceptance of the Truth, unfettered by man's thoughts and reservations. The following brethren and sisters comprise the ecclesia here—Bro. W. Chadwick, sister E. Chadwick, sister McNair, bro and sister Mandale, sister Philpotts, bro. and sister Rothwell. —W. ROTHWELL.

LONDON, S. (Clapham). — Avondale Hall, Landor Road, S.W. Sundays 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; M.I.C., 9.50 a.m.; Raleigh Hall, Brixton, S.W.; Thursdays 8 p.m.; Tuesdays (M.I.C. alternately with Eureka Class), 8 p.m. We have much pleasure in recording the baptism on May 10th of Mr. William Haines (formerly neutral), husband of sister M. Haines. We trust he will run faithfully, and be among those who will be approved. We also add to our number by removal and are pleased to welcome bro. Frank Morse from Swansea. On Saturday afternoon, May 24th, the members of the South London Mutual Improvement Class paid their twenty-fourth visit to the British Museum when many Roman, Assyrian and Egyptian exhibits of interest were inspected. Afterwards about 130 brethren and sisters sat down to tea at the Old Chelsea Restaurant, and in the evening some 250 brethren and sisters attended a

Fraternal Meeting at the Essex Hall, Essex Street, Strand. Visitors were welcomed from Bristol, Ilford, Croydon, Nottingham, Bexley Heath, Hitchin, Luton, Redhill, Southend, etc. Five upbuilding addresses were then delivered upon the subject, "Faithful Saints," viz, Abraham in Canaan; Moses in Egypt; Nehemiah in Persia; Daniel in Babylon; Paul in Rome. It is proposed (God willing) to pay a further visit to the British Museum in the autumn (further particulars later). It should be noted that from June 1st the time of the Sunday evening meeting has been altered to 7 o'clock, and the Sunday evening Breaking of Bread to 6 p.m.—F. J. BUTTON.

LUTON. —Oxford Hall, 3 Union Street. Sundays, Breaking of Bread, 11; Lecture, 6; Sunday School, 2.45; Bible Class: Thursday, 8 p.m. It is with pleasure we report that a majority of the Luton Ecclesia have taken a faithful stand in relation to this latter day departure from the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus. The following resolution was put to the meeting and voted upon by ballot: —"Seeing that the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia are determined to continue fellowship to some of their members who doubt the righteousness of withdrawing from all those who break the commandments of Christ by joining the State Forces, and that the Temperance Hall Ecclesia have withdrawn from those of their members who protested against this 'leaven;' and recognizing that for us to tolerate and encourage laxity in the 'One Body' is committing sin which may exclude us from the Kingdom we do therefore withhold our fellowship by withdrawing from the Temperance Hall Ecclesia until such time as they repent. We also withdraw from all other ecclesias who uphold the unscriptural position of the Temperance Hall Ecclesia by remaining in their fellowship. We are convinced that all meetings by this time have read or heard of this trouble. We cannot admit that we have 'liberty of conscience' as to whether we may disobey Christ or obey him; this being the principle which many in the Temperance Hall fellowship are upholding. We extend our fellowship to the John Bright Street Ecclesia and to all those who have taken a like stand as ourselves." The names of those who have voted for the resolution are: —Brethren G. Ellis, A.H. Phillips, T.A.S. Moorhead, C.R. Crawley, H. Rawson and A. W. Railton; Sisters E. Shackleton, J. Ellis, L. Smith, L. Phillips, M. Warner, E.E. Phillips, J. Wright, M. Moorhead, A. Crawley and F.O. Rawson. We have good reason to believe that sister Edith Blake will also be with us when she returns to Luton, she being away at present recovering from the effects of recently losing her mother and her sister (sister Ethel Blake), who died several days before the division, which took place on May 4th, 1924. She had not declared her mind on this matter; we all hope that she may be accounted worthy on that great day. We are continuing the work in this town in the same hall, and although fewer in number we are confident that our heavenly Father will bless our efforts. Our decision has been arrived at after months of careful investigation, a report of which may be published later. —GEO. ELLIS, Rec. Bro., 44 Oak Road, Luton, Beds.

NOTTINGHAM. —Clarendon St. Schools (Central Hall). Sundays: Breaking of Bread 2.30; Sunday School, 2.30, Lecture, 6.30. Huntingdon Street Schools: Eureka Class, Tuesday, 7.45 p.m. Wednesday, Bible Class 7.45. On account of structural alterations to the Corn Exchange the Sunday meetings are being held in the above room. It will probably be ten weeks before we are back again. We are pleased to report a noticeable increase in the number of strangers attending. —W.J. ELSTON.

OLDHAM. —Cooperative Guild Room, Greenwood Street, Huddersfield Road. Breaking of Bread, 2.30; Lecture, 6.30. During the month we have had the company and help of bro. Billiald, Nottingham; also we have had the addition to our fellowship from the Bridge Street (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia of bro. and sister W. Cockcroft, junr. —A. GEATLEY.

READING. —Sister Palser and I have today handed in our resignations as members of the Reading Ecclesia. We are wholly in agreement with the stand you and others have made with regard to the "Trouble," and willing only to fellowship those who have made a like stand. —ARTHUR H. PALSER, Rose Cottage No 4, Lodge Road, Hurst, near Reading.

RHONDDA. —18 Sherwood, Llwynypia, Rhondda, Glam. Will you kindly note our address as above. I meant to write you about the change of address, and also to say that sister Ellis and myself are Breaking Bread at home when it is not possible for us to go down to Bridgend. We go down to

Bridgend about every five weeks, as it is so very awkward to get back on Sunday, which we are compelled to do. —G. ELLIS.

ROCHDALE. —I am writing you to inform you that after serious consideration of the Birmingham Trouble, after having read both sides, I have come to the conclusion that the position taken up by the John Bright Street brethren is Scriptural, therefore I and my sister wife have withdrawn from the Littleborough meeting (who continues to fellowship Birmingham Temperance Hall, we being now in isolation). The separation came on this wise: —The Trouble having reached Oldham, the Littleborough Arranging Brethren became afraid, and the recording brethren (Jas. Carter and H. Binns) placed on the Arranging Brethren's agenda the following: "That we reaffirm our fellowship with Birmingham Temperance Hall." Thus it has entered the Ecclesia. I may say that Heywood Ecclesia is affected, and by the time you receive this letter there will no doubt be several withdrawals. I may say the Berean Christadelphian has helped me very much; also B.B., Rejoinder, One Master—all have been of service; but one thing I cannot omit—bro. F. Jannaway's visit to Oldham, in which meeting I was present. Bro. Jas. Carter, of Littleborough, stated to me that prominent brethren met and decided that their attendance would be of no use. Depend upon it, I gave him some real reasons why they ought to have attended, and afterwards I would not allow him to slander bro. F.G. Jannaway, or Clapham. —THOMAS HEYWORTH, 345 Bk. Market Street, Whitworth, nr. Rochdale, Lancs.

SHIRLEY (near Birmingham). —I have earnestly considered the Birmingham Trouble for some years, and am convinced the Temperance Hall brethren are wrong. The evasive manner they have dealt with matters concerning vital principles of Divine Truth and the admitted broad views (which are impossible views) on the question of fellowship and other matters that seriously affect the Truth. The evidence at hand proves conclusively that the Managing Brethren of the Temperance Hall are acting wrongly. Therefore in protest and in much sorrow I stand aside from their fellowship and now recognise myself with the John Bright Street brethren and all those who are prepared to uphold the Truth in its purity without any reservations whatsoever. —JOHN PHIPPS, Cheswike Mount, Monkspath, Shirley, Birmingham.

SUTTON COLDFIELD. —Since last writing we have received great benefit in the goodness of God by the meeting here for the fulfilling of the command to break bread in memory of Christ apostolically and with "gladness of heart." Public effort may not be expedient just at the moment, the Temperance Hall carrying on a series of lectures, although Sutton Coldfield has been neglected for years until just recently (except for private effort, of course, in this way as opportunity arose—such as suggested War Memorial, when the Scriptural position was publicly defined at a town meeting by a bro., V.H.). The most important work of strengthening ourselves (really more important than lectures) is being carried on, and we hope to all reap the benefit by being permitted to put on Christ's nature in "that day." The company and love of visitors from John Bright Street Ecclesia and the sisters E. and P. Corder of the Wilton Terrace, Portsmouth, Ecclesia have been our privilege. Most of our exhortations are from bro. Roberts in OLD Christadelphians. What a feast of fat things. We would urge young and old to resort to this source, especially those who may be in isolation (as many must now be); delve into the former works; a rich reward awaits you. See 1875, pp. 347, 415. The latter exhortation makes plain bro. Roberts' attitude to sword-takers and cooperators with the political parties of today, as bro. Thomas called them in his day, "Hurrahers for Abe Lincoln."—A. CHEFFINS.

SWANSEA. —Portland Buildings, Gower Street. Sundays, 11 a.m.; Eureka Class, 6.30 p.m., Breaking of Bread. Thursdays, 8 p.m. We are pleased to report an addition to our number by the application for fellowship of sister Ethel Davey from the Mumbles Ecclesia. She is now in total agreement with us upon the Birmingham Trouble and we welcome her into our midst. On the other hand we lose by removal from Swansea our bro. Frank Morse, who on account of business reasons takes up his residence in London. We commend our brother to the Avondale Hall Ecclesia with whom he will meet in future. Our visitors for the month have been as follows: April 27th, sis. C. Owen, London; May 18th, bro. W. Winston, jnr., Bridgend, bro. Cuthbert Watkins, Avondale Hall. We still have the company of bro. Winston, senr., and in the 18th we were ably supported by the assistance of bro. Winston, jnr.—J. H. MORSE, Rec. Bro.

CANADA.

BRANTFORD (Ontario). —C.O.F. Hall, 136 Broadway. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Thursdays, 8 p.m. We have pleasure in recording that two more of Adam's fallen race have put on the sin-covering Name, and thereby commenced a probation which we trust will end in the receipt of Eternal Life. Esther and Elizabeth Hickman, both Sunday School scholars and sisters to our sis. Hickman, were baptized into Christ on March 31st, 1924. May they continue faithful to the end and receive the Stephan. Bro. A. Fotheringham, of Hamilton, visited us on April 13th, earnestly exhorting us, and lecturing before several strangers. We have been much strengthened and edified by a visit from bro. B.J. Dowling, of Worcester, Mass., U.S.A. who spoke at our Bible Class on April 24th on "The Candlestick and the Book." We thank these brethren for their faithful ministrations. —WALTER J. LIVERMORE.

TORONTO. —Don Hall, 957 Broadview Avenue. Sundays: 10.30 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Sunday School, 12.15 p.m.; Wednesdays, 8 p.m. Since last writing we have had the pleasure of assisting through the waters of baptism Miss Irene Beasley, eldest daughter of bro. and sis. Beasley and a Sunday School scholar. We pray that she may recognise the end of the hope which she has laid hold upon. We have added to our members five members of the Musicians' Temple Ecclesia: —Bro. A.H. Warwick, bro. and sis. Simpson and bro. and sis. Nicol, who resigned because of the toleration of the teachings of bro. A.D. Strickler. We held our Fraternal Gathering on Good Friday, April 18th, when there were about 180 assembled from points far apart—St. Petersburg, Fla.; Worcester, Mass.; Buffalo, Hamilton; London, Ont.; Brantford, Montreal, Guelph, and other places. We had speakers from Buffalo, Worcester, Mass.; Hamilton and London, Ont. Bro. B.J. Dowling ministered to our needs on the following Sunday, and at the lecture there were thirty-four strangers—the largest number for years; and the lecture was given an excellent hearing. We have also been assisted in the Truth's work by lectures and exhortations by bro. W. Livermore, of Brantford, and bro. D. Martin, of Hamilton. We have planted, and we pray the Lord will give the increase. Sis. Kirkpatrick, who was immersed here some years ago and left immediately after for her home at St. Petersburg, Fla., is staying in Toronto for a time and is attending her first meetings since immersion. —ARTHUR EMENY, Rec. Bro., 263 Monarch Park Avenue.

HAMILTON, Ont. —I.O.F. Chambers, 194 Main Street, E. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m. Lecture, 7 p.m. Wednesdays, Bible Class 8 p.m. I omitted to state in our last intelligence the removal of bro. and sis. Alfred Allwood, who have gone to live in Vancouver, B.C., where they will in future meet with the brethren in Oddfellows' Hall, Main Street. On March 27th, bro. C. De Pelham put on the saving Name of Christ in baptism. Our new brother (formerly Methodist) first heard the Truth in England. We trust he will run well and so attain the prize. Bro. Johnson, formerly a member of the C.O.P. Hall Ecclesia, Brantford, now residing here, has become a member of this meeting. We are glad also to report that bro. R. Mullin, formerly of Irvine, Jutland, desiring once more to run the race, has after examination become a member of this ecclesia. On April 16th, our aged sis. Dawdy fell asleep. For many years our sister had suffered from asthma. Past the allotted span, her death was a release from suffering. Bro. Vibert laid her to rest in Mount Hope Cemetery, Brantford. We take this opportunity of thanking our visiting brethren from Toronto and London for their labours in proclaiming the Truth. Since last reporting progress, we have lost by removal sis. E. Allwood and sis. Derwin to Vancouver, B.C. We commend them to the care of our brethren at Oddfellows' Hall. Bro. E. Allwood has been with us for short holiday. We are always glad to renew association with old time and faithful co-labourers. We have been helped by a visit from bro. B.J. Dowling, of Worcester, Mass., who gave us some stirring addresses both at our week-night and Sunday meetings. We had on that occasion visitors from Brantford, Toronto, London and Guelph, and at our Sunday evening meeting fifteen strangers. We are grateful to our brother for his willing assistance. The help of our visiting brethren is much appreciated. We also were cheered by the timely exhortation of our bro. Hall, of the Fraternity Hall Ecclesia, Detroit, who was with us on Sunday, May 11th. We report the arrival and marriage of sis. Minnie Campbell, of Glasgow, Scotland, who was married to bro. D. Martin (son

of bro. and sis. Martin of this ecclesia) on May 10th, bro. G. Carrick, performing the ceremony. We extend to them the best wishes of the brethren and sisters, and trust their union may help them in the race for everlasting life. We commend them to the brethren at Castle Hall, London, at which place they hope (D.V.) to make their home. When we next report progress, we hope to have a new address, of which more later. —H. WARD, 504 Aberdeen Avenue Hamilton.

UNITED STATES.

DORCHESTER. —Breaking of Bread, 12 noon. Though five in number we have been pleased to add bro. and sis. Cousley, who withdrew from the Boston Ecclesia owing to their laxity in dealing with the Strickler Heresy, and would welcome to the address below all those who are firm in the faith that may be passing this way. —J. CARRUTHERS, 22 Dawson Street, Dorchester, Mass.

WORCESTER. —Mass. —Assembly Hall, Elm and Chestnut Sts. Breaking of Bread, 10.30.; Sunday School, 12;.Lecture, 7 p.m. Wednesdays, Bible Class 8 p.m. For the benefit of those (of like faith scattered abroad) inquiring as to our position in the present crisis, we wish to state, we are not responsible for the misleading intelligence appearing in The Christadelphian, May, 1924, headed Assembly Hall, Elm and Chestnut Sts., and signed by P.E. Laidlaw. There are two halls in the building where we meet, namely, Elm Crest Hall and Assembly Hall. We lease and occupy the latter. The brethren and sisters whom we had to withdraw from, meet in a room in the upper part of the building, and for any, other than ourselves, to designate themselves Assembly Hall is, to say the least, presumptuous. This ecclesia meeting at Assembly Hall, does not send intelligence to the Christadelphian (for reasons see Berean Christadelphian, p. 131), neither does it fellowship Birmingham (Temp. Hall) Ecclesia and kindred ecclesias, and, finally, does not fellowship Strickler Apostates. There is such a thing as studying to do our own business. Those who are endeavouring to place our ecclesia in a false light we would exhort to speak “the Truth,” and “shun profane and vain babblings” which gender “unto more ungodliness.” On May 11th, we had the pleasing company around the table of bro. and sis. Geo. Strong, of Milton, Mass., and sis. Fanny Ricketson of Lynn, Mass.—A. MARSHALL, Rec. Bro., on behalf of Assembly Hall Ecclesia.

FROM OUR POST BAG.

(From DETROIT).

23rd. April 1924.

Dear Brother Jannaway. —Although this ecclesia gave its name to the combined declaration against the Strickler heresy, it seemed hardly sufficient notice, in view of the course things have taken. The Arranging Brethren decided, therefore, to write to bro. C.C. Walker, as per enclosed copy of letter. Our first items of intelligence will be sent for insertion in the Berean shortly.

Faithfully your brother,

THOS. SHAW, Rec. Bro.

P.S.—We have withheld news to England for some time, hoping better things of Birmingham.

COPY OF LETTER TO BIRMINGHAM.

23rd April, 1924.

Dear Brother Walker, —This Ecclesia is one of those which collectively declared against bro. Strickler’s heresy, and those who tolerated it. In the circumstances of your own attitude, this automatically separated us, and we now regretfully have to say that we are further out of sympathy with the Temperance Hall Ecclesia on the question of withdrawal from the John Bright Street Ecclesia. I have been requested by the Arranging Brethren to separately advise you of our position, and to say that our intelligence will, until further notice, be sent to the Berean Christadelphian. Enclosed is copy of letter sent to bro. Jannaway, to whom a copy of this has been sent.

Faithfully your bro. in Israel’s Hope,

THOS. SHAW, Rec. Bro.

* * *

FROM SOMERSET.

“Many thanks for sending me Solemn Warnings. In one sense it is sad reading on account of the high estimation that such brethren as G.F. Lake, W.H. Boulton and others have held among us, but I am sure that all faithful brethren and sisters will be very grateful to you for its publication. We can only hope that those brethren who differ from us now may yet awake to the mistake they have made in sympathizing with the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia in wrong doctrines, which are undoubtedly peace first, purity afterwards, a reversal of the divine order. I am delighted to read of the proposed enlargement of the Berean Christadelphian and will gladly send the additional subscription at the date mentioned. May God’s blessing rest on yours and bro. Denney’s labours to give us a magazine that will strengthen and upbuild us in the Truth.”—E. M. LOCKE.

FROM BOSTON.

“Greeting you in the Master’s Name. I am writing to let you know there is a remnant in Boston still holding fast to the Truth. The writer of these lines has done so for forty-eight years and is determined to continue so to do, neither turning to the right hand nor to the left. . . . I see from last September’s Christadelphian, bro. C.C. Walker charges bro. Jannaway with sowing discord. I think if bro. Walker had been faithful to his editorial writings of 1910 he would not himself have caused the discord he has. . . . I have duly received the pamphlet entitled The Charge against the Birmingham (Temperance Hall) Ecclesia, and endorse it heartily.”—JOHN CARRUTHERS.

FROM LEICESTER.

I have never in any way been influenced by the attitude of bro. Lake. Those who seemed to be pillars mattered nothing to me. I have never “truckled” to Birmingham. As a matter of fact all my sympathies were with the John Bright Street brethren until they took the extreme step of withdrawal in sympathy with Clapham (bro. Dixon errs here: Clapham did not take the extreme step until a year or so after John Bright had been forced to take it. —EDITORS, Berean Christadelphian). I have thought from the first, so far as I could judge from the discordant and varying statements that Birmingham was absolutely in the wrong in the high-handed and unscriptural method with which they dealt not only with John Bright Street, but also with Blackheath. But the wrong is at their own door and to their own Master they stand or fall. . . . I desire to do the right thing, and I still think it could have been better had Clapham not taken the extreme course they adopted. I am hoping that if the threatened Bull of Excommunication is launched from Birmingham, Leicester will stand on its own Basis, for certainly I have no intention of “truckling” to any—even incipient—manifestation of the development of another “Mother Church” . . . This is not private. —J. S. DIXON.

FROM CORNWALL.

“Your little book Solemn Warnings to hand this morning. Such evidence as you have collected is indeed solemn warning to all of the great declension which is taking place in the brotherhood. Will you please send one dozen copies to us, so that I may pass on to those in Plymouth from whom we are separated, and who tell us that ‘if Clapham had not interfered, things would have been settled by now.’

Do you remember your cold drive to Princetown on Dartmoor, when bro. Hodge drove you in the sidecar to see the brethren who were in the prison there, during the war, because they stood firm for Total Exemption from all Military Service. How we should turn traitors to all such brethren if we allowed reservations now on such a thing as brethren joining the Constabulary, for one oath is as wrong to take as the other.”—A. L. HODGE.

FROM READING.

You are no doubt aware that Birmingham are taking a strong line and are circularizing all the Ecclesias still in their fellowship, to the effect that, unless they hear to the contrary by a certain date,

they will take it that they decide to fellowship them only, and reverse any previous decisions to fellowship both sides. This will make every ecclesia place itself definitely on one side or the other and do away with the "sit on the fence" attitude. I hear that many in Reading don't like the situation they are called upon to face, but we shall see what will happen. They are having a meeting shortly to deal with it, and some in Reading have expressed the view that if compelled to go one way or the other, they would rather fellowship Clapham of the two. Now I have no doubt that your Ecclesia will effectually deal with any situation that will arise, but this presents a little difficulty to me. I shall be very wary indeed before rushing into the arms of any who come out because of the present situation. Coming out as a stand for the Truth seems different to me to that of being pushed out. I take it that your Ecclesia—in such cases—would make very sure as to the soundness or otherwise of such bodies of brethren before deciding to extend fellowship, because the question must arise as to where they really are in the matter of fellowship."—A. H. PALSER. Hurst.

(In reply to this sound and typical communication we can assure our correspondents and readers that all matter under the heading of "Ecclesial News" is from Ecclesias which are wholeheartedly "with us" in the position set forth in the explicit notice immediately following the said heading. We have no sympathy with those Ecclesias which, like the Temperance Hall Ecclesia, blindly takes marching orders from one scripturally unfit for the supreme task of the care and direction of the Ecclesial world (1 Timothy 3: 1, 4-5). To those who are "on the fence" "watching developments" we say—Get down and "quit yourselves like men."—EDITORS.)

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: —

ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE. —J.H. Mellor, 27 Newmarket Road, Waterloo.

ARDROSSAN (Scotland). —J. Davidson, Inglefield Terrace.

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

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

BIRMINGHAM. —J. E. Weetman, 204 Burbury Street, Birmingham.

BIRMINGHAM. —A. H. Broughton, 140 Wiggin Street, Birmingham.

BLACKHEATH (Staffs). —W. H. Sidaway, 46 Hawes Lane, Rowley Regis.

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, "Brynteg," South Coast Road, Peacehaven.

BRIMINGTON. —R. Wharton, Station Road.

BRISTOL. —F. Walker, 41 Stokes Croft.

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

CHESTERFIELD. —(See BRIMINGTON).

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.

HASTINGS. —F.B. Handley, Fairlight Sanatorium, Ore.

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.

HURST (near Reading). —A. H. Palser, 4 Lodge Road.

ILFORD. —W. Diggins, 211 Hampton Rd., Ilford, Essex.

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.

LEICESTER. —E. Clements, 64 Red Cross Square.

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

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

LIVERPOOL. —W. Rothwell, 207 North Hill Street, Princes Road.

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

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

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

LUTON. —Geo. Ellis, 44 Oak Road.

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.

NUNEATON. —W. H. Wilson, St. Elmo, Edward Street.

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

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

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

PLYMOUTH. —J. Hodge, 1 Notte Street.

RAINHAM. —E. Crowhurst, Fairview, Herbert Rd., Maidstone Rd., Rainham.

READING. —(See HURST).

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

RHONDDA. —G. Ellis, 18 Sherwood, Llwynypia, Rhondda, Glam.

SALTCOATS (Scotland). —J. Holland, 39 Well Park Road.

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.

SUTTON COLDFIELD. —A. Cheffins, Elim, Reddicap Hill.

SWANSEA. —J. H. Morse, 33 Gerald St., Hafod.

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.
