

Price 6d

August, 1925

# 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, Mountview 1396, or Clerkenwell 2888.  
F. G. JANNAWAY, Brixton 626

Subscription ... 7/- per annum, post free

CONTENTS		Page
Dr. John Thomas, (Christadelphian) His Life and Work ... ..	...	281
The Bible Wholly Inspired and Infallible— ... ..	...	284
No. 118. — The Necessity of a Divine Revelation		
Editorial ... ..	...	287
1 Corinthians 12 (R. Roberts) .....	...	290
Sinai to Jerusalem .....	...	294
James 1: 14 .....	...	297
Sin and Sacrifice .....	...	301
A Brother's Load .....	...	303
The Destruction of the Devil .....	...	306
Sixth Visit to the Holy Land .....	...	308
The Mission of Bro. Wauchope .....	...	313
Palestine and the Jews .....	...	315
From our Post Bag.....	...	316
Ecclesial News . . . . .	...	317
Notes by the Way .....	...	322
Paragraphs.....	...	286, 312

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

IN FELLOWSHIP. —The brethren named will be willing to afford information as to meetings in their vicinity on the basis of purity: —

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

ARDROSSAN. —C. Grant, “Redholme,” South Beach.

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

BEWDLEY. —H. Pigott, “Shatterford,” nr. Bewdley.

BEXLEY HEATH. —H. A. Mayhew 232 The Broadway.

BIRMINGHAM. —C. Norris, 13 Western Road, Wylde Green.

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 Road.

BRIDGEND. —W. Winston, 6 Coity Road.

BRIGHTON. —J. A. Anstee, “Brynteg,” South Coast Road, Peacehaven.

BRIMINGTON. —R. Wharton, Station Road.

BRISTOL. —R. Durston, 9 Southernhay Avenue, Clifton Wood.

COCKERMOUTH. —E. Fleming (Miss) Soulsby’s Court, Kirkgate.

COLCHESTER. —L.H.W. Wells, 39 Drury Road.

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

CREWE. —J. W. Atkinson, 34 Meredith Street.

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

DERBY. —G. E. Lomas, 13 Haddon Street.

DONCASTER. (Near). —A. Hamilton 8 Nelson Road Rossington.

DUDLEY. —F. Jakeman “Halford,” Stourbridge Road, Scotts Green.

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

FALMOUTH. —W. Warn, Budock House.

GLASGOW. —G. E. Laister, 320 West Muir Street, Parkhead.

GREAT BRIDGE. —W. Southall 91 Hampton Road, Birchfields, Birmingham.

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

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

HEANOR (Notts). —Arthur Bowles, Church Street.

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

HUDDERSFIELD. —W. Bradford, 11 Longlands Road, Slaithwaite.

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

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

IPSWICH. —S. Simpson, 116 London Rd.

HARROGATE. —W. Mosby, "Holmside," Borough Bridge Road, Knaresborough.

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

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

LEEDS (Near). —T. Dixon, 6 Tingley Court, Bridge Street, Morley.

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

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

LINCOLN. —F. T. Heaton, 109 Sincil Bank.

LIVERPOOL. —W. Rothwell, 40 Chermerside Road, Aigburth.

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

LONDON (Putney). —W. Jackson, 172c New Kings Road, S.W.6.

LONDON (South). —F. Button, 1 Hillsboro Road, S.E. 22.

LONDON (West). —W.E. Eustace, 9 Clovelly Rd., Ealing, W. 5.

LUTON. —Geo. Ellis, 107 Selbourne Road.

MARGATE. —A Furneaux, "Lachine," Addiscombe Rd., Margate.

MOTHERWELL. —R. D. Ross, 34 Coronation Rd., New Stevenston, Scotland.

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, Pringhead, Oldham.

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

PEMBERTON (near Wigan). —J. Winstanley, 29 Green Lane, Orrell, near Wigan.

PORTSMOUTH. —A. G. Corder, 28 Upper Arundel Street, Landport.

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.

ROPLEY (Hants). —S. Marchant, Farmer.

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

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA. —W. L. Wille, 20 Westbury Parade.

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.

TIER'S CROSS. —H. Thomas, Tier's Cross Haverfordwest, Pembroke.

WALSALL. —A. M. Jordan, 12 Edward St.

WELLINGTON (Salop). —H. Saxby, 39 Ercall Gardens.

WESTON-SUPER-MARE. —Holiday Visitors, see BRISTOL.

WORTHING. —A. Jeacock, 4 King Edward Avenue.

#### UNITED STATES.

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

## CANADA.

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

## INDIA.

L. W. Griffin, Chakadahpur.

## AUSTRALIA.

J. Hughes, 55 Glenhuntly Road, Elsternwick, Melbourne.  
R. W. Ferguson, "Bellissima," Salisbury, Brisbane, Queensland.  
P. O. Barnard, 12 Brook St., N. Sydney, N.S. Wales.

## NEW ZEALAND.

K. R. MacDonald, P.O. Box, Whanganui.

## TASMANIA.

J. Galna, 18 Thistle Street, East Launceston.

---

## Notes.

D.S.—Respecting the Editorial (May Issue) on Freemasonry, read it again, you will see not only is no brother named therein, but no ecclesia. A guilty conscience, however, needs no accusing. We still await an answer to the simple questions at top of page 171. Why cannot the present editors of the Christadelphian be as frank as the previous editor, our beloved late Bro. Roberts? Since the latter's death, the craft has lost its moorings beyond doubt.

B.W.—Do you think it honourable to impart rumours defamatory to a brother's character after obtaining a promise from your listener, not to tell the brother in question? The Psalmist knows something of your type—Psalm 64: 3-4.

W. J. GREER. —Always glad to hear from you. Your letters have a Dr. Thomas ring about them.

W.H.F. (N.Z). —Ask bro. Leslie Walker to show you the letter we sent him on 15th June, and you will see why we cannot regard his ecclesia as "In Fellowship". It is not an open sesame to assure us that "we are not in fellowship with the Temperance Hall (Birmingham)", although that is a step in the right direction.

F.W.—The statement in Without the Camp that Birmingham signed the London Petition for Exemption is incorrect and was made under a misapprehension. The Petition Birmingham signed was the "Clause 7" Petition and even that they never had the courage to present; it still lies on their shelf. The London Petition for Total Exemption was not signed by Birmingham and was presented to

Parliament without the signature of the Temperance Hall. Bro. C. C. Walker is witness to these facts, see Christadelphian, 1915, p. 33 (his own notes middle of 1st column).

A.R.—We thank you for your correction, and ask our readers to note that the North London ecclesial present membership is but 174 and not 250 as we stated.

R. SMITH (Birmingham). —Thanks for yours. We are not a bit surprised to hear that brethren A. Davis and T.E. Pearce were "on the platform supporting bro. C. Wauchope of Adelaide at his last meeting". We expected it. Bro. Davis holds that "only a shadow" divides the Temperance Hall ecclesia from Suffolk Street. Bro. Wauchope is in fellowship with bro. J. Bell, and bro. C. C. Walker becomes "bereft" when strong supporters of bro. Bell come to Birmingham such as bro. Mansfield and sister Adams and lets them come into fellowship. Why should such as A. Davis and T.E. Pearce not therefore be on bro. Wauchope's right hand?

NATURE OF CHRIST. —Several articles in hand. We shall treat on this subject next month.

HELD OVER. —Although this month's issue of the Berean has four pages extra, the following articles in type have been held over, but will appear in the near future (God willing): — "Armageddon"; "Cloud and Sunshine"; "Is suing at Law for Divorce consistent with the Law of Christ"? "The Question of Responsibility".

Sister Evenden, Senior, is wanting a position as Housekeeper to Widower or Bachelor, with help. Fond of children. —142 Landor Road, Stockwell, S.W.9.

Sister Evenden, Junior, is seeking position in business, Drapery or Bakery, used to both. Both at liberty now. 142 Landor Road, Stockwell, S.W.9.

T.G. (Bedford). —Please read the three paragraphs under the heading, "Ecclesial News". As you personally think you are fulfilling the Scriptural standard of fellowship in adopting a neutral attitude to these paragraphs, and you fellowship those in your midst who claim it is the right thing to fellowship Birmingham Temperance Hall (who whittle away these three paragraphs), we must kindly but firmly refuse to insert any intelligence from you until your ideas of fellowship are clarified.

PHILADELPHIA. —Yes, we have heard from more than one source of many here being dissatisfied, and breaking bread at home; but why not all such have a preliminary meeting to see the way out? From what we hear, there are at least a dozen "of one mind", apparently waiting for their four faithless Philadelphian Ecclesias to "act" in relation to the Birmingham Trouble.

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, at 47 Birchington Road, Crouch End, London, N.8.

Volume 13, No. 8

AUGUST 15<sup>th</sup>, 1925

SIXPENCE.

Dr. John Thomas (Christadelphian)  
His Life and Work.

CHAPTER 20.

The next stage in the conflict between Dr. Thomas and Campbellism is marked by the appearance of the following in Mr. Campbell's paper: —

"As well might they charge us with the doctrine of Anabaptism or Materialism, because one of our brethren has allowed these sentiments. And I must be permitted to express my regret that it is so. I am sorry, truly sorry, that anyone who can wield so able a pen as our brother of the A— A— will turn away from the good work of pulling down the Babel of Sectarianism and building up the temple of the Most High to any speculations".

Again: —

"Our beloved Dr. T----- has lately given some views which I think are calculated to remove both the torment of fear and the fear of torment; for if they should not be wholly relieved from their alarm by re-immersion for the remission of sins, he has by means of opinions effectually barricaded all the avenues to the unseen world, whether by the pons asinorum, or through the air on angels 'wings', and can by an extra dose of heterodoxy (an old fashioned antidote for orthodoxy), make all who are nervous or uneasy sleep so sound that they shall not even dream of purgatory. But I am doubtful whether you would like church dormant any more than church patient; and, in the meantime, lest I should cause you to imagine either doctrine true, and put you to sleep, or 'torment you before the time' by too long a letter, I will close for the present".

Again, Mr. Campbell tells his readers, in commenting upon an extract from the letter of "a man of business", that it is more worthy of being embalmed than ever was the body of an Egyptian King. This extract is said to be composed of certain "apposite and practical reflections". They are the following: —

"I have read your conversation at Father Goodall's, and approve of it. I am no Sadducee. I believe in both angel and spirit. I think that God is the Father of the spirits of His saints, and earth the mother of their bodies. I am therefore agreed to give my mother earth all she can rightfully claim, namely, all that is corruptible; and having done so, I stand ready to be clothed upon with my house from heaven—namely my spiritual body; and in the meantime, I have no idea of remaining torpid or asleep. I am contented to go to Paradise or Abraham's bosom. I am willing to be with Christ wherever he is; if in the grave, why well. But we know he is not there; and therefore I feel a deep repugnance against being confined to the grave. If the grave has any charms for anyone, I can assure you it has none for me. I wish not to be reserved in chains of darkness. I wish to live, and I feel confident that, while Christ lives, those who trust in him shall live also. I have no idea of dying—Jesus has died for me, and therefore death has no claims upon my life".

On these, the Doctor makes the following remarks: —

"It will be seen from these 'obviously practical, useful, and apposite reflections', that the Harbinger represents me to its readers (without affording them an opportunity of judging for themselves or doing me the justice of self-defence) as a heretic of the deepest dye. If I believe and teach the things insinuated against me in the foregoing documents, the brethren who edit and write for that able work, are culpable and truant to the cause of truth in fellowshipping me as their beloved brother. I am accused of Anabaptism, of Materialism, of having turned away to speculation, of having ceased from the good work of pulling down the Apostasy, of forsaking the building-up of the temple of the Most High, of teaching re-immersion for the remission of sins, of barricading the avenues to the unseen world, of being a Sadducee, of affirming that the grave is the only Paradise, and I know not what else beside. I need not say to those who read the Advocate unbiassedly, or who hear me speak, that these insinuations are founded only in the distempered views of my dissentient friends. When I obeyed the Gospel, I knew nothing of the 'Reformation', or the topics of conversation between it and its numerous opponents. Having been thoroughly disgusted with Sectarianism in England, I determined to maintain my independence of all religious sects in America; and in this resolution I find myself this day. Christ, and not the Reformation, is my Lord. The spirit of liberty, based upon the law of faith, is the Spirit of Christ; and this Spirit all the sons of God are privileged to possess, and having it, to breathe. I claim the right of exercising this privilege, as well as my contemporaries; and I require of them that they should do to me as once they loudly required others to do to them. If I have turned away from the Faith, as some of the insinuations charge me, I am amenable to the law of Christ, and to the congregation in this city. I ought not to be represented to the brethren at large as guilty until proved so; and this proof can be received only as a matter of fact, and not as a matter of opinion. Having purified my soul (life) by obeying the Truth, I assumed the Truth as my sole instructor. By the Truth, I understand the Holy Spirit speaking in the writings of the apostles and prophets. All other writings are subordinate to these. None are infallible save the Scripture. The opinions of the world, that is, of mankind, whether readers, writers, or editors, are none of them so sacred but they may be examined and discarded or retained, as evidence may determine. For some time I thought this was the golden attribute of the Reformation, but I must confess myself deceived. I find that liberty is granted to discuss everything under certain conditions, which, in truth, nullify the privilege, or rather right, in toto. You may discuss all topics, except some, and these are called speculative, if they happen not to have come within the range of popular view. A thing is speculative in a bad sense when it happens to jeopardise the integrity of my opinions! You may 'prove all things', but you may not 'hold fast that which is good', unless we say so! You have more light than all men, but not more than we. The zig-zag of our belief is to be the bound of your liberty. You may do and say what you please, only don't condemn us. This is the spurious liberty with which Christ did not make his people free; I fear it is the liberty of this Reformation to a considerable extent. The treatment I have experienced from various sources, satisfies me that this is true. I once thought that the errorist was to be silenced by argument: Paul acted thus, but not so my brethren. The Harbinger seems to act as though it

thought that its opinion was the authority by which all controversies among us were to be resolved: and subscribers to our periodicals who succumb to this, deign not to convince us of our error, but summarily attempt to put it down by withdrawing their subscriptions. This is the argument of force, not the force of argument. One instance of this we put on record; another occurred in which we received a letter notifying the discontinuance of twenty-seven subscribers, and assigning as the cause, the agitation of the 'sleeping question', i.e., the state of the dead. Now, if I loved my subscribers' money better than what I believe to be the Truth, I should be afraid even to allude to that or any other unpopular subject, lest I should lose a subscriber. Have I found the key to rule 1? Would it be of practical utility to silence the Advocate"? If it would, certainly the most 'obvious' way would be to do as the Harbinger is doing— prejudice the minds of its readers so that they shall be deterred from yielding it their support. This would be a short way, and save the trouble of much argumentation. But, I can assure my brethren none of these things move me. The 'sleeping question', as it is called, is not disproved by the loss of twenty-seven subscribers, nor can the Advocate be silenced by authority. Our subscription is increasing; our paper is read with avidity; and if we succeed in our proposed arrangements, we shall go on more vigorously and securely than heretofore. While I regret that justice to myself and to truth requires me to speak thus of some of the brethren, it affords me pleasure to bear testimony to the free and noble spirit of liberty breathed by other brethren, who are for free enquiry on every subject relating to the destiny of man, come good, come evil from the Church or world. Many of these brethren were once Baptists, and have not been re-immersed. They prefer eccentric truth to consistent error and expediency. May it be my happiness to have my lot always cast with brethren of such principle.

"To say a man is a Materialist is to pronounce him as worthy of death at once in the estimation of some wise people. To give him a name that few know the meaning of, is an ingenious device to prejudice the world against him. I affirm that I have never read a single page of a book except the Bible, on the subject called Materialism. I once assented to the traditions of men on the spirit, the soul, the state and destiny of the dead, simply because I was nurtured in these absurdities; but the Truth had made me free, and I believe with the Apostles that the dead are truly dead, asleep, and will so remain until THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE shall call them forth from their graves to enjoy life, or to suffer punishment. Is this doctrine 'calculated to remove fear of torment'? Is this 'blocking up the avenue to the unseen world' bro. Richardson?

"My time is as much devoted as ever to the pulling down of Babel and to the building up of the temple of the Most High. Many can bear testimony that I labour more than any in these parts at this very work. I have neglected my own affairs to a considerable extent, since I submitted to the government of Jesus Christ, that I might attend to those very things. But, I expect no thanks from the many; my reward is reserved in heaven. God is the Judge. —It is not true that I have turned to speculation in a bad sense. It is the Church and the world that are speculating about ghosts and airy heavens. I am endeavouring to bring back from these aerial conceits to the grave and substantial matters (materialism, if you have it so) taught by the Holy Spirit in the Bible".

(To be continued).

---

## The Bible wholly inspired and infallible.

No. 118. —The Necessity of a Divine Revelation.

The human mind at its highest point of attainment is incapable of developing a true religion of its own volition and of knowing how to worship God in a way acceptable to the great Creator. Many men nowadays deny any necessity for a Divine revelation and teach that from a very lowly origin man has slowly developed along lines that may be observed, and is capable of supplying all he needs in the

way of religion from his own stores of ability. Some contend that a contemplation of Nature is a sufficient guide in matters of religious observance, and that man's moral sense is gradually evolving, and so continually reaching higher levels.

Yet no races of men are in closer touch with Nature than the African natives and it could scarcely be contended that this acquaintance with primitive life had conduced to high morality or worship acceptable to a Divine being. When men set out to make gods for themselves, they attribute to them characteristics and a character similar to their own. If the man is cruel and arrogant, his god is likewise. If we cancel out the necessity for a Divine Revelation we are placed in uncertainty and left with no help but that afforded by a motley crowd of various races and dispositions of men all clamouring for that one conception that most pleases them severally and individually. Confusion always results from a denial of God's supreme authority, for then who is to be the arbiter? What is one man more than another. Let it, however, be conceded that God provides for the needs of His creatures, and that in orderly fashion He made ready for them all the things necessary for their life before He created them, and we see at once why, when the balance of Nature is disturbed by man's interference, evil always results.

Many species of birds and beasts have been brought to an end by man's ways. Bolingbroke contended that "By employing our reason to collect the will of God from the fund of our nature, physical and moral, we may acquire not only a particular knowledge of those laws which are deducible therefrom but a general knowledge of the manner in which God is pleased to exercise His supreme powers in this system".

But however learnedly and deeply one may study God's wonderful works as exhibited all around, he will never discover therein what is his own true estate or by what means he may secure deliverance from the disabilities of his physical frame. The question, "What must I do to be saved?" cannot be answered by astronomy or botany. The clumsy attempt to provide a solution to the problem of human destiny provided by those who sponsor the doctrine of the immortal soul, is always destined to be frustrated by the hard facts of nature and chemistry.

The sermons we read in stones and trees tell nothing of human redemption.

The spiritualist soon exhausts the stores of human memory, and has nothing outside thereof. He falls back on cigars and whisky and the commonest human occupations when asked to describe how the supposed spirits engage themselves.

Many people now live in "mental homes", as lunatic asylums are euphemistically called, as a result of seeking to speak to their dead.

Dr. Temple contended (and many follow his example), that the decisions of conscience constitute the supreme standard of human belief and conduct. This is a fallacious argument, because, in the absence of a Divine Standard, no company of men will for long observe the same rules and share the same belief. Even where a definite creed or "Statement of Faith" has been accepted, once it has been granted that such may be modified by the individual mind, disintegration has set in till the standard has been abandoned. As an instance take the present position of the Anglican Church in relation to the Athanasian Creed. It is openly acknowledged that this creed now by no means expresses the mind of the Episcopal Church.

Look at the difficulty now present with all who hold the name of Christadelphian to maintain collective faithfulness to the Basis or Statement of Faith, promulgated and universally accepted by all such, some two generations ago. The divisions during the last fifty years prove how easy it is for human nature to alter and subvert even the highest and most rigid standards to suit itself. How many to-day stand where bro. R. Roberts and Dr. Thomas stood? Not many.

We are, therefore, brought to the conclusion that if any true idea of human redemption from sin and death was to be brought to man's mind it had to be by a spoken or written declaration having supreme authority. In His creative wisdom the Deity provided exactly what was needed in the Bible. Here is the book standing high in every way above every other book in the world, which tells of the Divine purpose and shows man the way in which to walk if he would be gathered up into that purpose. It speaks with authority and asks for unqualified belief and obedience. Setting out certain definite doctrines, it asks for a careful attachment thereto, and refuses to allow any tampering therewith. None may add or take away. Here is true wisdom, and the fact that, as Jesus put it, so few "enter into the narrow way" does not justify humanity in abandoning that way and seeking divers paths of its own. On the other hand it proves that if there were no Divine revelation there would be no authoritative standard, and consequently no real hope or faith. The fact that few "find it" proves further that the Bible way is not the outcome of merely human reasoning. Bible teaching is unpalatable to the flesh. Those will find peace now and salvation hereafter who submit unreservedly to its jurisdiction. They stand on a rock that no wind or storm can move. Let us, therefore, look upon the Bible as God's wise provision for man's greatest need and like all His works abundantly sufficient for the purpose in view. —G.H.D.

(To be continued).

---

There is no true religion without faith; nor any true faith without the belief of the truth.

---

### Editorial.

#### THE FUNDAMENTALISTS IN TENNESSEE.

Much attention has been given in the public press to a recent trial in Dayton, U.S.A. In the State in which that town is situated there are certain regulations as to the character of the Scripture teaching to be given in the public schools. There are regulations of some kind or another in most countries called Christian in respect to the same subject of child-instruction. In England, a compromise was arrived at when the Balfour government carried through its famous Education Act, whereby "simple" Bible teaching "without dogma" was established in the "Council" schools. This consists of reading portions of Scripture and describing sacred history, with instruction as to a Creator-God, and the birth and work of Jesus Christ, etc. There are occasional excursions into the mists of Trinitarianism and other like delusions by individual teachers, but no permission is granted to any such to exalt one church above another or to develop strong lines of controversy. In Dayton, a teacher named Scopes taught Evolution with all his might to his poor pupils and poured scorn upon the Book of Genesis. The simple curriculum of the State had set out that the children should be instructed according to the Book of Genesis as to Creation. Scopes set the law at defiance and tried to achieve a sort of martyrdom. He has been properly fined for his breakage of the law and will lose his situation.

We can visualize the situation easily if we think what would happen to a teacher in this country who with much bravado taught the children infidelity instead of "simple Bible instruction" when that subject was reached in the curriculum. He would soon be brought to book, and so he ought to be. This trial has, however, exhibited two things very clearly. One is, that nearly all the clergy and their followers now disbelieve in the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures and the veracity of its statements.

The second is that there are still some intelligent men such as Mr. W. J. Bryan who believe in the Bible as God's Holy Word, and can make out a good case for it.

We were particularly impressed with America's "leading atheist's" cross-examination of Mr. Bryan, as Mr. Darrow was described: —

Question: Do you believe that Jonah was swallowed by a whale?

Answer: I believe God prepared a great fish to swallow the prophet: in fact the whole of the Book of Jonah is true.

Question: If the book said that Jonah swallowed the whale would you still believe it?

Answer: The question is ridiculous but whatever the Book says, I believe to be true.

Question: But if the book said that you would believe it?

Answer: Most certainly.

The report says "loud laughter" followed. The laughter of fools is like the crackling of thorns under the pot.

They forget—these wise of this world—that Jesus himself confirmed the truth of Jonah's story. We would rather stand with Jesus than with the modern scoffer at the Scriptures.

#### "BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN".

On another page, we print an interesting letter from Bro. Purser, of Clapham. We are not troubled as he is, that we are sometimes called by the double name. Some description is always used of the various peoples all claiming to be Christadelphians. For years we have heard of "Renunciationists", "Masonic Hall brethren" and then "Suffolk St. brethren". The same folk are often dubbed "Partial Inspiration brethren" and the "Fraternal Visitor Camp". Then there are the "Advocate" brethren the "Shieldelphians" and the "Birmingham Temperance Hall Fellowship", etc. All are ugly though serving the purpose in view for those who use them.

But let who will call us "Bereans" as an addition to the title we believe we rightly bear of "Christadelphians". It conveys the truth about our attitude and is infinitely preferable to "Clapham Fellowship" which we see often used also. If we have to be dubbed we could not be better dubbed. Nevertheless we agree with bro. Purser that for our own part we claim one title only—Christadelphian. We put up with the difficulties of the moment as well as we can and do not see any need to change our title. We might do much worse. —G.H.D.

\* \* \*

#### "BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM".

What a necessary test in these days when, not only in commercial but in religious life things are palmed off for what they are not! And persons are given titles they have no real claim to. Baptists, for instance: why the title? Because in the first instance it was an article of their religion that no one could be a member of that body who had not been baptized in water. Not so to day, and yet they all call themselves Baptists.

#### SO WITH CHRISTADELPHIANS.

Fifty years ago, when we came to a knowledge of the Truth, and essayed to join the body, we were interviewed by three presiding brethren to see if we did know and appreciate the "First Principles." We well remember the searching questions put to us, especially upon the nature and sacrifice of Christ, doctrines now opposed by bre. Bell and Strickler, and even by the entire (T.H.) ecclesia in Ardrossan, in fellowship with Birmingham.

The same strictness was then observed in Birmingham. We have before us, "A Statement of The Faith forming their (the T.H.'s) Basis of Fellowship; Doctrines to be rejected; and, the leading features of the Commandments of Christ".

When the foregoing Statement of The Faith was up for reaffirmation in 1908, bro. C. C. Walker wrote, "The voting left much to be desired. There were some 300 who did not vote at all, besides some thirty or forty who could not be reached through the post"!

Possibly those 300 possessed the mind confessed to by the present editor of the Christadelphian—namely, "In nothing do we feel more bereft than on the question of fellowship" (Christadelphian, 1921, Jan. cover). If that was the mind of the 300, it was to their credit they did not vote.

Things have got worse, for now we have the Assistant editor, bro. C. Ladson, writing a distressed brother, "As a help to you personally in your understanding of the Christ spirit among brethren, have you ever asked yourself these two questions, and sought the answer in the Bible: (1) What is a First Principle; (2) How is it to be determined? "

Contrast these expressed minds of the present editors of the Christadelphian with that of their predecessor, bro. Roberts, who formulated the (Birmingham) Basis of Faith, which reads: —

"The first condition of association is this belief of the Truth, apart from the perception of which, there is no basis of fellowship. The Truth forming the Basis is made up of a number of items or elements, that are each essential to its integrity as a whole.

"That it is a matter of duty to require the recognition of these at the hands of those claiming association with us in the Truth.

"That we are not at liberty to receive anyone who denies or refuses to believe any of them, because the receiving of such would open the way for the currency of their principles among us, with the tendency of leavening the whole community. The elements of the Truth are so mutually related that the displacement of one undermines the foundation of the whole.

"A man himself believing the Truth, but willing to wink at its denial among those in fellowship in any of its essential elements, becomes by his willingness an offender against the law of God, which requires the faithful manifestation of the whole. Faithful servants of Christ cannot unite with such, on the ground that though he hold the Truth himself, such a man is responsible for the error of those whom he would admit, and, therefore, becomes the channel of a similar responsibility to those who may endorse him in fellowship—'He that biddeth him God-speed is a partaker of his evil deeds'" (Christadelphian, 22, 338).

It is manifest the Temperance Hall (Birmingham) Fellowship and the Christadelphian have left their moorings, and are no longer what they were under the guidance of bro. Roberts. To term them "Christadelphian" is as incorrect as to term non-baptists of the present day, "Baptists". —F.G.J.

---

## 1 Corinthians 12.

### A Sunday Morning Exhortation by Bro. R. Roberts.

BELOVED BROTHERS AND SISTERS, —There are several things in this chapter interesting and important to be understood, but not apparent on the surface. To discern them it is necessary to have distinctly in view the people to whom the Epistle was written, and the time and circumstances under which it was written to them. If we were to read it from a modern point of view—that is, if Paul were discussing principles applicable to modern circumstances—we should make many mistakes. Paul is discoursing on a situation of things existing in his own day, and having no parallel in our experience. The situation is very simply described. A number of people in Corinth, brought up in a mixed state of philosophy and idolatry, had believed the testimony of Paul on the occasion of his visit

to the city, concerning the resurrection of Christ, and the benefits offered to those who should believe and obey the risen Master. Their belief was based upon the signs and wonders by which Paul's word was accompanied. God gave testimony to the Word of His grace in signs and wonders and gifts of the Holy Spirit (Hebrews 1: 2), so that their faith "stood not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God" (1 Corinthians 2: 5). After they believed, the Holy Spirit was given to them also, by the laying on of the Apostles' hands, so that they also were able to speak with tongues, work miracles, prophesy, speak in the words of wisdom and knowledge, etc. Paul stayed with them a good while, even "a year and six months" (Acts 18: 11), for Christ had told him that he had much people in that city (verse 10). After Paul left them, various questions began to arise among them as to duty in this and that, in the new position in which the Truth had placed them. Some held one opinion and some another upon the various matters that arose. There were also sectaries among them—men who did not rise to the breadth and greatness of the unity that was in Christ, but conceived petty partialities for certain leaders and teachers. Some said "I am of Paul," as against others who boasted to the disparagement of Paul, that they were of Peter; while others again made Apollo the watchword, and others, "Christ". The existence of such a state of division in a community blessed with the gifts of the Spirit, will appear inexplicable to those who have not realized that those gifts did not override the judgment and temperamental peculiarities of the possessors; but were restricted to the particular function appertaining to them. A speaker of tongues was the same individual in the manifestation of character as if he had not received a supernatural knowledge of the languages. A worker of miracles was not made infallible by the impartation of the power to heal. Those having the gift of knowledge, wisdom, etc., would be reliable guides; but they do not appear to have been deferred to, to their full extent. And this would be accounted for by the probable argument that one man with a gift of the Spirit was as good as another with a different gift. Thus the man having the power to interpret tongues, if he differed in judgment with the brother who had the word of wisdom, might feel justified in maintaining his own opinion on the ground that he also having the Spirit, had as much right to form a judgment of the matter as another having the same Spirit in another form. In this distorted state they appear to have written to Paul to give his mind on the various questions raised. This fact comes out in the first verse of the seventh chapter: "Now concerning the THINGS whereof ye wrote unto me". The last ten chapters including the one that has been read, follow this sentence. It is, therefore, probable that they deal with questions that had been asked by the Corinthians in their letter. Indeed the style is decidedly indicative of this fact. Take the first verse of the chapter read for instance: "Now concerning spiritual gifts"; this is not the way a man writes who is dealing spontaneously with the subject. It is just the style of a man who is answering questions that have been submitted to him; who having done with one, is proceeding to another. It is, therefore, probable that Paul's judgment had been asked on the matters discussed in the chapter. This supposition greatly aids the comprehension of it.

"Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led" (verse 2). This allusion to their antecedents prepares the way for the attitude he is about to take as their teacher, and also lays a basis for the argument he is about to advance. As much as to say, "Ye know that apart from what I brought to you, ye were idolaters, without hope, without inheritance in Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise. The gifts that ye have, were acquired by you in connection with my gospel. Therefore, I and my gospel are the standards by which the questions in agitation must be decided. 'Wherefore I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed' " (verse 3).

Now how came Paul to have to make this apparently superfluous declaration? Obviously, because there were some among the Corinthians calling Jesus accursed, who professed to speak by the Spirit. How could such a thing be? This is only to be understood in view of the surroundings and extraction of the Corinthians. The Grecians had been termed the philosophers of the world. The Corinthians lived in one of the principal cities of the Greeks, and at one of the principal seats of philosophy. It was very natural, therefore, that philosophy should crop up in their midst as a perverter of the phenomena connected with the Spirit. Indeed, in the case of another Greek ecclesia—that at Colosse—he expressly says, "Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit". Now upon what principle of philosophy could any man take the attitude of a detraction of Jesus, and yet claim to be speaking by the Spirit? I could understand such a case to arise in this way. A worldly

thinker, brought in by the preaching of Paul and the novelty of the gifts, remains submissive to apostolic principles for a while, but bringing his secular philosophy to bear, aided by intercourse with the philosophic alien, gradually comes to regard the gospel movement as but a peculiar form of the universal truth. Such a man would come to esteem highly the writers and thinkers and orators of Greece, and to contend that although there was doubtless good in the apostolic system, and a greater measure of good than in paganism, that yet as a whole it was narrow and unphilosophical; that Jesus, dying by crucifixion, was accursed by the very system which he said he came to fulfil; that it was unreasonable to suppose that God intended an accursed man to hold the position of supremacy taught by the apostles, especially to the exclusion of "the wise and good" men of philosophic fame. The inspired teachers of the ecclesia would of course oppose such a doctrine; and decline to argue it philosophically, might assert the authority of the Spirit in them as sufficient to close the mouth of the objector. In answer to which the objector might say, "I also have the Spirit; I received it equally with you; in fact all men have the Spirit—the poets and philosophers of Athens, as well as the apostles, and therefore we have as much right to maintain our convictions as you". If the man or men were clever and loquacious, their words would stagger the faith of some, and be difficult of confutation. Accordingly Paul was written to: "Can a man have the Spirit who calls Jesus accursed"? Paul's answer is "No"! and on the general question of all men being inspired, he says, "The things of God KNOWETH NO MAN, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received NOT THE SPIRIT OF THE WORLD, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God (3: 11-12).

The next statement of Paul I understand also to apply to the cavils of the same objector: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit". The necessity for making that statement might arise in this way. In dealing with the man calling Jesus accursed while claiming to speak by the Spirit, the spiritual men of the ecclesia might point out to him that but for the Spirit coming into their midst by Paul, they never would have known about Christ at all. In answer to which the caviller might contend that the knowledge of Christ was as much a thing of natural cognition as any other matter of history. They would say that although they knew it first by Paul, that was a mere accident: he happened to be first on the ground; but that if he hadn't come, they would have heard of so stirring an historical incident in some other way. This would give rise to the point met by Paul's declaration, "Can a man know that Jesus is the Lord without the instrumentality of the Spirit"? The truthfulness of Paul's answer is apparent in many ways. To see or hear of the power of Christ was not to be made to know that he was the Messiah, the Lord. The Pharisees saw him but did not believe. His appearance conveyed no intimation of the fact. As the prophet had predicted, "He had no form nor comeliness; and when they saw him, there was nothing in him that they should desire him". His Messiahship required to be testified by the Spirit and confirmed by the Spirit. It was not to be known apart from this. Hence when Peter confessed that he was the Christ, Jesus said "Flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven". How? Not by the spirit going into Peter and mechanically convincing him as it were (for the "Holy Spirit was not yet given" in that sense, John 7: 39); but by the testimony the Father gave to Jesus on two notable occasions in the presence of Peter, and on one of them before a multitude. At his baptism and transfiguration, "A voice came from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son; hear ye him". No man could know apart from the Spirit that Jesus was the Lord. When men heard the apostles afterwards, as the Corinthians heard Paul, they heard the Spirit, for the Spirit was in them, as Jesus had promised. The co-operating works of the Spirit (in healing, raising the dead, speaking with tongues, etc.) were evidences of the testimony, being the Spirit's testimony; but apart from that testimony, no man could say that Jesus is the Lord. As a matter of human knowledge, it was unattainable; and therefore the philosophic caviller was sporting himself with his own deceivings in contending as many do in our own day, with Renan at their head, that the Lord Jesus was a mere phenomenal manifestation of moral power, to be recognized and understood on natural principles

But Paul's words in our day are greatly wrested from their meaning. They are made to teach that no man can say that Jesus is Lord unless he is personally and supernaturally illuminated by the Holy Spirit. This is a self-evident absurdity. We all here present confess that Jesus is the Lord; and we do it heartily, with joyful and grateful emphasis, yet we deny that we are subjectly illuminated in, the

way contended for in orthodox circles. We are only illuminated in this way, that the Spirit uttering its voice in the earth, 1800 years ago, and causing its words to be recorded, has furnished us with evidence that convinces our understandings that Jesus is the Lord, and apart from the means it instituted to this end, we never would have known the fact, and therefore could never have stated it. In this sense, still, no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit, but this is a very different sense from the orthodox sense which requires that God shall inspire us before we can know His truth, although He has sent inspired preachers for the very purpose of causing us to know that faith might come by HEARING their word. Furthermore, the people who claim to be thus inspired, it is easy to show, do not confess the Truth revealed by the Spirit concerning the Lordship of Christ in many important elements. We must take care, while steering clear of the atheistical philosophy of ancient and modern times, not to run into mistakes in the opposite direction, which are only a little less ruinous.

Paul's remarks on the unity in diversity of the gifts of the Spirit may also be understood as a reply to the same class of objectors while furnishing information useful to those not in that position. When the official brethren of the ecclesia claimed in the controversies that arose to speak with authority in the name of the Spirit amongst them, the caviller of the class in question, of whom so many specimens are to be found in modern times, might well be supposed to say, "You talk of the Spirit, and you point to the various things that are done, but we cannot see in them an evidence of the Spirit. They are more like the feats of conjurors. If it were one Spirit, would it not show itself in the same way in every person having it"? "Like causes produce like effects", they might say, with the dogmatic sapience of a philosophy which has proved itself so many times in opposition to the Truth. "How can we answer this"? the Corinthian believers may be well imagined to ask Paul. The answer is: "There are diversities of gifts, but THE: SAME: SPIRIT". And there is more philosophy in Paul's answer than the ancient philosophers knew. The law is found to operate even in the natural body which he afterwards makes use of as an illustration. Hearing is different from smelling, and tasting from seeing, and feeling different from both. Yet if you examine the nerve-substance employed in the generation of these different sensations, you will find it is exactly the same in all cases. Put it under a microscope, or test it with chemics, and you can discern no difference in the constitution of the nerve-fibre of the ear, eye, nose, tongue, or skin. And the vital energy developed from the blood by the discerning vessels, and supplied to these various functions, is exactly the same—"different manifestations, BUT THE SAME SPIRIT". Go wider still. Range the broad domain of nature, examine all phenomena, and you get at last to what is now termed scientifically the "co-relation forces;" that is, you come to see that the various powers denominated heat, light, strength, cohesion, gravitation, etc., are but the manifestation of a common, primal, simple, indefinable force: "different manifestations BUT THE SAME SPIRIT". Why is the same force one thing in one relation and another in another? There is no more philosophical answer than the one given by Paul: "All these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally AS HE WILL," The will of the Spirit—the appointment of the Creator—is the ultimate explanation of all things. The Corinthian philosophers were, therefore, not so wise as they imagined when they pointed to the diversity of the gifts as a disproof of the apostolic theory of the Spirit. In fact, it was a case of "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools".

---

## Sinai to Jerusalem.

### REFLECTIONS.

By Bro. J. M. EVANS, Clapham.  
(Continued from page 264).

But during the judgment of Sinai and the subsequent period of rejoicing, what is happening in the world without? In the Land of Israel we see the picture of wealth and prosperity foretold in Ezekiel. It has now become the vital position in the British Empire—not only a rich and thriving colony but the jugular vein of the system. In Egypt, Britain's tenure is beset by difficulties. Hated by

the Egyptians whom she has raised from poverty and tyranny to affluence and well-being, having no legal status but merely holding her position there by her might. Even in this we perceive the Divine hand. God gave Egypt to Britain, the door to the Holy Land, and he is using the ingratitude of the Egyptians to plant the Tarshish power more firmly in Palestine. Established in the Land of Israel with her army of occupation on both banks of the Nile, the strategic situation is secure, and without knowing it, Britain is occupying the battleground on which she will fight for her existence against the most implacable of her foes. Meantime, in spite of the Beaverbrooks and Northcliffes, Britain will continue her Divinely-appointed protectorate and under her aegis Zionism will prosper, the desolate places will be inhabited, Israel will possess cattle and goods, and the face of the land will smile with plenty.

But what about Israel's enemy? Even now we hear of Russian preparations. She is organizing a mighty army and it is a significant fact that it is composed largely of cavalry and light artillery, a force capable of rapid and irresistible movement. She is intriguing in Persia, and when the moment arrives for her march to the sea, which has been her objective since the time of Peter the Great, she overwhelms like an avalanche the British forces in Palestine. Jerusalem is taken and sacked; half of its inhabitants are taken captive, the invaders sweep on to Egypt which is given into the hands of a cruel lord who confiscates its gold and silver and precious things. Try and realize the grave crisis. Britain's Mediterranean fleet which is composed of her most powerful ships is broken, the remnant of her land forces retreats to the East of Jordan. Her communications with her Eastern possessions are cut. Her Empire is doomed

As for Israel—all her bright hopes are shattered. It had seemed that Jehovah had returned to her in mercy and given her a reviving to repair the desolations and to give her a wall in Judah and Jerusalem, and now all is darkness and despair. Her hopes are lost, they are clean cut off.

The holy cities are a wilderness, Zion is a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. All their pleasant things are laid waste; "Oh that thou wouldst rend the heavens, that thou wouldst come down, that the mountains might flow at thy presence. As when melting fire burned, the fire caused the water to boil to make thy name known and thine adversaries that the nations may tremble at thy presence". Thy help is near.

Listen, O Israel, "Behold the Name of the Lord cometh from far, burning with his anger and the burden thereof is heavy; his lips are full of indignation and his tongue as a devouring fire . . . And the Lord shall cause his glorious voice to be heard and shall show the lighting down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering and tempest and hailstones. For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down which smote with a rod".

But who is the one bearing the Name of the Lord? Who is the mighty one of Israel? Who is the one who treads Israel's enemies in his anger, and tramples them in his fury?

Let us return to the fastnesses of Sinai. The brief period of rejoicing is over. The time for action has arrived. Deity's war chariot is ready. The Eloah upon his horses and chariots of salvation. The Eternal Spirit incorporate in Jesus and his brethren. From the heights of Sinai they can be seen marshalled in their four-square encampment, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners". The multitudinous Son of Man, waits for the fiat which will send Him forth to execute the Judgment written. The moment having come, the wings of the Cherubim which have been let down during the period of inaction, are extended. The noise is as that of many waters, as the noise of a host. And so Christ and the Saints set forth on that terrible and glorious march which will end in the destruction of Israel's enemies and the conquest of the world.

---

## James 1: 14.

" Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own  
lust and enticed ".

### DOES THIS TEXT INCLUDE JESUS CHRIST?

(Continued from page 262).

#### JAMES 1: 14 DOES INCLUDE CHRIST.

Therefore James 1: 14 can be understood to include Christ, but not verse 15. Verse 14 is a Bible definition of temptation. It describes lust in enticement (or incitement within) which has to be obeyed or yielded to before sin is produced. Verse 15 describes lust in conception, because yielded to, bringing forth sin. Cruden describes lust in James 1: 14-15 as being "That original corruption which inclines man to sin and evil". In this he agrees with Dr. Thomas in Eureka, Vol. I., page 106, where he says that diabolos is the elements of corruption in our nature inciting it to transgression. What was the original corruption? Serpent suggestion accepted and acted upon which has been a law of sin, a corrupting principle inciting to transgression ever since. James therefore speaks of this corrupting principle of disobedience, inciting every man, tempting every man, to cross the line of law drawn between good and evil by the law of God. ALL, men including Christ have experienced the inciting of this corrupting principle, diabolos within; whilst all men, excepting Christ, have yielded to its enticements, allowing lust to conceive and bring forth sin. A man is therefore tempted of his own lust. When he yields to it or obeys it, the first product is an evil thought in the conception of lust, which evil thought is sin (Matthew 9: 3- 4; Jeremiah 15: 9, R.V.; Matthew 15: 18). It is said that verse 15 is a repetition of verse 14 and that the whole process of sin is described in verse 14, the verse being construed to read that "every man has sinned when he is drawn away of his own evil thoughts and enticed (entrapped)". This extraordinary rendering is obtained by interference with the Word. "Is tempted" is altered into "has sinned". "Lust" is rendered "evil thoughts", which it cannot be, because evil thoughts are the product of lust and therefore cannot be sin and the cause of sin too. "Enticed" is rendered "entrapped", thus abolishing temptation from within and setting up the proposition that temptation comes from without only, whilst what is styled temptation from within is really sin from within. It is claimed that it makes no difference to the strength of the temptation, whether it comes from without or from within. Whilst the no difference in strength may be open to question, the proposition cannot stand unless temptation from within does not necessitate sin, which it is said that it does, and to make it so, James 1: 14 is to be read, that "every man hath sinned", etc. If temptation from within does not necessitate transgression (and it does not), then why should temptation (from) within so necessitate it, that it is called sin? It is claimed that the one who tempts is always a sinner, and therefore must be someone without. This claim does not agree with Dr. Thomas' belief of the tempter in the wilderness, the someone whom he says came to Christ, which someone he affirms to be an angel of light (Christadelphian, 1873), and therefore not a sinner since the immortal nature cannot sin. To say a man tempts himself is not stating a Scriptural fact. What tempts a man? Answer: —His own lust (James 1: 14). "Let not sin reign in your mortal body that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof" (Romans 6: 12). "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death or of obedience unto righteousness" (Romans 6: 16).

Dr. Thomas shows (Eureka, Vol. I, p. 12, 19, 32) that sin "incarnate" which is the devil within, tempts from within (incitements within, Vol. I., p. 106, 107), and a man has not committed sin until and unless he yields, obeys or serves sin in the lust thereof. Men do so when they comply with Matthew 5: 28, for the forbidden thought is there, or as in the case of David, Achan, Gehazi, Ananias, and Sapphira. In each case there was an incitement of diabolos within, which need not have been yielded to, but could have been opposed, but because yielded to, the sin spoken of, was committed, the lust conceived bringing forth adultery (2 Samuel 11: 4), theft (Joshua 7: 1), theft (1 Kings 21: 16), (25, did sell himself to work wickedness, or obeyed sin in the lusts thereof), falsehood (2 Kings 5: 25),

falsehood (Acts 5: 3), and conceived in the heart (Acts 5: 4). Each case cited should be read in conjunction with James 1: 14-15, and not verse 14 alone.

Annandale's Concise English Dictionary gives "tempt" as meaning "to incite or solicit to an evil act, to invite, to try to induce", etc., which meaning harmonizes with the incitements of diabolos within. (Eureka, Vol. I., p. 106, 107.) Cruden's gives twenty-one passages with the word "tempted" in which it cannot be interchanged with the word "sin" and made to mean transgression. Nine times "tempted" is applied to God, in the sense of tried or proved, six times to Christ in the same sense and six times to men, one in the sense of trial and five in the sense of incitements within, which when yielded to produce sin. "Tempted" and "sin" are not, therefore, interchangeable terms, their use and meaning being different.

Bro. Roberts in Nazareth Revisited (2nd Edition), "Human Nature and Diabolos", p. 85, says:—"No man is tempted in this way (that is by a personal supernatural devil) but always by the incitements of the flesh, either operating spontaneously within, or presented to us in an objective manner by the suggestions of a person external to ourselves".

In Christendom Astray, Lecture 7, the same point is stressed in the following words:—"But, the objector may say, true, sin is the cause of death but who prompts the sin? Is it not here that the devil of popular belief has his work? Nothing can be more directly met by a Bible answer. "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death" (James 1: 14-15). This agrees with a man's own experience of himself; sin originates in the untrained natural inclinations. These in the aggregate Paul terms: "another law in my members warring against the law of my mind". Every man is conscious of the existence of this law whose impulse uncontrolled would drive him beyond the restraints of wisdom. The world obeyeth this law and lieth in wickedness. It has no experience of the other law which is implanted by the Truth. All that is in the world, John defines to be, "the lust of the eye, the lust of the flesh, the pride of life" (1 John 2: 16). When a man becomes enlightened by the Truth and is thus made aware of God's will in reference to the state of his mind and the nature of his actions, a new law is introduced. This is styled the "Spirit" because the ideas upon which it is based have been evolved by the Spirit through inspired men. "The words that I speak unto you", says Jesus, "they are Spirit and they are life" (John 6: 63). Hence the warfare established in a man's nature by the introduction of the Truth is a warfare of the two principles—the desires of the flesh, and the commands of the Spirit. This is described by Paul in the following words:—"The flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other" (Galatians 5: 17). Walk in the Spirit, says he, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh (verse 16). He says in another place, "Let not sin therefore, reign in your mortal body that we should obey it in the lust thereof" (Romans 6: 12). Dr. Thomas shows, *Elpis Israel*, page 68 that the evil, or spirit of disobedience, sin in the flesh, in human nature, is personified by the apostle Paul in Romans 7: 12-18, as "pre-eminently, A SINNER"; to which we would add the words of Proverbs 1: 10, 16 as illustrative of the example of Christ in opposing the incitements of diabolos (the sinner within) and the enticements and pressure of sinners without—"My Son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not (yield not, obey not, serve not). If they say come with us . . . My Son, walk thou not with them. Refrain thy foot from their path, for their feet run to evil".

If we would follow the Captain of our Salvation we must locate the enemy where it is to be found, in the flesh, and overcome it even as Christ has done, using the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, to subdue the incitements of diabolos, the devil within, and oppose enticements and pressure from without.

The word "tempted" is never used to mean "transgression" neither in the Scriptures nor in any Dictionary, therefore the words following it in James 1: 14, cannot describe transgression, and do not mean that every man has sinned when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. If they did, then the statement would be a contradiction, and the Spirit would be at fault in selecting a word which does

not mean "to sin" and qualifying it with a following clause in the same sentence which it is claimed describes an act of transgression.

(Concluded).

---

## Sin and Sacrifice.

BY BRO. WM. SMALLWOOD, TORONTO.

(Continued from page 219.)

### PART 8.

Let us now consider the following from bro. Strickler: —

“The sins from which he (Jesus) was justified were the sins which he bare when he became a curse. Those were not his own sins personally; his resurrection was the proof that he bare no guilt because of them; he was freed or justified as to the claim that they had upon him, otherwise he would have remained dead for ever, as that is what happens to those who bear sin judicially. Christ’s release from death by resurrection unto eternal life proved that the penalty for the sins for which he died was never satisfied or paid by himself, neither could he have paid the debt, which was eternal death, and been raised from the dead. What did happen, however, was that those persons whose sins Christ bare, were forgiven them; the impending penalty was not inflicted”—Out of Darkness, p. 53.

Does bro. Strickler really believe that actual transgressions were in some incomprehensible way transferred to the body of Jesus and borne by him to “the tree”? The fact that he has said so in the above quotation and in other places, while rejecting the only alternative would lead one to this conclusion if he had written nothing to the contrary. The following, however, adds further confusion:—

“What have we in a sacrificial sin bearer, but a highly figurative and symbolic performance; and so far as Jesus Christ was that bearer of sin, the symbolism was based upon actual death and resurrection to show the final object of the figure symbolism” \* —Out of Darkness, p. 88.

Again from the above testimony it is proved that the sin or uncleanness that defiled the altar was not “sin in the flesh, but sin in its primary sense.” It was from that kind of sin that the Mosaic altar was cleansed, and therefore the antitypical altar was cleansed, and therefore the antitypical altar was cleansed from the same kind of sin; “but it was only in figure and symbol, because as a matter of fact neither the typical nor the antitypical altars were defiled or cleansed from sin” \* — Out of Darkness, p. 66.

\* Italics mine. —W.S.

In another place he refers to “the sins which had in symbol been transferred to Christ and became his own”—Out of Darkness, p. 76.

So, according to bro. Strickler, sin was laid upon the “lamb slain” “symbolically” only. Symbolical is not real, and if not real it has no effect, unless something is done to which the symbolical performance has reference. What is the difference between typical and antitypical atonement? From this brother’s mode of treating it there is none, seeing that sin is borne “symbolically” in both cases. If he is right, then sin has not been taken away, our “faith is vain,” we

are “yet in our sins.” Such is the disastrous result, logically worked out, of his truth-destroying invention.

But, thank God, sin has been taken away, but only in the Lord Jesus himself, so far. God is in the process of removing it from his brethren also, in harmony with the moral principles involved; and will at last abolish it altogether from the earth. Jesus bore the effects of sin that his Father might remove them in him by his death and resurrection, on behalf of all who should take his name and be approved by Him. The true friends of Christ stand before God accepted in him as forgiven sinners, and not as sinners for whom the penalty has been paid by Christ. They attain to this position of privilege and honour by willingly and humbly conforming to the conditions which God in His kindness and wisdom has prescribed.

Bro. Strickler’s idea evidently is, that the sins of the faithful that were laid upon the “sacrificial man, Jesus,” were entirely outside of himself. That as the sins of the Israelites were (ceremonially) transferred to the living scape-goat, so the sins of his brethren of all ages were symbolically laid upon Jesus, who made an atonement for them by his death on the cross. But the ceremonial transferring of sins to the goat was only a type or shadow, a ritual prophecy, pointing forward to the one on whom sin should be really laid, a sin—“body prepared” by God for the purpose, in order that sin might be destroyed in him in accordance with the moral principles involved. Where is the substance of the Mosaic shadow? According to bro. Strickler’s mode of dealing with the subject there is none; and the dreadful agony of the cross must have been endured for nought.

Another thing in the type that is out of harmony with this brother’s teaching is that the sins symbolically transferred to the scape-goat were “sins that were past.” The sins committed by the Israelites were symbolically borne away every year after they had been committed. According to bro. Strickler’s way the first scapegoat might have sufficed for all generations of Israelites. But it is not done in this way in the type, neither is it in the antitype. As already indicated, by the death, resurrection, and transformation of Christ, sin both in cause and effect has been condemned, destroyed, and he has become a sin-covering for all who get connected with him in God’s appointed way. He is God’s way of righteousness. All in him by faith are declared justified or righteous; all who may ultimately become incorporate with him by a change of nature will be constituted righteous as in the present state they are “constituted sinners”—Romans 5: 19.

(To be continued).

---

## A Brother's Load.

In an article (Christadelphian, 1923, p. 456) with the above heading, bro. G. F. Lake gives an illustration of the question of marriage with the alien. He says that it is an offence compromising fellowship which he rightly observes is, "quite as serious as the Police Service Question".

He tells us that thirty years ago, certain well-known brethren spoke, and voted, against the proposition that marriage with the alien was an offence compromising fellowship; but, that "as these brethren assented to the mind of the majority the matter ended; and that it was never suggested that those who had opposed us should be withdrawn from".

Brother Lake argues that this was the Scriptural attitude to adopt; and, that as the question of Police Service is much on the same plane, brethren are not therefore justified in withdrawing from those who believe in the legitimacy of Service in the Police Force for the brethren of Christ, so long as they "do not oppose the ecclesial action" against brethren who join the Police Force; and, in order to justify their view, he cites Romans 14: 1, "Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations".

Now, before we consider Paul's argument in this chapter, let us point out, that, "if marriage with the alien is an offence against the law of Christ", then "those who maintain the contrary are not fit for fellowship with those who consent to the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus", (as stated in Proposition 36 of the Birmingham Temperance Hall Constitution): and, that where the offence takes place," the offending brother or sister shall only retain their place among the brethren by admitting their offence".

Now if this is the Scripturally enjoined attitude on marriage with the alien, and joining the Police Force is "quite as serious a breach of the law of Christ" as bro. Lake contends, then, "those who maintain the contrary" (as brethren A. Davis, and T.E. Pearce do in their speeches), "are not fit for fellowship with those who consent to the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus". For this reason, brethren who openly avowed their belief in the legitimacy of Service in the Police Force can only Scripturally retain their places among the brethren by admitting their offence, in disavowing their false teaching.

It was purely in obedience to this divine principle of action, that we insisted that brethren Davis and Pearce should disavow the wrong views they had publicly advocated, as the condition of their remaining in our fellowship.

If a brother maintained that marriage with the alien was legitimate he would be withdrawn from (see Temperance Hall Constitution, Proposition 36). If a brother maintains that union with the Police Force is "not a sin compromising fellowship", as brethren Davis and Pearce do, then on the same principle, and by the operation of the same rule, they should be withdrawn from, for there is no difference.

But if we are to abandon this Apostolic principle of action, the truth of which bro. Lake disputes in his article, in favour of the retention of brethren in our fellowship who are known to hold erroneous views on vital doctrines, so long as they agree "not to oppose ecclesial action" against brethren who actually join and remain in the Force; or, who "for the sake of unanimity assent to" while "disagreeing with the position of the ecclesia", then we have started down the slippery slope of Apostasy; for, there is no false doctrine in all the realm of Spiritual darkness which may not on this principle be sheltered in "the bosom of the Church".

Further, and more serious still, such a false doctrine involves, yea, necessitates, "the infallibility of the Church"; which, in turn, carries with it the false doctrine that the majority of nominal believers in any city, town, or village, whether they hold The Truth or not necessarily, and without exception, constitute "the Church". This doctrine leaves no room for the apostasy of such a Church, and semper eadem—unchanging, and for ever the same, eventually becomes her blasphemous claim.

Do not be shocked, brethren. Those who were delivered from Egypt were taken captive by Babylon, and Rome is not far from Jerusalem! It is high time we examined ourselves, "whether we be in the Faith".

Now let us consider the chapter in Romans which is supposed to contain this principle of the Apostasy. In this chapter, it is clear, that, the Spirit of God in Paul is contending that we should deal kindly with those weak brethren who had scruples in matters of eating and drinking, and in the estimation of one day above another; matters in which brethren are free to please themselves, so long as they do not seek to impose these non-vital questions upon their fellows.

For bro. Lake to apply the Apostolically enjoined reception, and toleration, of brethren who were weak on those non-essential matters, to the reception and toleration of brethren known to hold doctrines subversive of our position of separateness in Christ, is as inexcusable as it is unscriptural. Let us take an illustration. Taking bro. Lake's view, let us argue as Paul does in verse 2, and onwards, substituting specific false doctrines for the things to eat and drink and see where it would land us: —

“For one brother believeth that he may legitimately join the Army, or the Police Force, or become an executioner: another, who is weak, feareth to do these things, and abstains from them. Let not him that feareth to join the Army or Police Force condemn him that joineth these Forces, or believeth that he may join, for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up; for God is able to make him stand”.

Again: "One brother believeth in the transmigration of souls: another, the doctrine of purgatory, a Scriptural doctrine. Let every brother be fully persuaded in his own mind (for whatsoever is not of faith is sin). He that regardeth the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the transmigration of souls, to the Lord he doth not regard it. Then why dost thou judge thy brother? or, why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ . . . Let us not therefore judge one another any more; but judge rather that no man put a stumbling-block, or an occasion to fall, in his brother's way".

Such a misapplication of the Apostle Paul's teaching would lead us back into the Apostasy: for there is no error, in all the realm of Spiritual darkness, which might not be excused and tolerated on these false principles as we have shown; but, we are "persuaded better things" of bro. Lake, though we thus speak: and feel sure that he has been overtaken in a fault and hope he will upon reflection admit his error, and withdraw his article "A Brother's Load".

Sutton Coldfield.

VINER HALL.

---

## “The Destruction of the Devil.”

By Bro. B.J. Dowling, U.S.A.

(Continued from page 223).

### PART 4.

An old proverb reads: “He who follows two hares is sure to catch neither;” and so with bro. Strickler as he mingles the thoughts of Truth and error, neither are well expressed nor directed, and nothing convincing can be grasped. But to those “who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil”—Hebrews 5: 14, his ideas and conclusions are impotent, vain and heretical.

Bro. Strickler has devised this constraining influence of “habit,” to take the place of the “law of sin which is in our members”—Romans 7: 23. He says “The first sin of Adam fixed itself in the brain” as “a habit”—“sow a habit and reap a destiny,” says bro. Strickler.

To this we reply: habit is simply an acquired tendency. Continued use breeds a habit. A bad habit is acquired by bad actions oft-repeated. A habit therefore is different in every respect from a physical law infixed in the being, as the result of one bad action. As declared in our Basis of Faith: “The sentence,” the definite judgment of the Court of Heaven, “defiled and became a physical law of his being.” This changed physical condition of Adam’s body was the judicial sequence of a decree, issued by the most Sovereign Authority in the universe—the all-powerful Creator, reading as follows: “In the day thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die.” This was more than a mere sinful habit acquired by continuous use; it was the judicial physical result of a single sinful act.

But bro. Strickler goes on to illustrate his “new thought,” which he is now firmly convinced will eventually lead not only bro. C.C. Walker, who has pronounced him “fundamentally sound,” but other Christadelphians also, “Out of Darkness into Light.” He proceeds to quote: “A sower went forth to sow.” The seed fell at first upon “very good” ground but brought forth bad fruit—Adam sinned. He acquired a bad habit which became customary with him. The only real change, however, that occurred

in Adam, according to bro. Strickler was that his first “unforgiven sin,” “fixed itself in the brain,” like a bad habit and became his “devil” and the cause of subsequent transgression. Bro. Strickler’s thought is that it was a simple “mental” change, or to use his own words: “a mental law that still exists in connection with any good or bad habit.”

But bro. Strickler is too shallow, he does not go deep enough; but our Basis of Faith does. In it brother Roberts has declared: “The sentence defiled (nothing good about it—B.J.D.) and became a physical law of his (Adam’s) being and was transmitted to all his posterity.” From this physical principle nothing good is evolved. When we would do good, this evil is present with us, —Romans 7: 21. Mind is a development of brain, and as Doctor Thomas wrote in *Elpis Israel*, page 113, this principle of sin in the flesh operates upon the brain, exciting “the propensities, and these set the intellect and sentiments to work,” and when these “operate under the sole impulse of the propensities, the understanding is darkened through ignorance because of the blindness of the heart.” The result therefore is evil and not good. Any man can change his mind or his habits when enlightened by the Word, but no man can change this principle of evil or sin dwelling in us. Evil is not its only result, it is also the cause of disease and it has the power of death. This physical principle of sin has been nullified and destroyed in Christ, as it will be also, in those who are Christ’s at His coming.

Bro. Strickler has frankly admitted to the present writer that he does not believe the teachings of brethren Dr. Thomas and Robert Roberts on the “Constitution of Sin.” Therefore when he professes to endorse our Basis of Faith, it must necessarily be with reservations that nullify this vital Truth. In other words, he is not fundamentally sound, and his reasoning upon the matter in question is better adapted to so called “Christian Science,” than it is to the Truth.

Bro. Strickler believes that Adam died a “natural death,” but he affirms that his death “was not an exhibition of God’s displeasure,” which is a direct contradiction of the Spirit’s testimony in Genesis 2: 17 and 3: 17—see *Out of Darkness into Light*, page 50.

Bro. Strickler also declares that Adam’s posterity do not inherit sin—see page 44, but simply acquire the same bad habit their forefather did, and consequently acquire the same “unforgiven sin,” or the “devil” of his theory. He holds however, that there was one notable exception, viz., Jesus, the Christ, who was also a Son of Adam. He acquired no bad habits and consequently had no “unforgiven sin,” and therefore according to bro. Strickler no “devil”—no sin in the flesh like Adam himself and Paul acquired—p. 83.

Bro. Strickler says he had “no condemnation of any kind resting upon him”—see p. 61. Yet strange to say, he teaches that this uncondemned Man was required to die upon a cross, affirming that it was because sin was to be “condemned in him,” and he asks the question: “How did he have it” (sin)? Note carefully his reply and his denial of physical sin inherited. Here is his reply: “By inheritance? NO. By transgression? NO.” In some unaccountable manner, the sins or transgressions of others were “transferred from the sinner to the victim (Christ) so that the punishment for sin would not have to be inflicted” upon those “who had committed the act”—see pp. 44 and 45; and yet brother Strickler affirms that he is not teaching substitution!!! Such a statement to an intelligent mind, makes contradiction sure.

(To be concluded next month).

---

## Sixth Visit to the Holy Land.

(Continued from page 258.)

FROM LONDON TO THE MEDITERRANEAN.

Yes, here we are on our Sixth Visit to the Holy Land and other Bible places. By "here" we mean on board a large "whirling thing," even "a vessel of swiftness on the surface of waters", "a swift

messenger", to appropriate the translation of Dr. Thomas of the 1st verse of chapter 18 of Isaiah, in dealing with what God inspired that prophet to say about certain ships in the Time of the End. The vessel in which we are housed for the time being is named the "Sphinx", a fine ship of more than 15,000 tonnage—a noteworthy contrast to the little yacht in which, nearly a quarter of century ago, we made our first trip to the HOLY LAND; a steamer of only a fifth of the tonnage, and known as the "Argonaut", now lying at the bottom of the ocean as a result of a collision near DUNGENESS. An interesting coincidence is that what in particular tempted us to make the Holy Land Tour in 1901, is what had the same attraction in 1925—a vessel in which we could make the same cabin "our home" throughout the whole of the cruise; and all arrangements for both cruises made by the same master of ceremonies, then Dr., but now, Sir Henry Lunn. It was soon after Christmas last that we heard of the "Sphinx" being chartered for the present pilgrimage, and as the result of correspondence, and promise of a certain cabin, we decided, God willing, to be among the paying guests, and here we are.

We left London about ten o'clock on the morning of July 6<sup>th</sup> (by "we", of course the writer means himself and his beloved companion for the last forty-three years). At the London terminus (Victoria) there was the usual touch of sadness in bidding dear ones good-bye when setting forth on such a journey, for who can say when or where we shall meet next? The little group that assembled at the London terminus to bid us God-speed included my brother Arthur and his life-long partner, the former of whom has passed the "allotted span", and yet is still in the forefront of the battle being waged against the current latter-day Birmingham Apostasy. Upon arriving at Dover we were further cheered by being greeted by bro. and sis. H.E. Purser, who had journeyed from Folkestone to bid us good-bye. "As iron sharpeneth iron, so doth a man the countenance of his friend"—Oh, how true!

While awaiting departure of the train from London, we caught sight of a somewhat short, thick-set and well-built gentleman in the midst of quite a large group of pilgrims. Tightly clasped in his hands was a copy of Sampson Low's edition of Palestine and the World! Later on we discovered that he was none other than Dr. W. O. Poole, the successor, at Christ Church, Westminster, of Dr. F. B. Meyer, the world-renowned successor of the "Rev." Newman Hall. He is travelling as the leader of this 1925 "Pilgrimage to the Holy Land". We are wondering what the sequel will be when Dr. Poole and the writer come to a closer acquaintance. It remains to be seen.

The railway journey from LONDON to DOVER, the boat journey from DOVER to CALAIS, and the further railway journey from CALAIS to PARIS, and the journey from PARIS to MARSEILLES, afforded very little of interest to a brother and sister of the Lord Jesus Christ, excepting, of course, the beauties of Nature, so well touched upon by our brother Henry Atkinson, in his exhortation the day previously at the Clapham Breaking of Bread, and which we hope to reproduce in an early number of the Berean Christadelphian. Of the beauties of Nature there was no lack, especially in the "Garden of Kent", where a striking feature was that of the hopfields in full bloom, and in Southern France, where it was that of the vineyards. By the way as to hops and vines we have met well-meaning folks who would prohibit the growth of either on account of their misuse, notwithstanding the fact that when rightly used they—to use Bible language—"cheer" the heart of man. What good thing is there that cannot be abused? And, then, the good thing gets a bad name.

#### MARSEILLES.

This city, our goal so far as French soil is concerned, is not much of a place to talk or write about: it is the third city of importance in France, and its first seaport of importance, as it is also first of importance in the Mediterranean. It is largely made up of docks, for which it possesses great natural advantages, the sea penetrating quite into the heart of the city. The population is nearly three-quarters-of-a-million. MARSEILLES can trace its pedigree back to the days of Nebuchadnezzar, in whose reign it was founded by the Greeks, and in less than 500 years it became an educational centre of no mean reputation. That was when it was conquered by Julius Caesar. About 2,530 years after its foundation, two "pilgrims" hailing from Stockwell were being hurried across the city, from the Gare St. Charles to the Messageries Maritime Quay, where was located the floating Hotel "Sphinx", and

which was to be the "pilgrims" home and head-quarters while cruising around the scene of the Apostle Paul's missionary journeys and labours nearly 1,900 years ago. What a contrast between the cargo and passenger boats of Paul's day, and the one in which we were now located! This (the "Sphinx") is really a fine boat; the largest steamer of the world-renowned French Mail line, the Messageries Maritime. It is nearly 500 feet long, and over 60 feet in width. It has five decks, excluding the hold. What would Paul have said of such accommodation? The Lower Deck (A) contains the three Dining Saloons—1st Class in the centre, the 2nd Class aft, and 3<sup>rd</sup> Class ahead; Deck B. is entirely devoted to Cabins—2nd Class aft and 3rd Class ahead; Deck C. is devoted to 1st and 2nd Class; while Deck D. is wholly devoted to First Class single and double state-rooms, fitted with casement windows instead of port-holes. Profiting by experience, I had secured a room on this deck several months ahead, quite a little bed-sitting room. It opens on to the promenade on the larboard side of the vessel so that on the outward journey we shall see the sun rising in all its grandeur and glory. The ship is well provided with music, lecturing, and other saloons, suited to the class to which they are allotted.

And now for, a little information concerning "our company". We will not say "our companions", for we have but one. Who she is our readers will not need to be told (Malachi 3: 16). Our "company" includes a little army of "clerics"—fully fledged "Reverends"—I have already counted forty-one, and still they come; among them is a "Venerable Archdeacon" and a "Bishop". Sir Henry Lunn was wise in his day and generation in securing Dr. Poole as the leader of his "Pilgrimage" —a man capable of adapting himself to any circumstance. His state-room adjoins ours, so we are continually running against each other. As to the majority of the forty-one clerics, perhaps the less said the better; so we will leave them—for the present. The "company", generally speaking reminds me of what Dr. Thomas wrote, under similar circumstances sixty-five years ago, when crossing the Atlantic on the S.S. Idaho. Here is how he summed up the company which surrounded him then: —

"The Saloon circle was a small epitome of the 'respectable' outer world. It was an aggregation of the 'names of blasphemy', of which the eight-headed Gentile body politic is 'full' (Revelation 17: 3, 11). There was a Popish sin-pardoner, the representative of the drunken prostitute sustained by the government of Europe, and especially by the Frog Power, until 'the Ancient of Days', in consequence of the great words the mouth of the little horn is ecumenically preparing to give utterance to, shall come to destroy it utterly. There was also a broken-down politician and episcopal parson incarnate in the same palsied carcass, with the jolly-faced captain, who "did duty" according to the stereotyped routine of Queen Victoria's Prayer Book, on Sunday mornings, as representative of English and American episcopal formalism. Besides these 'miserable sinners', who with many others publicly told the Lord that they had 'erred and strayed from His ways like lost sheep', and that there was 'no health in them', there was a hard-headed and pugnacious Caledonian, a deacon of some Presbyterian conventicle in New York, returning from a visit to his fatherland, where anything may be made to flourish save bright sunshine and truth. After these came a small try of 'abominations of the earth', such as Methodists and other pious ballad singers, who now bawled out, 'Jesus shall reign where'er the sun', etc, and then adjourned to cards which exorcised them of the little sense they might otherwise have obtained credit for. Such was the man-porpoise it was my fate to room with during the voyage—a fat intellectual blank, with no ideas above a bottle of champagne and the racecourse. In the midst of this heterogeneous mass of corruption were two Jews, who had become such by putting on Christ according to the formula prescribed by Paul, who says, 'As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.'"

For " two Jews " the reader must read "a Jew and Jewess", and instead of four "reverends" imagine more than forty.

It goes without saying that were I penning these notes for the 1925 Birmingham Christadelphian, the foregoing from the pen of the Doctor would be blue-pencilled. Such suppression of the trenchant testimony of Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts, by their professed followers, is saddening; although of no concern for the rising generation of nominal Christadelphians, it is heartbreaking to

those who for half-a-century have been fighting to maintain the Truth brought to light by Dr. Thomas and bro. Roberts. It is a hard fight against vested interests, maintained under false colour, just as those of the clergy are, under the flag of the Bible, but to which they are as faithful as the Temperance Hall community is to the Birmingham Statement of Faith.

#### STRAITS OF BONIFACIO.

On our left hand we have an island about 100 miles long and 50 miles wide—a land replete with forests and foliage; and with valleys and mountains, the chief of the latter being over 9,000 feet high. The name of the island is CORSICA, famous as being the birthplace of the great Napoleon, a land whose history is reputed as having been written in blood. AJACIO, its principal city, which saw the birthplace of Napoleon, is just within sight. Another hour or so, and we are passing through the Straits, with a good view of the little town of BONIFACIO, with a population of 3,000 or 4,000 inhabitants, who, to all appearances, would be thrown into the sea were the land to be shaken, so precipitous appear the cliffs, on the edges of which the houses are built. On our right, as we pass through the Straits, on the South, is the island of SARDINIA. It is the second largest island in the Mediterranean, and like its sister island CORSICA, abounds in forests and mountains.

Having spent a day and a night in the deep, the company began to talk "business", and a meeting was held in the Saloon to arrange meetings and other things connected with such a pilgrimage. We attended as interested visitors, taking a back seat.

Dr. Poole was the chairman, and approaching us prior to the proceedings, enquired if he was correct in presuming I was the author of Palestine and the World. The conversation resulted in our being requested to address the company during the voyage. It goes without saying that the answer was in the affirmative. It is rather a unique experience for a Christadelphian to be asked to address an audience which includes forty or fifty "reverends". What will be the sequel remains to be known and told, and our readers must be content with being advised to "wait and see."

Between SARDINIA and SICILY are the LIPPARI ISLANDS— seven in all, we believe—the most important being called LIPPARI, from which the group takes its name. The latter only comprise about ten square miles of territory. The most interesting, however, of the group is STROMBOLI, surnamed "The Lighthouse of the Mediterranean" from its being a volcano in almost continual eruption; explosions being heard almost every few hours. In the middle ages it was deemed to be the gateway to purgatory, and Crusaders who passed it declared they could hear the groans of the damned souls! —F.G.J.

(To be continued.)

---

PITIABLE. —" In matters of great concern and which must be done, there is no surer argument of a weak mind than irresolution: to be undetermined where the case is so plain, and the necessity so urgent". —Dr. THOMAS, 1851.

---

### The Mission of Bro. Wauchope.

Bro. Wauchope, of Adelaide, has started upon his world tour to bring all the sections of folk called Christadelphians together in one. This is a laudable desire on right lines, but not on the lines he proposes which simply mean shutting one's eyes to the plain facts of heresy, and entails toleration of all such. For news of the success he has already achieved in his campaign we are indebted to several correspondents.

In Vancouver, B.C., he has brought together in one, the Temperance Hall fellowship, the Williams' fellowship, and the "Partial Inspiration" fellowship. This is hailed as a splendid result and it is claimed that this new combination will be in fellowship with both the Birmingham Temperance Hall and the Birmingham Suffolk Street Ecclesias.

We have prophesied this result and were not alone. The Shield did likewise last November.

In England several Temperance Hall Ecclesias are getting ready to welcome him. Plymouth Ecclesia for instance, had distributed circulars to all its members and it is now reported that Bro. Wauchope will pay a visit there. A brother has forwarded the following very effective and Scriptural reply: —

Sunday, 29th, March, 1925.

To the Brethren of the Adelaide Ecclesia,

Your brochure has been handed to me and I forward a few notes upon your suggestions as they appeal to me.

Page 1. —You advise: —"No contention nor controversy".

"Leave off contention".

"The existing Statement of Faith exhibits the doctrinal principles of Salvation".

If all the brethren believed and accepted the Statement of Faith without reservations, then you would be offering sound advice to the household. But where are some ecclesias at the present time?

1. Numbers believe in "clean flesh" and thus give us another Christ.
2. Bro. Strickler in his book *Out of Darkness (Christadelphian darkness) into Light*, rejects some Scriptural teaching, and in a letter I have seen from him, opposes Dr. Thomas and Bro. Roberts in belief.
3. Some brethren in Birmingham say they will accept the Statement of Faith in the sense of "SUBMIT" to it, but they have reservations.

With this condition within the household, how can true brethren desist from contention as you suggest? By so doing you are asking brethren to ignore the Spirit's teaching, "To contend earnestly for the Faith" (Jude 3).

Page 1. —On this page you introduce the Prodigal Son as an example of forgiveness, but you omit an equally essential feature of the narrative which teaches that Repentance must precede, and did precede the Father's Forgiveness. When Forgiveness is obtained from the Father (through the Word) upon Repentance, brethren must comply, and act upon the Repentance knowing that Forgiveness from the Father will follow.

If you can show that the erring brethren within the ecclesias have repented or changed their minds, and now believe the Truth, there will be no further cause for contention. But until this is shown—and brethren can do so with half sheet of note paper and a few drops of ink—the Spirit's teaching is very unmistakable which says: —"Withdraw from all who walk not according to the traditions received of us" (2 Thessalonians 3: 6). In fact, brethren who advocate non-contention, and non-withdrawal from error, are putting themselves outside true fellowship, for the Spirit says: —"If any man teach otherwise (than the Spirit's voice) and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of the Lord Jesus, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness . . . from such withdraw" (1 Timothy 6: 3-5).

Page 2. —You quote, "Whom GOD hath joined together let no man put asunder". All who are joined together in Fellowship with the Father, His Son and the Truth, are of one mind and one judgment, and all speak the same thing (1 Corinthians 1: 10; 1 Peter 3: 8; 1 Peter 4: 11). If we speak error we are not in fellowship with the Truth (1 John 1: 6) and there is NO FELLOWSHIP with the Father and His Son outside TRUTH, of which error is no constituent; so that those who speak error are

not joined together by GOD in His fellowship, for error mars the link of fellowship with GOD which TRUTH alone supplies.

Page 2. —You quote, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you".

If brethren do not speak the same thing as spoken by the Truth they are breaking GOD'S command, and thus are not His friends. By allowing error to exist within the household without contention we are offending GOD. It was GOD'S complaint against Israel, and Christ's complaint against the early Churches. The Scriptures clearly define that fellowship with GOD (and thereby with one another) can only exist through the Truth, and this one-ness of mind with the Truth, and with one another, makes us friends with GOD. The Spirit therefore directs Withdrawal from error seeing the Truth is the ONLY channel whereby we can obtain friendship and fellowship with GOD and His Son.

Page 3. —You quote, "If Christ loved you ye ought to love one another".

LOVE is the key-note of the Spirit's teaching in John's Epistles, and if we follow the commands therein contained, we shall LOVE in a true Scriptural sense. The Spirit says, "If there come unto you any who bring not the doctrine brought by Christ, receive him not neither bid him GOD-speed". Here we have an example of GODLY LOVE, and it is on a par with the Spirit's utterance to the early church in 1 Corinthians 5: 5, which says: —"Deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord". These are harsh treatments but they are examples of GODLY LOVE, and are commanded to be performed by such as desire to save a spirit in the day of the Lord. If we shrink now from doing what GOD has commanded because of harshness, how shall we be able to destroy flesh and blood with fire and sword when Christ comes, for "this honour hath all his saints". Standing aside or disfellowship, is an act commanded by GOD against error, and is an act of LOVE from GOD.

Page 2. —Your remarks suggesting that in the act of fellowship we presume to determine worthiness or unworthiness to meet in the Kingdom, scarcely calls for comment, for you know no brother could Scripturally think such a thought, and by its introduction you have placed "Fellowship" in an unscriptural position. We are forbidden by GOD to judge motives at any time—GOD alone can read the heart—but we are commanded to judge personal actions and also doctrine, and we disobey if we fail to do so, for GOD will not allow us to join error with His Truth and remain in His fellowship.

First purity and then peace,

Your brother in Israel's Hope".

North London Ecclesia and the Essex Hall Committee recently appointed, have issued a letter, dated March 19th, which is exactly in line with bro. Wauchope's ideas, and is couched in similar language: —

" That all contentious controversy on doctrinal differences between the two parties, supposed or real, shall cease".

When we said over a year ago that North London Ecclesia was in effect joining hands with the Suffolk Street Ecclesias, we only said what is now being clearly made manifest. The logical outcome of bro. Wauchope's circular, and the latest North London effusion, are identically the same in every way. We have little doubt but that the "Ease in Zion" movement, sponsored by these two Ecclesias—Adelaide and North London—will greatly commend itself to the supporters of the Birmingham Temperance Hall Ecclesia, and will attain success, from the point of view of the flesh. But the Spirit still calls in warning tones, and those who desire to preserve entire their heritage of Divine Truth must stand aside. —EDITORS.

---

## Palestine and the Jews.

FURTHER IRRIGATION FOR JEWISH SETTLEMENTS. —Energetic steps are being taken by the Agricultural Colonisation Department of the Palestine Zionist Executive to irrigate the fields of the Zionist settlements in the Emek and the Jordan Valley, where, owing to the lack of rain, the crops are threatened with destruction. Pipes are being used for partial irrigation to enable the settlers to raise immediately fodder for the livestock and vegetables for the market, the sale of which may possibly cover the damage of the other crops. Steps are being considered for the irrigation of the entire district of Nuris, with its various Keren Hayesod settlements, so as to save the dairies from destruction. — New Judea.

\* \* \*

AGRICULTURAL LAND IN PALESTINE. —Replying to a question by Lord Raglan in the House of Lords, on Wednesday, Earl Stanhope said that the total area of Palestine was approximately twenty-seven million dunams (a dunam being rather less than a quarter of an acre). Of this acreage, the Southern Desert embraced seven million dunams, and some seven and a half million dunams were accounted for by towns and villages, railways and roads of uncultivable land, leaving twelve and a half million dunams available for cultivation. Approximately nine million dunams were cultivated by Arabs, and about one-third left fallow each year; 850,000 dunams by Jews, and 150,000 by others. That left about two and a half million dunams remaining uncultivated, and of this probably not more than one and a half millions would, in any case, be available for Jewish settlement. He should point out that in the absence of an accurate survey, it was not possible to give accurate figures, and the area for settlement must be largely a matter for conjecture. —Jewish Chronicle.

\* \* \*

THE TOURIST SEASON 1924-25. —The Tourist Season this year was the most numerously attended in the history of Palestine; on the other hand it seems to have come to an end earlier than usual. It is estimated that there were quite 20,000 visitors, including those from other parts of Palestine, in Jerusalem for the opening of the University, and hotel and private resources were most severely taxed to accommodate them. A few stragglers may still remain, but of the thousands who came for the University opening, and even for the Passover, about all have by now left Palestine. Even Mr. Ernest Franklin, and Dr. Marjorie Franklin, who arrived only on the eve of Passover, have gone. Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Franklin arrived only a few days ago, and the other well-known English Jews still in Palestine are Mrs. Gaster, Dame Louise Samuel, Mr. Herbert Bentwich, Miss Ruth Franklin, and Miss Iris Castelli. Dr. and Mrs. J. L. Magnes, who may now be considered permanent residents, left on a visit to the United States a week or two ago. —Jewish Guardian.

\* \* \*

ARABS IN PALESTINE. —It is stated that Miss Newton, of the National Political League, who has taken a very active part in the Arab opposition to Zionism, has given a large sum of money towards the establishment of an Arab publishing company, which will issue an English newspaper in Jerusalem to conduct propaganda for the Arab cause. —Jewish Guardian.

---

## From our Post Bag.

FROM AUSTRALIA.

Am very pleased with the Berean; it lifts a lonely but truthfully clear and sonorous voice in the wilderness of Godless Gentilism—and acts as a refreshing antidote to the weak-kneed, milk-and-water policy re fellowship with error, which is studiously inculcated by the spiritual invertebrata of the Christadelphian ilk. Their present man-pleasing policy of compromise is utterly unscriptural—God must come FIRST absolutely and always. Our love of the brethren must have as its basis our unadulterated love of God. Such a love can only exist in a mind entirely subject to and saturated with

the knowledge and will of God. Such a mind is dynamically intolerant of everything that is subversive of the Truth.

Compromise is begotten of "the fear of man" that "bringeth a snare"; and let us not forget that first and foremost on the list of the rejected as tabulated in Revelation 20 are "the fearful", whereas "perfect love (of God) casteth out fear". Let us then reverence God and keep all His commandments, pleasant and unpleasant. This is our whole duty. Sentimental excuses at the Judgment Seat of Christ will avail us nothing. So take courage bro. Editor and the Everlasting Arms of Yahweh uphold you and bro. Jannaway in your fight for purity. Yours Fraternally,

PERCY O. BARNARD.

BEREAN CHRISTADELPHIAN.

6 Elms Road,  
Clapham Common, S.W. 4  
July 22/25.

DEAR BRO. DENNEY, —You may have seen the circular issued by bro. R. Smith, of Birmingham, relating to the visit of bro. Wauchope. It is noticed that the description "Berean Christadelphian" is used. I feel sure when you and bro. F. G. Jannaway added the name "Christadelphian" to the "Berean" you did not anticipate it would be used in a denominational sense and thus become descriptive of a new sect. This new name has been the vogue with some for sometime, and is evidently on the increase. It has attracted the notice of the Editor of the Fraternal Visitor as you may see from the current issue.

You frequently print it in the "Berean", but this need not necessarily mean that you fully approve.

Now I feel justified in disclaiming on behalf of Clapham any such nomenclature. We hold to the simple title of "Brethren of Christ" which is covered by the name "Christadelphian". As the title is on the wing, the difficulty is how to stop its use. In view of the fact that "Berean Christadelphians" exhibits a separation from other Christadelphians (particularly from the Temperance Hall section) it will be clung to so long as the Magazine bears its present name. It would be a simple matter to suggest another if desired. I am penning you these few thoughts knowing that the matter is causing anxiety. You may think it desirable to call attention to the matter in your next issue.

Trusting you are feeling well and with affectionate greeting,  
Faithfully your brother,

HENRY E. PURSER.

---

## Ecclesial News.

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

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

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

---

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

---

BEXLEY HEATH. —Co-operative Hall, Broadway. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m., and alternate Sundays 6.15 p.m.; Sunday School, 3 p.m.; Lecture, 7 p.m. Thursdays: Bible Class 8 p.m., last Thursday in month M.I.C., 8 p.m. We regret to report that after long forbearance we have been compelled to withdraw from bro. R. Penn for persistent absence from the Lord's Table. On the other hand we have been cheered by the obedience in baptism of Mr. Percy George Beere, son of our bro. and sis. Beere, and Mrs. Adeline Martha Newton, wife of our bro. Newton, who were immersed at Erith Baths on July 7th; we pray they may hold fast till the Lord's return. —H. A. MAYHEW, Rec. Bro.

BIRMINGHAM, (John Bright Street). —Shakespeare Rooms, Edmund Street. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m., Lecture 6.30 p.m. Wednesday, 8 p.m. We are pleased to announce since last writing you, we have been much encouraged by the company and faithful help of the following: —Brethren Moorhead (Luton), F. H. Jakeman (Dudley), W. Southall and T. Phipps (Great Bridge), and bro. D. Jakeman (Dudley). We thank God for these mercies and press forward, notwithstanding the many gainsayers in general, and "some" in particular. These would have us trim our sails and take in any breeze of the Gentile Apostasy; but the ship of "truth" sails not with such foul "winds". —C. H. NORRIS, Rec. Bro.

BRIDGEND. —Wyndham Street. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m.; Eureka Class, 3 p.m.; Lecture, 6.30 p.m. We are pleased to announce that the circumstances which caused the Eureka Class to discontinue, no longer prevail, and the class conducted by our bro. Squires is well attended by our young brethren. We have benefited by arrangements made with the Newport brethren, and have enjoyed an uplifting visit from our bro. Ivor Rees (Clarence Hall), who exhorted us to love and good works in the morning, and lectured in the evening. It is a great comfort to be associated with those of like precious faith. We have also again enjoyed the cheering company of our bro. and sis. Ellis (Ystrad), and have now arranged (God willing) exchange visits with them—who knows what the result may be? —W. WINSTON, 6 Coity Road.

DUDLEY (Scott's Green). —Christadelphian Hall. Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m.; Lecture, 6.30 p.m. Bible Class, Wednesday, 7.30 p.m. Since our last communication we have been busily engaged in various branches of the Master's work. On June 20th, the Sunday School outing took place, when about one hundred of us spent a most enjoyable time at Stourport, enjoying the blessings of the life that now is, and remembering glories that are to come. On June 27th, in connection with the Eureka Class belonging to the Sunday School, a party of thirty-five paid a visit to London. Conducted by bro. E. W. Evans, we paid a visit to the Museum and saw for ourselves the evidences of the veracity of the Word of God. We believe, not because we have been told, but because we have seen. It was a visit that will live with us. In the afternoon we joined the Clapham brethren and sisters at Bushey Park, and enjoyed a spiritual feast of comfort, edification and warning. We have also supported the Great Bridge Ecclesia in the faithful endeavour (indoor and outside) to contend in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel. A few of us paid a visit to Blackheath in answer to the Macedonian cry. Our hymn well describes the situation which we felt—"Thick darkness broodeth yet", and not until the "Morning Star" arises will it be dispelled. In faithfulness to Christ we have withdrawn from bro. Aston for questioning and denying the Elements of the One Faith. Our thanks go out to the brethren who have loyally assisted us. —FRED H. JAKEMAN, Rec. Bro.

LIVERPOOL. —18 Colquitt St. Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11 a.m. Lecture, 6.30 p.m. Wednesdays, 8 p.m., 31 Stanley Street, Fairfield. A fraternal gathering was held on June 6th when about forty brethren and sisters assembled. Bro. Elston spoke on "God our Strength"; bro. Geatley, "God our Joy"; bro. Rothwell, "God our Peace"; a most profitable time was spent together, those present expressing their appreciation of the comfort received: we are only a few in these parts, the majority preferring the way of ease and comfort, but our stay is upon the God of Israel who can save with either few or many. Our endeavour is to build up and edify in all possible ways, that we may endure the good fight of faith

and lay hold on Eternal Life. Bro. W. Chadwick has left us and rejoined the ecclesia in fellowship with Birmingham Temperance Hall, although his mind is unchanged with regard to the sin of Birmingham. Bro. I. J. Mandale has departed from the Truth on the vital doctrine of the nature and sacrifice of Jesus, and, therefore, ceases to be in our fellowship. Let these unfaithful lapses prove incentives to us to trust in the strength of Yahweh, for away from Him, the flesh will choose the easier path, which always leads towards the broad and easy road. This has considerably reduced our numbers, the writer being the only brother, who is now contending against the false doctrine fast gaining ground in the Temperance Hall fellowship. We are thankful for the help of a few sisters whose steadfastness is worthy of commendation in an age when the fear of God is taught by the precepts of men. We thank God and take courage: He will save to the uttermost. —W. ROTHWELL, Rec. Bro.

LONDON (Clapham). —Avondale Hall, Landor Road, S.W. Sundays: Mutual Improvement Class, 9.45 a.m.; Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m.; Sunday School, 11 a.m., Lecture, 7 p.m. L.C.C. SANTLEY STREET SCHOOL (nearest approach from Ferndale Road, Brixton Road). Tuesdays: Eureka Class and Mutual Improvement Class (alternately), 8 p.m. Thursdays: Bible Class, 8 p.m. We are pleased to be able to report the baptism of Miss Ada May Thorpe on June 14th last. The name of the brother reported last month as "Naish" should read "Maish". We welcome to our membership sis. Bessie Olden from Toronto, Canada. The following have removed to the Croydon meeting as being more convenient, viz., Bro. and sis. R. Davis, and their son, bro. W. R. E. Davis, also sisters F. Wood and E. D Parsons. We have had the painful duty of withdrawing from bro. Stephen Charles Crosskey, who for some time past has manifested indifference to the responsibilities of the Truth and has now completely lost faith in the things he at one time believed. We hope that the love which has now grown cold may be re-kindled ere it is too late. We extend our sympathy to bro. Buxton in the loss of his sister wife who died June 12th last. She suffered much but is now at rest awaiting the call from the grave and the reward of eternal life promised to all who are faithful unto death. She was interred at Norwood Cemetery on June 24th, a number of brethren and sisters being present at the graveside. The Sunday School Superintendent (bro. F. G. Ford) furnishes the following report: —"The Summer Outing of the Clapham Ecclesia and Sunday School was held on Saturday, June 27th, when Bushey Park and Hampton Court were visited by a large number of brethren and sisters and children. We were glad to have the company of over thirty brethren and sisters from Dudley and Great Bridge, who made a special journey to London for the occasion, visiting the British Museum and other places of interest in the morning and proceeding to Bushey Park in the afternoon. After tea in the Pavilion, the children were addressed by bro. A. H. Jannaway, and received prizes for races, etc., run earlier in the day; whilst a meeting was held for the adults in a large tent, provided for the occasion. The meeting was addressed by bro. J. M. Evans, A. T. Jannaway, and bro. Jakeman junr., of Dudley. In a brief review of the years that had elapsed since our first visit to Bushey Park, our brethren exhorted us to hold fast to the glorious hope which was the cause of our coming together, and not to grow weary or turn aside as many had done because of worldly attractions, or other causes which had led to their first love for the Truth growing cold. Special trams took the company back to London after a day which we all felt had been enjoyable and helpful in our endeavour to attain the Kingdom". — H. E. PURSER, Rec. Bro.

LONDON (Clapton). —Pembury Hall, 41 Pembury Road, Clapton, E.5. Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11 a.m., Lecture 6.30 p.m. Tuesdays: Bible Class, 8 p.m. We are pleased to report that after a satisfactory interview, bro. and sis. T. Richardson, formerly of the North London Ecclesia, have been received into our fellowship, having decided to dissociate themselves from current heresies. —C. C. REDMILL, Rec. Bro.

LONDON, WEST (Gunnersbury). —Ivy Hall, Wellesley Road. Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11 a.m., Lecture 6 p.m. Wednesdays, 8 p.m. We held our Fraternal Outing to Kew Gardens on June 13th, adjourning to Ivy Hall for the after meeting when about a hundred brethren and sisters partook of spiritual refreshment. We are persevering in the testimony to the Truth by distributing literature, and lecturing, and have had one or two strangers at the lectures. It has been our painful duty to withdraw our fellowship from sis. Brett owing to her departure from the Faith. Visitors at the Table of the Lord have been: sis. Caulton (Derby), bro. and sis. F. H. Trapp (Clapton), sisters E. A. Robinson, D. A. Robinson, and Hunt Smith (Clapham), and sis. Shekel (Putney). —W. E. EUSTACE, Rec. Bro.

LONDON (Putney). —The Scouts' Hall, Oxford Road, S.W. Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 11 a.m.; Lecture 6.30 p.m. It is with great pleasure we report the obedience in baptism of Mr. Edwin Perry (son of our bro. and sis. E. Perry) on June 9th, 1925. We earnestly trust he will endure faithfully unto the end, and finally receive that crown of Life which fadeth not away. We continue to bear testimony to the Truth, Sunday by Sunday, by public proclamation, and are encouraged from time to time by the attendance of a few interested strangers. We have received much help and encouragement by the ministrations of faithful brethren, whose services have been very greatly appreciated. We have lost sis. L. Reed, by removal to Clapham. —W. H. JACKSON, Rec. Bro.

MARGATE. —Foresters (Lower) Hall, Union Row. Sundays: Lecture, 3 p.m., Breaking of Bread 4.15 p.m. Wednesdays, Bible Class, 7.30 p.m at "Lachine", Addiscombe Road, Dane Park We are still able to interest a few strangers in this town of pleasure, through the help of brethren from Clapham, Ilford and Gunnersbury, to whom we are deeply grateful, the attendance for last Quarter averaging five. We have also been cheered and encouraged by the company of visiting brethren and sisters at the Table of the Lord, and are especially grateful to the brethren who have ministered to our Spiritual needs during their brief holidays, appreciating the untiring labours of those who consider there is no holiday in the work of the Vineyard. —A. FURNEAUX, Rec Bro.

NOTTINGHAM. —Sundays: Breaking of Bread, 10.30 a.m.; School, Eureka Class; Wednesday 7.45 p.m. At our last quarterly meeting the following resolution was adopted: —"That this ecclesia considers that it is not consistent for brethren and sisters to be members of Trade Unions, for the following reasons: That we are commanded to refuse to be yoked together with unbelievers. Also that Trade Unions are becoming more distinctly political organisations; therefore it is inconsistent for a people who declare that they can take no part in politics, to permit themselves to be considered constituents of labour members, or associates of a great political party". The idea is now to get in touch with all brethren and sisters of like mind so that the heads of the Unions can be approached, and the position of these brethren and sisters placed before them. The lectures here are being well attended and much interest manifested. —W. J. ELSTON, Rec. Bro.

PEMBERTON, (nr. Wigan). —Orrell Gardens, Orrell Post. Sundays: School 2 p.m., Breaking of Bread 3 p.m., Lecture 6.30 p.m. Wednesdays 7 p.m. We regret having to report withdrawal from brethren Thomas Berry and Thomas A. Roby for long continued absence from the Table of the Lord. We have also withdrawn from bro. James Silcock, who has adopted views subversive to the Truth as believed by us. We are, however, glad he has not advocated his views in the Sunday School during the tenure of office as Superintendent. Our efforts to regain him have not been successful. We hope and pray he will see the error of his way. We still continue to make known the Truth to those around us, and we pray that God's blessing may follow our work, and with patience wait for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have been encouraged to steadfastness by the ministration of the following, to whom our thanks are due: —Brethren W. Cockcroft, A. Geatley, and W. V. Butterfield (Oldham), F. G. Jannaway (London), W. J. Elston (Nottingham), W. Rothwell (Liverpool). —J. WINSTANLEY, Rec. Bro.

PLYMOUTH. —Temperance Hall, Millbay Road. Sundays: Breaking of Bread 11 am.; Lecture 6.30 p.m. Bible Class, Thursday at 8.15 p.m. We are pleased to report the visit of bro. Geo. H. Denney to us on Sunday, July 12th, who in the morning gave us encouraging words of exhortation, and in the evening gave a lecture on the subject "Jesus Christ and the Modern Mind. Can they be reconciled"? This lecture was advertised in the local papers and by the circulation of literature and invitations but from the small number of strangers present it is evident that the Modern Mind and Jesus Christ are not reconciled. We held our Annual Outing on Wednesday, July 22nd, at Elburton. The brethren and sisters with interested strangers numbered seventeen, with seven Sunday School scholars, and despite showery weather, a most enjoyable time was spent. —J. HODGE, Rec. Bro.

SLAITHWAITE (Nr. Huddersfield). —11 Longlands Road, Slaithwaite. We are very pleased to report that we had the pleasure of the company of Bro. J. W. Atkinson, of Crewe, at our Breaking of Bread, on Whit- Sunday. We much enjoyed our brother's words of exhortation, and spent a very

profitable time together. We would give a hearty invitation to our brethren and sisters who are in fellowship with us (especially those who belong to the ecclesias in fellowship that are not far distant from us), to give us the pleasure of a visit whenever possible at our Breaking of Bread, as we are still in isolation. —W. F. BRADFORD, Rec. Bro.

## AUSTRALIA.

MELBOURNE. —55 Glen Huntley Road, Elsternwick. We have had the company at Breaking of Bread meetings of sis. Amy Drabble (Brock) from Keller-berrin, W.A. She is passing through Melbourne on her way to Sydney, but will stay here awhile. The March Berean Christadelphian Intelligence brought many applications and enquiries, so we hope the work being done will bring forth fruit in due season. We note bro. F. J. Jannaway's intended visit to Palestine and elsewhere which, without doubt, will be of interest to the readers of the Berean Christadelphian; it would be a great work accomplished and many misunderstandings could be personally cleared away if it were possible for the journey to be extended to Australia and New Zealand. LATER. —It is with pleasure I am able to report as visitors to the Breaking of Bread meeting, June 21<sup>st</sup> and 28th, of sis. Moss, Ledgerwood, East Coast, Tasmania, whose company with sis. Amy Drabble, of Keller-berrin, W. Australia, we expect for a few more Sundays. We realize the meaning of the words "where two or three are", there will our Father be, and knowing He is a God of Love as well as a just and righteous Judge, we appreciate His blessings. Enquires are still arriving, March issue Intelligence bring them now from New Zealand and Vancouver, B.C. Canada, bringing words of comfort and strength, refreshing us for the work ahead, knowing that God has spoken and will surely perform His glorious promises: therefore, we remember the glory and remember the land, saying with John in Patmos, "Even so come, Lord Jesus, come quickly". —JAMES HUGHES.

## CANADA.

BUENA VISTA, B.C.—This comes to announce that I now have decided to rank up with you in the stand for purity of doctrine and fellowship. I was baptized (on behalf of the Great Bridge, Tipton, Ecclesia) on Jan. 28th, 1880, at Dudley, England. I was well-known in the Midlands, lecturing for Great Bridge, West Bromwich, Dudley, Netherton, Lichfield, Cannock, Nuneaton and Hednesford. I was well and intimately known to the late bro. and sis. R. Roberts, and began to contribute to the Christadelphian the year before I was immersed, and it now regularly visits me and will do up to this year's end. I am in isolation here, breaking bread with my sister-wife every first day. I am sixteen miles from Vancouver, and four from New Westminster. I might possibly be able to visit the ecclesia at bro. Fenn's, Jubilee, B.C. occasionally, but having experienced three strokes in the last four years, it is precarious to venture out. Not only have I heart trouble, but have been a sufferer from pulmonary tuberculosis for the last seventeen years. On Aug. 21st next, I reach my sixty-sixth milestone in the journey through life. I once heard bro. Frank C Jannaway lecture in Birmingham, and as secretary of the Great Bridge Ecclesia on one or two occasions invited his brother, Walter, to lecture for us. Asking God's blessing on His pure Truth and His noble upholders thereof, with love in the glorious Truth, I have the honour to subscribe myself, Your fellow-labourer Zionward. W. H. MOSLEY.

HAMILTON, (Ont.). —I.O.O.F. Temple, 41 Gore Street. Sundays: School 9.45 a.m.; M.I.C. 10 a.m. Breaking of Bread 11 a.m.; Lecture 7 p.m. Wednesday; Bible Class 8 p.m. On May 14th, Rita Verna Coppins (one of our Sunday School scholars), age thirteen, was baptized for the remission of sins; she has decided to remember her Creator in the days of her youth, and we trust will continue faithful to the end. Our visitors at the Table of the Lord recently were brother Malan and Orloff Carrick, and sister Carrick, of Hagersville, Ont., sis. Gruitt, and sis. McBride from Buffalo, N.Y., bro. De Bois, of Montreal. Our thankful appreciation is extended to bro. D. Gwalchmai, of London, Ont., for his willing help in the service of the Truth. —H. WARD, Rec. Bro.

VANCOUVER, B.C.—Breaking of Bread, Sunday 11 a.m. at 2360 Fredrick Avenue, Burnaby. We are pleased to say that we have had another addition to our number. On Wednesday, June 10th, Eva

May Harding, age 15, after a good confession of the things of the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, was immersed into the Saving Name and received into fellowship on Sunday, June 14th. We have been asked to define what we mean when we speak of the "Berean" Basis of Faith. Our basis is "The Birmingham Temperance Hall amended Statement of Faith (both positive and negative) without reservations". Withdrawal from Birmingham Temperance Hall and all in their fellowship on two counts: —1. What is known as the Birmingham Trouble. 2. The Strickler Heresy. We use the term "Berean" for the purpose of distinction and believe the above basis is in harmony with the teaching of the Berean in the matter of fellowship. —W. B. FENN, Rec. Bro.

BOSTON. —The brethren here who have come out for purity, have now secured a suitable hall, and are making progress. All enquiries to be made to bro. R. Wilson, the recording brother of 154 Alabama St., Mattapan, Mass.

## UNITED STATES.

PHILADELPHIA. —Just a note to say bro. W. H. Woodworth, M.D., died May 5th, after a very short illness and was laid to rest, for we hope a short time, in Mount Peace Cemetery. He came here about two years ago from Newark, N.J. The writer had been closely in touch with him for about twenty years, and knew him to be straight in the Truth, and opposed to the error which is causing so much havoc in this and other lands. "The Clean Flesh Heresy", we sat and talked it all over pro and con just a short time before his death. He was clear on the matter, and opposed to holding any "reservations" concerning it. The writer said what was necessary at the service held in his home, and laid him to sleep in Hope of a glorious awakening. He leaves a widowed sister, two sons and one daughter; one son and the daughter came into the Truth. I am not writing from any ecclesia, as at present I am not in fellowship with any in this city. Faithfully your brother striving for purity in the Truth, and the hope of Life, DAVID C. WILSON, 3330N, 15th St.

## NOTES BY THE WAY.

From Bro. B. J. Dowling.

It was after my first visit to California that bro. J. T. Irwin of Los Angeles undertook the defence of brother Strickler's writings. By letter and by pamphlet he has striven to prove that those who condemn bro. Strickler's writings are condemning "God's Truth" as bro. Strickler himself also claims. Bro. Irwin is very outspoken in his defence, saying in a letter to a brother, "I write you further giving reasons for my DISBELIEF of the doctrine that is held by some Christadelphians, that CHRIST HAD TO OFFER FOR HIMSELF". As this statement of belief was a bold contradiction of Paul's inspired declaration in Hebrews 7: 27, "This he did once when he offered up himself", the Los Angeles ecclesia passed a resolution declaring they would "not fellowship anyone holding this erroneous teaching"; but bro. Irwin stood firmly to his mad folly.

But the real surprise came when the editors of the Birmingham Christadelphian espoused the dangerous cause of brethren Irwin and Strickler and branded those who had stood firm for the Christadelphian doctrine, as "sowers of discord among brethren". But despite this "campaign of slander", and the unbearable proposition published in their "Ecclesia Relationships", that "an item of intelligence in the Christadelphian is a sufficient intimation for all concerned to observe", the men of the Golden West were inflexible in their determination to uphold the Truth in its Purity, and they refused to be swayed from their purpose by the above editors, as were some of the more "simple" (Romans 16: 18) in a few sections of the East. The next erroneous attempt to sway the destinies of the Truth in the land of the setting sun, was made by bro. Edwin Hill who in a very uncouth and illogical manner gave his reasons for his disbelief of doctrines held by Christadelphians.

Having succeeded in deceiving the Birmingham editors, he regarded the task before him in the West as comparatively easy. But he found by an unpleasant experience that the brethren and sisters of the "Orange Kingdom", were individuals of harder mental parts and not so easily misled.

After a few interviews and considerable letter writing, he was, to use the words of Job, glad he "escaped with the skin of his teeth". In a letter to sister Golden, he wrote as follows: —

"Now mark you, bro. Dowling, who is mostly to blame for deluding you folk says: 'The body cannot be redeemed from this sin and death condition until this physical principle in our nature, the devil, which has the power of death, has been destroyed', as you also speak of in concluding your letter."

Bro. Hill then continues, "Of course it is foolishness, for certain it is, there is no such devil in the flesh as a physical principle of sin which has to be destroyed. . . Surely the sacrifice was not to destroy the devil or sin principle in the flesh of the lamb or to atone for any farm-yard etiquette it might have committed". Could any argument be more clumsy or grotesque? The Scriptures declare that the blood of an animal could not take away sin. Sin was forgiven under the Mosaic Law because of confession and obedience, but the taking away of sin or the elimination of the cause of it, required the sacrifice of the nature that had sinned (see Eureka Vol. III., p. 666). Bro. Hill makes no distinction between type and antitype. Shadow and substance are the same with him. He is following a shadow, nothing more, and his hope is built upon it. O, foolish man: who hath bewitched him?

Speaking of evil thoughts he wrote saying: "Surely since nothing of the sort proceeded out of the heart of Jesus, it should be permissible to speak of him as A CLEAN FLESH MAN".

Brethren Hill and Irwin are confessedly "clean-flesh" advocates. They have failed to grasp the truth that while Christ was begotten of the Father, he was made and born of a woman—the Word made flesh, made in the nature of Adam—a Son of Adam (Luke 3: 38) whose being or nature the sentence defiled, becoming a physical law of sin and death in his constitution, which was transmitted to all his posterity, including Christ. There was therefore a "necessity that this man (Christ) have somewhat to offer", to "purify" himself, and redeem his nature by atonement—see Clause 5, Statement of Faith, also Hebrews 8: 3; 9: 13, 23; 13: 20, and Leviticus 17: 11.

The conception of the matter in the minds of brethren Hill, Irwin and Strickler is, that "sin in the flesh" is not a hereditary physical principle of evil to be destroyed (Hebrews 2: 14, Elpis Israel, p. 113), but a graduated mental condition brought about by the number and heinousness of personal transgressions, and as Christ never transgressed they claim that he was free from it, and therefore they conclude that "it is permissible to speak of him as a clean-flesh man". If this were true, it would make Christ's death substitutionary—a slander upon the character of God—a violation of His righteousness in requiring the death of a man that ought not to die. Such teaching leads men away from the light of Truth into the darkness of the blackest error.

Dr Thomas said: "Those who hold Paul's doctrine ought not to worship with a body that does not. . . although it might require us to separate from the nearest and dearest" (Christadelphian 1873, p. 324). Temperance Hall and kindred ecclesias are acting in opposition to Dr. Thomas' Scriptural counsel. They are following a perverse and wayward course in fellowshipping these "false teachers" and recommending others to do the same.

The responsibility now rests with them, but believers of the Truth everywhere should condemn their attitude and resist their efforts to force such an evil upon the household. Read 2 John 7, 11.

---

